

SCHOOL QUALITY REVIEW REPORT

FOR

Oakland High School

1023 MacArthur Ave., Oakland, CA 94610

Oakland Unified School District

Principal: Matin Abdel-Qawi

2014-2015

SQR Visit: February 10-12, 2015

In Preparation for the WASC Visit in Fall 2015

School Quality Review Leads and Report Authors

David Chambliss and Marie Roberts/ Continuous School Improvement

FINDINGS

The School Quality Review team spent three days (February 10-12, 2015) at Oakland High school—observing classrooms, school-wide activities, and various parts of the campus inside and outside the building. The Team conducted a variety of interviews (individually and in groups) with students, parents, teachers, classified staff, administrators, and community partners. The Team also reviewed the school documents, performance data, and budget. Before and after the three day site visit, the Lead Evaluator interviewed additional current and former school staff, partner organization staff, and District leaders.

The following report provides a description of this school’s strengths and challenges in its development toward the school quality defined in the OUSD School Quality Standards. This report does not offer specific recommendations for further improvement or growth. A key goal of the School Quality Review is for schools to “see” what they do well and what needs improvement. It is the school community, in coordination with central supports that should identify what should be done next to improve the quality of services the school provides students and families. These next steps need to be carefully planned and prioritized by the various stakeholders of the school and incorporated into the school’s Site Plan.

HOW TO READ THE FINDINGS IN THIS REPORT

The findings are organized into 5 broad areas known as School Quality Indicators:

1. Quality Learning Experiences for All Students;
2. Safe, Supportive & Health Learning Environments;
3. Learning Communities Focused on Continuous Improvement;
4. Meaningful Student, Family and Community Engagement;
5. Effective School Leadership & Resource Management.

Each School Quality Indicator has several focus School Quality Standards (see Appendix on p. 47; highlighted in blue). For example,

Quality Indicator 1: Quality Learning Experiences for All Students *(School conditions standards)*

A quality school...

1. provides students with curriculum that is meaningful and challenging to them.
2. provides safe and nurturing learning environments.
3. ensures that the curriculum follows state and district standards, with clear learning targets.
4. uses instructional strategies that make learning active for students and provide them with different ways to learn.

Findings for School Quality Indicator 1 (pp. 6-26)

The standards for School Quality Indicator 1 are focused exclusively on the classroom. The findings on this set of standards are organized by “academic strand”.

What are the “Academic Strands”? Given the number and variety of classroom academic offerings at Oakland High, the SQR Team decided that, for School Quality Indicator 1 standards, it could provide the best feedback organized not by the school as a whole, but by more specific “parts” of the school. In preparation for the site visit, with the school leadership, the SQR Team identified that Oakland High had several academic “strands” with somewhat distinct conditions and strategies for student learning:

- 9th grade Families: Math, English, Social Studies, and Science teachers have formed into families where teachers are collaborating in their instructional planning and coordinating supports for students.
- Career Academies: English, Social Studies, and Science teachers in the three career academies—Environmental Science (ESA), Public Health (PHA), and Visual Arts (VAAMP)—are collaborating in their instructional planning and coordinating supports for students.
- Math Department: Teachers in the Math Department have reported specific instructional improvement efforts around the implementation of the common core standards and around providing a diversity of offerings that address the needs of Tech students.
- Special Education: PEC teachers serve a high-needs population that is one of the largest of any high school in OUSD, and must build instructional conditions in their classrooms that are often distinct from mainstream classes.

Given this, the SQR Team organized its data collection and ratings for School Quality Indicator 1 into **5 academic strands**:

1. **9th Grade** (9th grade Math, English, Social Studies, and Science classes);
2. **Career Academies** (10th-12th grade English, Social Studies, and Science classes part of the 3 Career Academies)
3. **General Education** (English, Social Studies, and Science classes in grades 10-12 that are not part of a Career Academy);
4. **Math classes** (10th-12th grade); and
5. **Special Education classes**.

Data collection for key School Quality Indicator 1 standards (1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.7, 1.10 and 1.11) was conducted specifically through classroom observations and short student interviews, during the observations—whereas data collection for the other school quality indicators was done through campus observations, longer interviews, and focus groups. **The SQR Team observed 73 classes at Oakland High School, looking for specific “key elements” of these key School Quality Standards.** To determine how Oakland High was developing toward the quality described in these “student learning experiences” standards, the SQR Team did the following:

1. Assessed whether each “key element” of the standard (again, see the rubrics in Appendix on p. 47) was present or not present during each observation;
2. Added the number of times, across all the observations, each key element was present, and divided that by the total number of observations—to arrive at a “frequency” percentage, or the percent of classroom observations where each key element was present.

The following “Academic Strands” analyses and ratings for School Quality Indicator 1 begins with a Classroom Observations Frequencies Chart that presents these frequencies for each Oakland High Academic Strand and specific evidence for each element, collected by the SQR Team. For example,

<i>Standard 1.2</i>		9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
Safe & Nurturing Learning Experiences	A. Students are safe and learn free from intimidation, bullying, and/or discrimination.	92%	68%	63%	78%	100%	78%
	<i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The learning environment is calm; students are engaged (always at least 90%). There was no evidence of bullying, intimidation or discrimination • Students were able to self-monitor. Twice during the discussion students “called each other out” but re-directed the conversation. • Students cursed aloud, yelled, off task. Teacher had little control; few students on task. 						

Based on the specific evidence in this frequency chart, each Academic Strand is rated for its development toward the quality described in each standard. For example,

STANDARD RATINGS for each Oakland High Academic Strand

Focus Standard	Focus Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
STRAND 1: 9th Grade (English, Social Studies, and Science classes)						
1.1	Meaningful and Challenging Curriculum		X			
1.2	Safe & Nurturing Learning Experiences			X		
1.4	Active & Different Types of Learning		X			

These ratings are then followed by bulleted statements that compare Academic Strands, thereby summarizing the whole school’s development toward the quality described by each of these key standards in School Quality Indicator 1. For example,

Cross Strand Summary Analysis

Focus Standard	Focus Standard	Summary Analysis
1.1	Meaningful and Challenging Curriculum	<i>Strengths</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The observations across all 5 academic strands showed consistent evidence of classroom learning building on students prior knowledge, skills, and experiences. The Career Academy and Special Education classes were particularly well-developed on this key indicator of meaningful curriculum.

Findings for School Quality Indicators 2-5 (pp. 27-44)

For 2 standards in School Quality Indicator 1 and each standard in School Quality Indicators 2-5, the report provides:

1. bulleted summary statements about the evidence gathered from across the school on that standard; and
2. a rating of the school’s development toward the quality described by that standard.

These bulleted summary statements and the rating draw on the specific developmental scale and language of each standard’s rubric (located in Appendix, p. 47). For example,

Focus Standard	Focus Standard	Rubric Rating	Summary Explanation of Ratings
1.8	Academic Intervention & Enrichment Support	<i>Beginning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SQR Team collected evidence that Oakland High had some systems to <u>identify</u> students who were struggling and <u>why</u> they needed academic support.

This analysis is followed by a Summary Chart of the ratings for the standards. For example,

Standard #	Focus Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
1.8	Academic Intervention & Enrichment Support		X			
1.10	Equitable Access to Curriculum		X			

Quality Indicator 1: Quality Learning Experiences for All Students

"ACADEMIC STRANDS" ANALYSES AND RATINGS

<u>Classroom Observations Frequency Chart</u>		Oakland High Academic Strands (# of Classroom Observations in this strand)						
		9 th Grade (13)	Academies (19)	General Ed (16)	Math (9)	Special Ed (10)	Whole School (73)	
School Quality Standard	Key Element of the Standard	Percent of Classroom Observations where this Key Element was Present						
Standard 1.1 Meaningful & Challenging Curriculum	A. Learning builds on students' prior knowledge/ skills/ experiences.	77%	95%	63%	67%	90%	79%	
	<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are reading "Of Mice and Men" and the second part of the lesson builds upon yesterday's learning. • Work is supposed to build on prior knowledge; however there were new students and a buddy class room student that was dropped off in the class. Some students were lost because they missed yesterday and didn't know what to do. • Teacher posted yesterday's LT in addition to today's on Active Board • Students have been working on the writing process that involves editing and peer conference. This lesson focused on self-reflected editing and peer conference. • Warm-up question taps into prior knowledge in order to do an analysis of a text. • The class is reading a novel. The teacher started the class with introducing the term 'exposition' and related this term to personal experiences. The students had to talk in groups of 2 or 3 what exposition means and how it's used in everyday life. One student told his partner that in the movie star wars, the exposition is at the beginning when the writing scrolls and gives context and background. The other student was like, "oh yeah!" • The "Do Now" required students to recall a past learned technique as well as the continuation of an ongoing project. • The catalyst/do now was for students to write what a stem cell is, activating the learning from the previous day. • Disjointed lesson: nothing related to previous lessons and the activities did not tie together. All activities came from different work books. 							
	<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>		9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
	B. Students apply learning to questions or problems connected to their interests, goals, experiences, and communities.	54%	63%	50%	22%	60%	52%	
<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The learning target that was stated and reviewed asks Ss to "Connect the War on Diamonds with the Hip Hop Industry" Ss are reading about Sierra Leone and making connections to life in US 								

- *During the reading, students made connections to the language characters were using to the book to language used today*
- *This lesson did not make direct connections, nor did the student interviews indicate that they are connecting the work to their interests, goals, experiences or communities*
- *Teacher talked entire time. Problems were textbook with no input or connection to students' goals or experiences.*
- *Students had to re-read their writing and determined what needs to be revised on their own, and then they read each other's writing to give input and suggestions.*
- *Continuation of civil rights conversation from seeing the movie Selma a few weeks ago. All of this stems from the study of how gay rights partly developed out of advocating for your partner in the medical setting.*
- *The "Do Now" discussion was about whether or not greed is good. It was a follow-up to the previous class, where reporters were debating whether or not China's free market economy was greedy. It was a rich discussion with students articulating both sides of the argument.*
- *Teacher facilitated students relating modern day characteristics of teenagers dating, or talking about having sex to understand what was happening in the play.*
- *Other than passing the AP exam, students did not make other connections.*
- *No student work time. All direct instruction and T-S-T-S interactions. Students were not allowed to talk to each other at any time. No students were allowed to ask a question.*
- *Students weren't paying attention to the teacher. At best, there were 3 students who had eyes on the teacher, at any given time, there was not much learning going on. None of it was connected to students' interests, goals, experiences, communities.*
- *Students were working on homophones worksheets and matching first sounds with letters. They did not connect to their own interests. Work was completely driven by the worksheet and the game board.*
- *Yes, students are learning real life skills, such as basic hygiene and continued basic communication using assisted devices and computers. Student learn the importance of personal hygiene and the essential of basic communication using monitor and sensing devices.*

Key Element of the Standard	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
C. Students communicate their thinking, supported by teacher/peers, using the language and reasoning of the discipline.	46%	63%	56%	67%	90%	61%

- Examples from Classroom Observations:*
- *Students presenting their questions, thinking, and work on small white boards positioned in front of each group.*
 - *Teacher provided students opportunity to share their thoughts after the choral reading. Thereafter, students were able to share their thinking, critique, and reasoning around the shared reading. Student academic discussion skills of both listening, responding, and articulating thoughts clearly.*
 - *Students were comparing and contrasting a modern film version of "Romeo and Juliet" with the traditional version. While students were able to discuss through comparison, there was not a requirement to use / cite textual evidence nor to build upon the thinking of others.*
 - *Most students were working independently with teacher intervention. Little or no opportunity for structured academic discussion in pairs, groups, or whole class.*
 - *A few students talked, but they used low level math language like "graph", while the teacher was discussing "polynomials" and "graphing coordinates" and "slope". Teacher allowed little wait time for student response and answered own questions.*
 - *The reasoning behind the assignment was supported throughout the presentations. Specifically students had to explain why the subject matter was important to them.*

- The teacher went over key vocabulary at the beginning so the students used the vocabulary in the discussion.
- Teacher prompted students, but most interaction was a call and response w/o academic language.
- Following the movie, teacher used Socratic seminar discussion prompts to engage students in open ended questions. Socratic method was projected on the board and students were led in review.
- Students had to create explanatory book for children using academic/scientific language and concepts.
- When teacher did 1 to 1s with students, especially when their answers were not correct, she asked them first to explain how they came up with the answer they did.

Key Element of the Standard	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
D. Curriculum reflects an academic push, from the teacher, to have all students progress far and attain high levels of mastery.	46%	53%	56%	56%	90%	58%

- Examples from Classroom Observations:*
- While the exit ticket and homework ask students to write opinions, there was not an expectation that the opinion include evidence (either from text or other sources) which would show a higher level of mastery
 - While student were engaged in a discussion, the discussion did not involve building on the thinking of others nor require them to use textual evidence which would have been a push and indication of mastery.
 - Teacher was consistently monitoring students progress, providing support, and nudging students on task. Warm demander classroom management to make sure all were on task and receiving support (e.g. positive narration, and circulating among groups).
 - Students self select where they sit. There are several students in the back of the room that are not engaged. Students on the left side were on task then jumped off task looking at cell phone video.
 - There was not push to keep students on task and on pace with reading.
 - Teacher focused on front four tables and "ignored" other four tables of students. There was no academic push. Teacher did "heavy lifting."
 - Students take copious notes verbatim as projected on the board and spend most of the time on this activity. Very little thinking.
 - Teacher poses great questions and allows for productive discussions and productive struggle
 - Teacher did a reading workshop. At different instances the teacher stopped and modeled different strategies for reading new text.
 - Every student was assigned a part in the Hamlet play, and to perform their part they had to also be able to explain what their lines meant.
 - Teacher pushed for more practice when he saw that not all groups could work out the problem. If they all got it he moved on to new material. If he noticed the groups could not answer questions on the strategy, he re-visited the problem and went over it again.
 - There is no academic push, no clear lesson or plan and no clear activity. The noise is high as the games on the phones continue
 - No push from teacher to have students progress. It was free for all. People were scattered all around the room in pairs, small groups, and individuals talking, laughing, looking and talking on their phones, dozing, etc...
 - The students work hard in this class. They stay on track. Teacher pushes them to keep on and not give up. She does not let them just "get by".
 - 3 students were working on math related to IEP goal and they appeared to be challenged by the work. When challenged they asked teacher for support.

Standard 1.2 Safe & Nurturing Learning Experiences	Key Element of the Standard	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
	A. Students are safe and learn free from intimidation, bullying, and/or discrimination.		92%	68%	63%	78%	100%
<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The learning environment is calm; students are engaged (always at least 90%). There was no evidence of bullying, intimidation or discrimination</i> <i>Students were able to self-monitor. Twice during the discussion students "called each other out" but re-directed the conversation.</i> <i>Students cursed aloud, yelled, off task. Teacher had little control; few students on task.</i> <i>Students were able to snatch paper from each other and talk disrespectfully. They eat in class, drop candy in class, talk on cell phones, take pictures, have ear phones, with no intervention.</i> <i>Students were cursing and mocking one another.</i> <i>Students heckled each other in class and were not completely respectful of the ideas being presented. Teacher interrupted several times to get class back on track.</i> <i>None of these problems observed. Very caring, supportive environment.</i> <i>Class engaged in discussion until argument broke out with 2 female students. Students then began to argue and curse. Teacher separated student then other students went to the door (one student was sent outside class). Situation was diffused and students went back to seats. Security was called and teacher requested that students participate in conflict resolution setting.</i> <i>3 boys were sent out of class for being disruptive "talking smack about each other", while a few others made some rude comments under their breath to intimidate a few girls who were trying to ignore them. The teacher was unaware of this.</i> <i>No intimidation, bullying, and/or discrimination.</i> <i>Very safe, respectable environment.</i> <i>Students were saying "Nigga, B..., Hoe...You fat f-ing, greasy f-..." More cursing, offensive and abusive language. Teacher did nothing to intervene until one student screaming obscenities and threatened to beat up another student.</i> <i>Students spoke respectfully to each other when answering and clarifying questions even when students made mistakes.</i> <i>Classroom climate is very affirming and accepting. Students talk to each in a collegial way. Teacher and para are very respectful of students and give positive support</i> <i>Students from different backgrounds worked cooperatively and collaboratively. When I entered the classroom all students were participating in a five minute meditation. Students smiled at one another, engaged in friendly conversation and supported one another in completing work.</i> 							
<p><i>Key Element of the Standard</i></p>							
B. Routines & structures support students to build positive relationships across different individual and cultural "lines", so that they can effectively work and learn together.		54%	58%	56%	33%	80%	57%
<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>There were no posters of rules or expectations, however the teacher had such a strong presence, modeling respect and value of all ideas shared that it seemed to norm the class.</i> <i>All work was independent, although students were allowed to work with others if they wanted, they were not explicitly grouped or paired for an activity.</i> 							

- *The class structure includes teams and each team works to hold each other accountable.*
- *No routines or structures observed (e.g. turn and talk, prompts) to promote cross-cultural relationship building. Latino and African American students are building bonds in class. There is good cross cultural interaction.*
- *Structured opportunities for students to engage in academic discussion with topics that touch upon potential religious differences.*
- *A few students are talking on their phones and some slumped over on their desk totally disengaged*
- *Even though students are sitting in pairs there is very little communication between the pairs. Although they sit together, the students are not necessarily working together*
- *Classroom set up required that students sit with a partner. The teacher had multiple protocols and activities in which the students worked with their partners. They were not self chosen.*
- *At the closing of the period, the teacher had students walk around the room, a "give one/get one" new learning and record it in their notes. Students did so with ease and seemed to really enjoy discussing each other's learning.*

<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
C. The classroom is an "accepting" environment in which the contributions, culture and language of each student is validated, valued, and respected.	62%	68%	56%	33%	100%	57%

- Examples from Classroom Observations:*
- *Students comments and questions were answered in a respectful and validating manner by the teacher.*
 - *The teacher led, whole group discussion included instances of teacher recognition and the teacher asking students to expand on their thinking. The tone of this discussion was always respectful and accepting.*
 - *Students were talking in the back of the class. Teacher asked them to "be quiet" several times. Other students were walking around. One student began to heat his lunch in the microwave during another classmate's presentation.*
 - *The environment is very challenging especially for students whose languages are outliers. The Chinese, Hispanic and Arabic speakers have grouped together and the rest of the students sit alone. Explicit and direct instruction of a concept as whole group is necessary before the students do independent work. This is not happening so the noise level is partly frustration and partly the most aggressive students seeking help.*
 - *Teacher ensures everyone participates and has roles for students to keep the environment engaging and students as respected stakeholders of the learning*
 - *There are multiple ways students contribute. The more talkative students contribute in the large group discussion while the less talkative engage in 1:1 moments as the teacher floats.*
 - *Student work is validated as correct or incorrect but there is no more interaction.*
 - *Positive affirmations were commonplace. Students were praised for interim steps of accomplishment throughout the lesson.*
 - *Students from different culture and language abilities worked together and were spoken to and treated with respect by teachers and instructional aides.*
 - *Student work and pictures of students and families were present on the classroom walls.*
 - *Teacher's one to one approach to each students seems to make every student feel welcome and take risks easily*

Key Element of the Standard	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
D. All students manage their emotions to persist through difficult academic work.	31%	47%	50%	44%	80%	49%
<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While students managed their emotions well during this period, the work that was presented, while engaging, was not at a high level of difficulty(e.g. opinions did not have to be backed up by textual evidence or evidence from other sources). • The vocabulary work for the day did include challenging word parts for students. However, all students persisted through the work. This is partly due to the fact that they have a consistent routine and organized system for keeping their work (binders) • Most students waited for teacher assistance patiently and quietly. • A couple students became frustrated by not remembering or not knowing the answer to a few of the tasks, and other students stepped in to help. • There were several outbursts from students complaining about turning in work. After teacher explained that the students had 5 days to complete, the complaints continued. • Difficult to judge how these jewelry/macrame projects were difficult academic work for different students. That said, students appeared to reach moments where their project "wasn't working". Heard grunts and groans. Peers and teachers provided support. All students worked through these. • After the close reading, the teacher gave a writing assignment that was challenging. Some students were vocal in needing help. One girl in particular really struggled; the teacher supported her and she was able to get started. She did a good job managing her emotions with the support of the teacher. • Students did not voice complaints or say anything like, "this is so hard," while at the same time being asked probing questions by teacher. • Students seemed to expect to be pushed and have difficult problems to solve. • Teacher recognizes when students are frustrated and immediately offers help by modeling a problem or offering feedback in a supportive manner 						
Key Element of the Standard	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
E. The physical environment of the classroom is clean and organized to be safe and supportive of learning.	92%	89%	69%	89%	100%	87%
<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The desks are organized. Students were able to access their books and journals quickly and easily. • The classroom is clean, organized and safe. Students are grouped in tables. • Desks arranged orderly. BBC clearly posted. Walls and floors uncluttered. • The room was crowded and disorganized. There was too much stuff everywhere. • Clean, organized, process posters all around, bulletin with updated relevant info. The room was inviting and organized, students could get their books easily. • Screen used for class was placed where students needed to readjust themselves to see and did not support learning as some students did not make the needed adjustment. • Students books, folders, HW, quizzes, etc. were all organized and marked clearly, and students knew exactly where to get what they needed without the teachers direction. 						

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The counters had several rows of boxes reaching (close) to the ceiling, several rows of piles of papers sat on counters and tables, no student work, or clean posters. Not inviting.</i> • <i>Room was clean. I wonder why teacher kept the room so dark -- lights and blinds closed. The desks are in traditional rows. I wonder why they don't move the desks into a circle when they do group work.</i> 						
Standard 1.4 Active & Different Ways of Learning	<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
	A. Students actively “work”—reasoning, reading, writing, and/or speaking the language of the discipline.	54%	79%	50%	67%	90%	67%
	<i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i>						
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There is teacher lecture and some interaction to solve board problems. When turn to working individually on worksheet, lesson turns to a social interaction.</i> • <i>Students only watched a PowerPoint with minimal discussion and answering questions. When asked to write notes, many did not participate.</i> • <i>Students engaged with teacher demonstrated lesson that invoked student thoughts and inquiry.</i> • <i>Students engaged in academic discussion.</i> • <i>All students worked steadily on their jewelry/macramé projects.</i> • <i>In the small discussion the students had, they clearly had a command of the discipline and were able to tie language as well as experience.</i> • <i>Students read together, worked individually annotating their reading, and then shared or asked questions.</i> • <i>Yes, the students verbalized how they got to the answer, they wrote their formula, deciphered the compound, and used the key vocabulary.</i> • <i>The teacher read the directions, story and questions. Teacher called upon some students to share the answers. However, most students did not participate in any way in the day's lesson. They did not speak, read, or write</i> • <i>Students were not asked to write more than 1 word answers. They read 10 sentences and 17 questions. They were not asked to speak once. Then they did 2 word searches.</i> • <i>Students applied spelling words to real life use with vocabularies, like different, international, unfriendly, mimed, etc.</i> • <i>The work is minimal. Students could work together if they wanted; the teacher only spoke with 2 students directly to offer support during the entire lesson.</i> • <i>Students mostly doing worksheets. Little opportunity to observe active reasoning in the form of activity, discourse, or writing.</i> 						
	<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
B. Students “work” <u>together</u> in the discipline, and their collaboration facilitates deep learning.	38%	58%	31%	22%	70%	45%	
<i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The lesson observed only required students to work independently.</i> • <i>There were no observations of small group work nor partner work. There was a shared reading with students involved in the reading (taking on the characters from the reading), but, the majority of the work was still independent in nature</i> • <i>Teacher said students could work together if they wanted during the assignment for the reading "Of Mice and Men" Working with a group was</i> 							

optional and students did not really know how to engage with others or form groups.

- *While the class discussion and whole group study were engaging, there were no opportunities for small group collaboration or strategic partner work.*
- *When asked to pair up, many students did not participate.*
- *Students worked with each other at their tables and across the classroom.*
- *Students were seated in groups, but not expected or at least prompted to work together. Few students were on task.*
- *Students engaged in academic discussion.*
- *Students were working on their own projects, but there was considerable back and forth about their work and what looked good, etc.*
- *Classroom table groups during independent work provided an opportunity for students to engage in collaboration, but not deep learning.*
- *Teacher provided a worksheet with discussion questions and prompts. Students worked in small groups to discuss answers and reasoning.*
- *Students really owned their learning and seemed generally interested in sharing, discussing and debating with others.*
- *Students did not have any opportunity to work together or share answers. Students were not allowed to speak to each other. Academic discussion and student voice was totally absent.*
- *Student engaged in conversation with another student regarding the best way to solve a math problem.*

<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
C. Students learn using various learning modalities and/or multiple intelligences.	62%	53%	50%	33%	70%	54%

Examples from Classroom Observations:

- *The lesson today included one quick write, after that it was whole class discussion and students taking notes.*
- *Teacher modeling using computer, overhead projector, screen, to hands-on paper editing of written work. They engaged in text talk and conversation around written work.*
- *A lot of kinesthetic and verbal modalities*
- *They worked on their own, in groups, and the teacher used the smart board. One student referred to his physics class and said it was more kinesthetic, and this one was all about formulas.*
- *Teacher facilitated an activity where they passed a ball to each other, and if you caught the ball, you had to repeat the last sentence spoken.*
- *Yes, students engaged in academic discussion. Students engaged in different aspects of geometry: explaining, justifying, and doing geometric constructions.*
- *Students required to do research, write essay, and create poster and present. Worked as a group to accomplish these tasks.*
- *Audio to visual to talk to note-taking. Literary analysis, text talk, discussion, reflection, and evaluation of implied/explicit nuances from story.*

<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
D. Students use language support scaffolds (e.g., sentence frames, graphic organizers, manipulatives, and turn-and-talk activities) to engage in learning.	15%	32%	44%	33%	80%	39%
<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There were sentence frame starters on the Do Now activity: "This makes me think..., This means..."</i> • <i>There were not scaffolds other than a shared reading of a text with the teacher taking the lead.</i> • <i>There were no scaffolds offered during this lesson</i> • <i>No explicit language support scaffolds observed. Predominantly, lecture and independent practice. In supporting students, most of support was helping students to begin/engage the worksheets. Did not observe verbal support around language.</i> • <i>There was a Shakespeare word wall, and academic discussion sentence frame anchor charts posted in the room. However, I did not observe the teacher or students using them.</i> • <i>Teacher uses vocabulary walls that students referred to in discussion and writing.</i> • <i>Did not observe any language support scaffold posted on wall or verbally shared. Students did not have many structured opportunities to produce language in paired or setting.</i> • <i>Little supports, with the exception of Q and A format within lecture were provided to help make sense of the language such as the graphs or expressions.</i> 						
<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
E. Students develop questions, pose problems, make connections, reflect on multiple perspectives, and/or actively construct knowledge.	31%	53%	50%	44%	50%	46%
<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>While it appears that this unit includes readings that show multiple perspectives, it was not evident in this lesson that students are actively posing problems and developing their own questions.</i> • <i>The task is teacher directed and there was not a structured conversation or task to support developing questions or posing problems.</i> • <i>Teacher talked the entire class.</i> • <i>Students had to re-read their writing and determine what needs to be revised on their own, and then they read each other's writing to give input and suggestions. Students did hands-on paper editing of written work. They engaged in text talk and conversation around written work.</i> • <i>The writing assignment did just that, asked the students to put themselves in the POV of the main characters wife. They needed to think in her shoes. This meant understanding her from the novel but also understanding what it means to be a Muslim woman, single mom, business owner, living in New Orleans, etc. There was some deep discussion about this prior to the writing.</i> • <i>Students connected to their own experience and multiple perspectives their own and their families.</i> • <i>During the class, teacher stopped to ask questions, allow students to ask questions, gave examples. Allowed students to give examples. Questions varied from recall to application.</i> 						

Key Element of the Standard	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
F. Students explain and revise their thinking and build on and evaluate the thinking of others.	15%	47%	50%	44%	90%	48%
<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The discussion was always student to teacher and teacher to student. There was not a discussion protocol that allowed students to build on each other's thinking</i> • <i>During the whole group discussion, the discourse pattern was teacher to student, student to teacher. There were many missed opportunities for students to build on and evaluate on the thinking of others.</i> • <i>Not observed as there was limited opportunity for students to share.</i> • <i>Students were encouraged to make connections between Holocaust movie and genocide literature in order to complete assignment. Students were also engaged In group discussion to obtain alternate points of view and determine most appropriate answers.</i> • <i>A few students were able to offer critiques to strengthen arguments.</i> • <i>Students were paired sharing what they had underlined and explained to each other why they chose to underline the sentence.</i> • <i>Yes, the evidence was in the group work, as the work on their own to solve problems they asked what they got for an answer , when it was not the same they asked each other why and the group tried to solve it, when they could not explain to the other student how to solve it - they called on the teacher.</i> • <i>Using the so-called "Ritchie" method students built on the ideas of others.</i> • <i>Students engaged in academic discussion as a whole class.</i> • <i>When the teacher asked for an answer, he accepted it and moved on, not asking others to add on or to agree / disagree.</i> 						
Key Element of the Standard	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
G. The pacing of learning reflects an academic push to have all students complete learning activities and reach expected high levels of mastery. ("Every minute is used well.")	31%	53%	44%	44%	80%	49%
<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There was not evidence in this lesson of the expectation for high levels of mastery. While students were revising notes and asked to write short opinions, there was not evidence that students were being asked to build arguments based on evidence from texts or other sources. Both assignments could have been written with only a personal opinion.</i> • <i>The expectations for the response log are not clear. The task of writing a character point of view did not have a criteria for a high level of mastery</i> • <i>While the pacing of instruction was good and all students were participating, there was not a clear task which would indicate a high level of mastery</i> • <i>Teacher provided 35 min "mini lectures" then immediately proceeded to keep students on task with independent work.</i> • <i>Most students were off task and teacher did most talking. Teacher seemed to only expect work and/or participation from some students and ignored others.</i> • <i>Teacher circulates, supports, and nudges students to get back on task.</i> 						

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assignment was not graded for mastery, but completion—nor was feedback given. • Note that it is difficult to assess in this Commercial Art class what is high level of mastery. Nonetheless pace was "persistent" and pushing students to complete their project. • The teacher did a great job pacing the activities of the class. The students were constantly engaged and the transitions were seamless. • All students were engaged and she pushed them to finish the assignment and to really understand the point they want to make. • No expectation of what must be complete by the end of class was provided therefore mastery is not clear for the given task. • Teacher pushed students to complete the assignment, but students were unclear about what mastery was. 														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Key Element of the Standard</th> <th>9th Gr.</th> <th>Academies</th> <th>Gen Ed</th> <th>Math</th> <th>Sp Ed</th> <th>Whole</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>H. Various technologies are used to make learning active and to meet the learning needs of students.</td> <td>8%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>33%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>21%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Key Element of the Standard	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole	H. Various technologies are used to make learning active and to meet the learning needs of students.	8%	21%	25%	33%	20%	21%
Key Element of the Standard	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole									
H. Various technologies are used to make learning active and to meet the learning needs of students.	8%	21%	25%	33%	20%	21%									
	<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher was projecting the lesson, but, there was no other technology used by the teacher nor the students. • There was not a use of technology by students in this lesson. • Paper, pencil, and white board. • Jewelry boards, beads, macramé string, etc. • Teacher used a overhead projector to show virtual tour and students used chrome books to register for website. • Students used laptops, teacher projected learning quest from her computer. • By default students rely on Google Translator. 														
Standard 1.7	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Key Element of the Standard</th> <th>9th Gr.</th> <th>Academies</th> <th>Gen Ed</th> <th>Math</th> <th>Sp Ed</th> <th>Whole</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Students know the learning objectives for the lesson.</td> <td>46%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>56%</td> <td>80%</td> <td>66%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Key Element of the Standard	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole	A. Students know the learning objectives for the lesson.	46%	95%	44%	56%	80%	66%
Key Element of the Standard	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole									
A. Students know the learning objectives for the lesson.	46%	95%	44%	56%	80%	66%									
Students Know What They are Learning, Why, and How it can be Applied	<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students interviewed could state the objective • Teacher stated the objective and it was written, but students could not explain it and were confused. • Students could articulate that they were working to analyze and understand Hamlet. • Students were able to articulate that they were learning skills necessary to pass the AP Exam, but they were unclear about "what" the specific skill was. • Students knew that they were learning how to identify a key theme or plot event. • Students were able to point to the learning objective written clearly, stated and re-stated by the teacher. "I can describe the role of stem cells?" • Learning target on the board had been there for several weeks and was general and not related to the day's activities. • Learning objective was divorced from the actual lesson contents. Perhaps it was the unit's objective? 														

<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
B. Students recognize the connection between today's learning and long-term outcomes.	23%	68%	38%	33%	60%	46%
<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Students were not able to articulate the long term outcomes; they were only able to state short term, class-oriented outcomes. [Repeated for several observations.]</i> • <i>All students interviewed indicated that this lesson is good for their writing development and for college preparation.</i> • <i>Students understood why it is important to learn about historical events and how they relate to current life.</i> • <i>Student understood that the use of technology is a skill needed in future careers.</i> • <i>Students were able to articulate that reading Hamlet is helping them get better at understanding difficult texts.</i> • <i>Students focused on learning skills to pass the AP exam.</i> • <i>Only to help them pass their AP exam.</i> • <i>They recognized that Shakespeare is part of the literacy culture and, if you know how to analyze his writing, it helps in other areas</i> • <i>Student commented that content would help them prepare for college and that it was generally important to know one's own body.</i> • <i>Students interviewed had not considered the connection between their learning and long-term outcomes. For both students, their motivation is to pass the class so they can graduate.</i> • <i>Teacher showed students a video of Jimmy Fallon signing and students made connection to the TV show. Teacher used video to explain lesson to students. Students laughed and smiled when they made a connection between the task they were going to complete and how it related to a larger social context.</i> 						
<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
C. All students have their learning checked with immediate feedback regarding their progress toward the day's learning objectives.	31%	47%	38%	44%	70%	45%
<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The student group director tells the group how close they are to getting the work done and done well.</i> • <i>While the teacher collected their note taking / worksheet forms, she did not give immediate feedback, nor, did they discuss with partner / take a moment to debrief the learning other than through the exit ticket which was not checked immediately.</i> • <i>There is not immediate feedback, rather, students turn in their work and the teacher will eventually write responses</i> • <i>Students will get a score of 1-5 on their Silent Reading Log, depending on how much they write (not the quality or content of the writing), the teacher does this and gives it back to students the next day (not immediate)</i> • <i>While students vocabulary work will be checked in their binder, there was not immediate feedback provided</i> • <i>Teacher consistently circulating throughout class to keep students on task and assist with completion of class work. [Repeated for several observations.]</i> • <i>Only some students had their learning checked</i> • <i>Peer conference after self-reflection/conference.</i> 						

- *Teacher has a sustained lecture and does not check for understanding*
- *Of those students the teacher worked with, lots of feedback was given in terms of their progress towards the day's learning objective.*
- *YEs, all students received immediate feedback verbally and in written form.*
- *Teacher gave students opportunity to share answers and receive feedback, "popcorn" style.*
- *Teacher made random checks (mostly call and response of raised hands).*
- *There was no observable feedback from the teacher during the activity, and she did not collect the handout that some students worked to complete.*
- *The teacher went around each group and asked specific questions about their analysis.*
- *Students did not have immediate feedback, even when they attempted to answer with incorrect grammar. The teacher did not model or paraphrase the answer of the student, so they could hear the correct grammar.*
- *Only students who asked questions got feedback. Teacher did ask if there are questions. He also encouraged students to work in groups and ask a neighbor.*

<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	<i>9th Gr.</i>	<i>Academies</i>	<i>Gen Ed</i>	<i>Math</i>	<i>Sp Ed</i>	<i>Whole</i>
D. Students make "real world" connections about how their learning can be applied.	38%	58%	56%	22%	60%	49%

- Examples from Classroom Observations:*
- *Students interviewed connected their learning to the real world experience that they are having and how studying other cultures can help them.*
 - *Not observed in this lesson which focused on the direct understandings of the text, which itself is not explicitly connecting to the real world.*
 - *Some students talked about parallels between Pearl Harbor and 9/11.*
 - *Student discussion talked about how the protests here in Oakland were rooted in the organization of protest from the 1960s.*
 - *Students were unable to connect stem cell learning to anything other than passing the class.*
 - *Yes, students made connections to one of the vocab words "segregation". One students said here we have segregation because all the ELL kids are segregated from others.*

<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	<i>9th Gr.</i>	<i>Academies</i>	<i>Gen Ed</i>	<i>Math</i>	<i>Sp Ed</i>	<i>Whole</i>
E. Students understand what it looks like to know or perform "well".	23%	42%	31%	22%	30%	31%

- Examples from Classroom Observations:*
- *The student group director tells the group how close they are to getting the work done and done well.*
 - *Students stated that they would get a note back from the teacher, but they did not know what performing well looks like.*
 - *They know that if they have a 1-5 on their response journal that it is due to the length of their response not the content.*
 - *Students equated good grades with performing well.*
 - *Doing well is based on feedback from peers, the teacher's writing checklist, and grade for the assignment.*
 - *Students have a clear sense of what looks good for their jewelry/macramé project.*
 - *Student stated she would only know if the teacher told her she was doing well.*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students said "pass the test." • When students completed objectives they were given verbal praise or positive physical signal. Students were also allowed to do optional choices as a reward once they completed mandatory work. 														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Key Element of the Standard</i></th> <th>9th Gr.</th> <th>Academies</th> <th>Gen Ed</th> <th>Math</th> <th>Sp Ed</th> <th>Whole</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>F. Students can accurately assess how close they are to mastering expected learning outcomes.</td> <td>15%</td> <td>47%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>33%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole	F. Students can accurately assess how close they are to mastering expected learning outcomes.	15%	47%	31%	33%	30%	33%
<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole									
F. Students can accurately assess how close they are to mastering expected learning outcomes.	15%	47%	31%	33%	30%	33%									
	<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students interviewed were not sure of how they are being assessed or how close they were to doing well (mastery). • Students said they know based on their grades, checking of homework, do nows, etc. • The expectations and objectives were pretty clear; therefore the students had a shared understanding of what it meant to master the learning outcomes. • They said they have to perform and know how to solve and explain their answers. • Students shared that they know they are getting better at writing essays, and understanding more complex text because of the teachers feedback and their grades. • Teacher has lots of exemplars posted and states it. • There is a running record so students know where they are • Teacher and class used a grade checker sheet for students to self monitor progress. In particular, quiz grades and binder. For example, a 70% indicated proficiency. • No formal rubric or mastery expectations shared by teacher or students. • LT: I can transform the figure using rotation, translation, reflection." If they can solve these types of problems they feel that they can master it. 														
Standard 1.10	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Key Element of the Standard</i></th> <th>9th Gr.</th> <th>Academies</th> <th>Gen Ed</th> <th>Math</th> <th>Sp Ed</th> <th>Whole</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Diverse groups of students are proportionally represented in the academic programs.</td> <td>85%</td> <td>79%</td> <td>63%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>90%</td> <td>76%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole	A. Diverse groups of students are proportionally represented in the academic programs.	85%	79%	63%	67%	90%	76%
<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole									
A. Diverse groups of students are proportionally represented in the academic programs.	85%	79%	63%	67%	90%	76%									
Equitable Access to Curriculum	<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students of mixed abilities and ethnicities were seen in most classrooms. • Students of both genders were seen in most classrooms. 														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Key Element of the Standard</i></th> <th>9th Gr.</th> <th>Academies</th> <th>Gen Ed</th> <th>Math</th> <th>Sp Ed</th> <th>Whole</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>B. The school offers academic interventions that identify and support specific learners who experience ongoing discrimination or who are part of historically lower-achieving groups, which gives them access to challenging curriculum and enables them to achieve high standards.</td> <td>23%</td> <td>42%</td> <td>38%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>36%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole	B. The school offers academic interventions that identify and support specific learners who experience ongoing discrimination or who are part of historically lower-achieving groups, which gives them access to challenging curriculum and enables them to achieve high standards.	23%	42%	38%	22%	50%	36%
<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole									
B. The school offers academic interventions that identify and support specific learners who experience ongoing discrimination or who are part of historically lower-achieving groups, which gives them access to challenging curriculum and enables them to achieve high standards.	23%	42%	38%	22%	50%	36%									

	<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There was not a moment in this lesson in which struggling learners were offered a support</i> • <i>This lesson did not offer a clear intervention during the course of the lesson. The teacher said if you need help ask me. During the entire lesson she only "touched base" with 2 students for a brief time (less than 1 minute).</i> • <i>During this lesson, there was not an opportunity for students to receive differentiated support / intervention.</i> • <i>The teacher attempted to redirect students who were not on task but was not very successful.</i> • <i>No tier 1 interventions observed.</i> • <i>There was an aide in the room, who sat at a desk on his cell phone the entire time.</i> • <i>The teacher made complex content of Shakespeare accessible by reading it aloud, in groups, scaffolding analysis so that everyone who did not have prior experience with Shakespeare could engage.</i> • <i>Teacher is aware of at least 3 students that need accelerated work and offers them that.</i> • <i>There were not scaffolds or modifications for students or strategic grouping to promote the learning of underachieving groups.</i> • <i>An aide was available and checking in with students.</i> • <i>The purpose of this program was to help students having difficulty keeping up with their work. They were getting tutoring to help them catch up.</i>
--	---

Standard 1.11	<i>Key Element of the Standard</i>	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
College-going Culture & Resources	A. Students connect how their learning in class prepares them for future college and/or career opportunities.	23%	58%	44%	22%	20%	37%

<p><i>Examples from Classroom Observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Only a few students mentioned A-G - inconsistent understanding of connections to their future.</i> • <i>No evidence observed, besides college posters hung up in the room.</i> • <i>Students interviewed did not connect their learning to college and career</i> • <i>Students don't make any connections to outside world or long term leaning outcomes.</i> • <i>Students interviewed equated Biology with Science careers</i> • <i>No evidence of explicit connections to college or career in the classroom instruction.</i> • <i>Students reported that this course fits in with college path and possible majors in college.</i> • <i>This class is part of the Public Health Academy that is very conscious of how they are preparing students for the real world. Teacher explained how this year she is using a Reading/Writing for the Real World curriculum. In collaboration with other staff and Linked Learning, she talked about how with fidelity, they are addressing how to best prepare students for success after graduation.</i> • <i>One student interviewed stated the use of technology was important to future career.</i> • <i>During second interview, student stated "If we plan to go into advertising we need to know the impact color has visually. "</i> • <i>There was no explicit evidence of connection to college and career. There were posters in the class of notable activists.</i> • <i>There was a poster of A_G requirements, and though the content was clearly in preparation for the AP exam, there was no other mention or connection to college or career explicitly made.</i> • <i>Other then they had to pass the class, students could not articulate why.</i>

- Several students refer to wanting to complete their A-G requirement to graduate and go on to college. Other students expressed interest in continuing with chemistry in college.
- No explicit connections made between content and college preparedness. Most connections were made to more immediate future, namely, an upcoming quiz.

Key Element of the Standard	9 th Gr.	Academies	Gen Ed	Math	Sp Ed	Whole
B. Teachers are explicit that certain skills and dispositions (e.g., peer collaboration, study/organizational habits) particularly prepare students to be successful in college and careers.	15%	42%	31%	11%	10%	25%

Examples from Classroom Observations:

- There were no explicit prompts or skills that connected their skills to college. The room was very organized and there were posters about grading policies and homework but there wasn't a clear connection between that and the skills that would support their college experience.
- No specific evidence of this. [Repeated for many observations].
- There was some evidence of the use of Cornell Notes and how you use these to understand a subject. However, there was no evidence of peer collaboration and the Cornell notes were not explicitly called out as a resource for future success in college and career.
- This lesson was structured as silent reading time with response journal, followed by a whole group shared reading of text, none of the skills or dispositions from the instruction were highlighted or explicitly connected to college or career
- All students interviewed indicated that this lesson is good for their writing development and for college preparation.
- No explicit skills were mentioned by the teacher that would be beneficial in college and career.
- The teacher did not make an explicit connection between the skills and dispositions that students need to be successful in college and careers.
- The teacher designed a learning sequence and provided experiences that will prepare students to be successful in college and careers *
- Teacher has students grouped by Acting Companies with specific roles, Director, producer,
- There was no mention of college or career in this classroom. There were no college or career visuals in the classroom.
- There was no mention of college or career. There were no visuals about college or careers.

Given these frequency percentages, the SQR Team rated the development of each Oakland High Academic Strand on each standard in School Quality Indicator 1, “Quality Learning Experiences for All Students”, as follows:

Standard #	Focus Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
STRAND 1: 9th Grade (English, Social Studies, and Science classes)						
1.1	Meaningful and Challenging Curriculum		X			
1.2	Safe & Nurturing Learning Experiences			X		
1.4	Active & Different Types of Learning		X			
1.7	Students Know What they are Learning, Why, and How it can be Applied		X			
1.10	Equitable Access to Curriculum through Proportional Enrollment & Classroom Interventions		X			
1.11	College-going Culture & Resources	X				
STRAND 2: Academies (10 th -12 th grade English, Social Studies, Science classes part of the 3 Career Academies)						
1.1	Meaningful and Challenging Curriculum			X		
1.2	Safe & Nurturing Learning Experiences			X		
1.4	Active & Different Types of Learning			X		
1.7	Students Know What they are Learning, Why, and How it can be Applied			X		
1.10	Equitable Access to Curriculum through Proportional Enrollment & Classroom Interventions		X			
1.11	College-going Culture & Resources			X		
STRAND 3: General Education (English, Social Studies, and Science classes in grades 10-12, <u>not</u> part of an academy)						
1.1	Meaningful and Challenging Curriculum			X		
1.2	Safe & Nurturing Learning Experiences			X		
1.4	Active & Different Types of Learning		X			
1.7	Students Know What they are Learning, Why, and How it can be Applied		X			
1.10	Equitable Access to Curriculum through Proportional Enrollment & Classroom Interventions		X			
1.11	College-going Culture & Resources		X			

Standard #	Focus Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
------------	----------------	-------------	-----------	------------	------------	----------

STRAND 4: Math classes (9th-12th grade)

1.1	Meaningful and Challenging Curriculum			X		
1.2	Safe & Nurturing Learning Experiences		X			
1.4	Active & Different Types of Learning		X			
1.7	Students Know What they are Learning, Why, and How it can be Applied		X			
1.10	Equitable Access to Curriculum through Proportional Enrollment & Classroom Interventions	X				
1.11	College-going Culture & Resources	X				

STRAND 5: Special Education classes

1.1	Meaningful and Challenging Curriculum				X	
1.2	Safe & Nurturing Learning Experiences				X	
1.4	Active & Different Types of Learning				X	
1.7	Students Know What they are Learning, Why, and How it can be Applied			X		
1.10	Equitable Access to Curriculum through Proportional Enrollment & Classroom Interventions			X		
1.11	College-going Culture & Resources	X				

Cross Strand Summary Analysis

Focus Standard	Focus Standard	Summary Analysis
1.1	Meaningful and Challenging Curriculum	<p><i>Strengths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The observations across all 5 academic strands showed consistent evidence of classroom learning building on students prior knowledge, skills, and experiences, especially when lessons were grounded in literature or scientific/social issues. The Career Academy and Special Education classes were particularly well-developed on this key indicator of meaningful curriculum. Students in the Career Academies more frequently reported strong connections to the content and the internship opportunities. In classes where students were focusing on the learning of specific skills (e.g., vocabulary, math), lessons did not make this connection as effectively. Three strands showed consistent evidence of students communicating their thinking, using the language and reasoning of the discipline. The 9th grade and General Education classes showed the weakest evidence in this indicator of challenging curriculum. <p><i>Challenges</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oakland High classrooms showed less than consistent evidence of curriculum that asked students to apply their learning to questions or problems connected to their interests, goals, experiences, and communities. The Career Academy classrooms showed the strongest evidence, but still had substantial room for development. With the exception of the Special Ed strand (90%), approximately 1 out of every 2 observations showed evidence of challenging curriculum that pushed <u>all</u> students to progress far and attain high levels of mastery.
1.2	Safe and Nurturing Learning Experiences	<p><i>Strengths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The observations across all 5 academic strands showed consistent evidence that students are safe and learn free from intimidation, bullying, and/or discrimination. The 9th grade and Special Education classes were particularly well-developed on this key indicator of safe learning experiences. However, there were notable exceptions that we of concern to the SQR Team. <p><i>Challenges</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oakland High classrooms showed less evidence of routines and structures that support students to build positive relationships across different individual and cultural "lines", so that they can effectively work and learn together. Except for Special Ed classes, approximately 1 out of 2 classes observed showed an absence of effective teacher practice in building the social-emotional learning conditions necessary for rigorous learning. Interviewed students described how they had some classes where they learned well and some where they did not, and they connected the quality of their learning to the ability of the teacher to get students to focus.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the exception of the Academy and Special Ed classes, approximately 1 out of 2 classes observed were "accepting" environments in which the contributions, culture and language of each student was validated, valued, and respected. English Learner students consistently reported this challenge in their classes. • In interviews, students consistently reported that disruptions and off-task behavior impacted their learning. They said that these problems primarily depended on the abilities of the teachers to be "strict" and to manage the class "fairly". • Given these challenges, the team consistently found that, students did <u>not</u> manage their emotions to persist through difficult academic work. The Team regularly observed classroom disruptions caused by students who were challenged by the classroom learning or not socially-emotionally ready to engage with it.
1.4	Active & Different Types of Learning	<p><i>Strengths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations in the Career Academy, Math, and Special Ed classes showed consistent evidence of students actively working—reasoning, reading, writing, and/or speaking the language of the discipline. • 80% of the observations in Special Ed classes showed evidence of instructional pacing that pushed all students to complete learning activities and reach expected high levels of mastery. Also students were consistently asked to explain and revise their thinking, and supported with language scaffolds. <p><i>Challenges</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations in 9th grade and General Ed classes showed less than consistent evidence of students actively working—reasoning, reading, writing, and/or speaking the language of the discipline. • With the exception of the Academy and Special Ed classes, approximately 1 out of 3 classes observed showed an absence of students working <u>together</u> in the discipline, in a way that facilitated deep learning. • Also, across the 4 non-Special Ed strands, there was a consistent absence of language support scaffolds (e.g., sentence frames, graphic organizers, manipulatives, technology, and turn-and-talk activities) needed to effectively engage struggling readers and English Learners. English Learner students in particular reported that they did not have enough opportunities in class to develop their oral skills. • Across all strands, less than 50% of the observations showed evidence of students developing questions, posing problems, making connections, reflecting on multiple perspectives, and/or actively constructing knowledge. Similarly, less than 50% of the observations showed evidence of instructional pacing that pushed all students to complete learning activities and reach expected high levels of mastery. • Taken together, these challenges indicated the predominance of teacher-centered instruction at Oakland High and that many teachers struggled to set the social-emotional learning conditions for more student-centered instruction. The curriculum content could be strong, but students were not consistently facilitated to engage constructively and actively with the content.

<p>1.7</p>	<p>Students Know What They are Learning, Why, and How it can be applied</p>	<p><i>Strengths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 72% of the classrooms observed had the day’s learning objective posted, typically as part of a Blackboard Configuration. • Students in the Academy and Special Ed classes observed consistently knew the learning objectives for the lesson and recognized the connection between the day’s learning and long-term outcomes. <p><i>Challenges</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% of the classrooms observed had the day’s learning objective stated at some point during the lesson. • Approximately 1 out of 2 students in the 9th grade, General Ed, and Math classes observed knew the learning objectives for the lesson. 1 out of 3 recognized the connection between the day’s learning and long-term outcomes. • Across the 4 non-Special Ed strands, there was a consistent absence of students having their learning checked with immediate feedback regarding their progress toward the day’s learning objectives. • Across all strands, students could not consistently describe how close they were to “mastery” or what it looked like to perform well. Teachers did not consistently provide “anchors” or rubric language that helped students understand what “doing well” meant.
<p>1.11</p>	<p>College-going Culture & Resources</p>	<p><i>Strengths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students in the Career Academy classes observed consistently connected how their learning in class prepared them for future college and/or career opportunities. • The SQR Team found school-wide practices for intervening and supporting students to be college ready—including the school and college counselors, the periodic “Advisory” classes, the College & Career Center, the Pass2 program, and the Student Success Nights. <p><i>Challenges</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few students in the observed non-Academy classes connected how their learning prepared for them future college and/or career opportunities. • Teachers in observed classes were infrequently explicit that certain skills and dispositions (e.g., peer collaboration, study/organizational habits) prepared students to be successful in college and careers. • The SQR Team did not gather evidence of how the resources identified above were coordinated and aligned to ensure that all students were identified, served, and tracked through these various interventions/supports.

Because the analysis for **Standard 1.8** (“Academic Intervention & Enrichment Support”) and **Standard 1.10** (“Equitable Access to Curriculum”) draws on evidence across the six academic strands, the findings for these two standards are reported separately here and follow the organization used for the remaining standards in School Quality Indicators 2-5—that is with the bulleted summary statements and the rating reported together.

Focus Standard	Focus Standard	Rubric Rating	Summary Explanation of Ratings
1.8	<p>Academic Intervention & Enrichment Support</p> <p><i>A quality school provides resources and programs before, during, and after school that ensure that all students have the academic intervention and broader enrichment supports they need to be academically successful and engaged as a whole person.</i></p> <p>Note: This standard focuses on how a school provides a coordinated and integrated system of <u>academic</u> supports and enrichment that promote quality learning experiences for all students. It This standard is complemented by Standard 2.2 (see following), which focuses on how the school provides a coordinated and integrated system of <u>other supports—specifically health, safety, social-emotional, and youth development services—</u> that are necessary to promote quality learning experiences for all students.</p>	<i>Beginning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SQR Team collected evidence that Oakland High had some systems to <u>identify</u> students who were struggling and <u>why</u> they needed academic support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regarding school-wide systems, teachers reported that SRI data was now being regularly shared and that this data gave them an understanding what students were struggling readers and how their reading levels contributed to it. Teachers also reported reviewing D and F rates in the ninth grade and at the senior level and reviewing CAHSEE pass/failure data—but not specifically using this data to understand why students were struggling. ○ The Team heard reports from teacher teams in the Career Academies and in the 9th grade families about their regular collaboration to discuss students who were struggling and to identify collectively why. • However, teachers also said that, while student performance data was shared, it was done without clear protocols or expectations of what to do with that data and how it could guide teacher supports for students. Teachers said that in many cases math and reading levels were so low that they were not clear how to address student academic needs within their classrooms. • In general, the SQR Team found considerable variability across individual teachers, departments, and academic pathways in the will, skill, and knowledge for using assessment data to identify struggling students. Only one department (ELA) reportedly set academic goals, which could clarify what assessment data was most important or what assessment data was needed. This contributed to a professional culture only weakly focused on data inquiry about what students know and can do. • Teachers reported their various efforts to differentiate and to create in-class, Tier One academic supports for struggling students, but often qualified these efforts as not successful because of classroom management challenges. As noted in Standards 1.2 and 1.4 above, Oakland High classes inconsistently showed evidence of the classroom routines and structures that created the social-emotional learning conditions necessary for effective “Tier One” classroom academic supports and interventions for students. • There were sectors of the school, which were observed by the SQR Team and named by staff

and students, where effective academic interventions/supports were evident. These were the Career Academies, the Special Education classes, and, in a preliminary way, the 9th grade houses. In these sectors, teachers were developing collaborative strategies for supporting struggling students—starting in class, then outside class and managed by teachers, and then out of class and managed by other providers.

- Students reported how their Career Academy classes functioned as basic, Tier One supports and interventions. As one Public Health Academy student noted, “I want to be in my PHA classes. We all have a similar goal, the teachers and the students. ... Teachers keep coming back to the material until we understand it. ...Classes are small, so you learn faster. Students and teachers get close, and we go to them when we need help.”
- Some 9th grade teachers, while acknowledging that the 9th grade families needed more development, described the double English period as an important academic support. A few 10th grade teachers said their students were much better prepared as a result of the 9th grade families.
- Overall, the SQR Team gathered evidence of the following academic support and enrichment opportunities on campus during and after the regular school day:
 - Universal academic supports (Tier One)
 - The Shop 55 after-school tutorial program in the Wellness Center, run by EBAYC, which offered tutoring to specific student groups (e.g., 9th graders; sports teams) and open tutoring to all students.
 - Teachers variously reported holding office hours and/or tutoring time for students in their classes.
 - Targeted academic supports (Tier Two)
 - 9th grade advisory classes in which teachers discussed students’ grades with them and suggested ways in which students could seek assistance.
 - 9th grade “second English class” to support the language arts skills.
 - Academic Literacy classes using Read 180: entirely 9th grade students who scored below 750 on 8th grade SRI.
 - Academies reportedly have mandatory tutoring for their students who have been identified as deficient in some respect.
 - APEX (computer courses for recapturing credits).
 - The Learning Center
 - Intensive academic supports (Tier Three)
 - Special Education classes.
 - English Language Development classes and the Newcomer program serving about 70

			<p>students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AVID, and the four Upward Bound programs provide intensive, college-readiness support to students in their programs. ○ CAHSEE preparation classes which students could attend until they passed the exam. ○ AAMA Manhood Development class and case management which supported 50 African-American males. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Team found little evidence that the systems which were in place monitored the effectiveness of the supports or adjusted them—ensuring that students “got in and got out” as progress occurred. Some staff reported that there were no “school-wide” intervention systems outside of the after-school program and that there was little coordination of the individual intervention systems that were in place. Some observations were: “Depending on how kids struggle the support is provided.” “This is an area we are working on to improve.” “We try to work on intrinsic motivation to move kids to know when they need help and ask for it.” Generally staff reported that students in the academies received help, but students outside of academies had a more difficult time getting “wrap-around support.”
1.10	<p>Equitable Access to Curriculum</p> <p><i>A quality school provides curriculum and courses (including A-G and AP courses at the high school level) that prepare students for college, and it ensures equitable access to such curriculum and courses, for all students, through academic interventions that catch and support students to complete a college preparatory course work.</i></p>	<i>Beginning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Diverse groups of students at Oakland High were not proportionally represented across all academic programs. Two of the three Career Academies (Public Health and Visual Arts) showed proportional ethnic/race enrollment, but the third (Environmental Science) was disproportionately Asian. English Learners were underrepresented in all of the Academies. ● Partly because of the way that Advanced Placement (AP) classes were linked to Career Academies, these courses were also disproportionately Asian, while the General Education strand was disproportionately African American and Latino. English Learner and Special Education students were significantly under-represented in AP classes as well. ● Responding to concerns about these disproportionalities, the process by which 9th grade students were recruited, applied to, and accepted into the Academies was being revised. ● As the adults were negotiating these revisions, the SQR Team saw evidence that adults appeared to be competing for students—a competition that raised significant equity issues. Even as the adults shared the desire to achieve equitable access and enrollment in the academies, they were caught in a competitive frame that focused on students according to their academic achievement. Students who were higher achieving were desired. Adults across academies appeared to want their “fair share”, almost as if these students were a limited commodity. The selection process being revised would, as some adults said, determine which students the adults could “go after” and “who they had rights to”. While the racial and language characteristics behind this framing of students were not overtly discussed, the SQR Team was concerned about the equity implications of this “narrative of competition” in which

			<p>some students were “desired” and others therefore not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Related to this equity challenge was evidence gathered by the SQR Team that teachers who are perceived to be stronger get recruited by their colleagues to become teachers in the Career Academies.• The AAMA Manhood Development program was the only evidence that the SQR Team gathered that Oakland High offered academic interventions that identified and supported specific learners who experience on-going discrimination.
--	--	--	--

DATA COLLECTION FOR SCHOOL QUALITY INDICATORS 2-5

Data collection for School Quality Indicators 2 through 5, as noted earlier, was done primarily through campus observations, longer interviews, and focus groups. Members of the SQR Team spoke with students, parents, teachers, classified staff, administrators, and community partners. The Team also reviewed school documents, performance data, and budget information. Before and after the three day site visit, the Lead Evaluator interviewed additional current and former school staff, partner organization staff, and District leaders.

Quality Indicator 2: Safe, Supportive & Healthy Learning Environment

Focus Standard	Focus Standard	Rubric Rating	Summary Explanation of Ratings
2.2	<p>Coordinated & Integrated System of Academic Learning Support Services</p> <p>Note: This standard complements Standard 1.8 and focuses on which focuses on how the school provides a coordinated and integrated system of other supports and enrichment—specifically health, safety, social-emotional, and youth development services—that are necessary to promote quality learning experiences for all students.</p>	<i>Beginning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SQR Team found limited evidence that Oakland High had effective behavior management systems that created a social-emotional foundation for learning in the classroom and a positive school climate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As noted in the strand analysis, observed classes did not consistently show evidence of classroom routines and structures that effectively managed student behavior and created a social-emotional foundation for learning. The absence of a shared, school-wide behavior management approach contributed to this. Students experienced many different routines and structures across classrooms. That variation and lack of consistency in the student’s day undermined student social-emotional readiness to learn. In reporting their frustrations with the inconsistencies in how behavioral issues were handled upon referral, teachers revealed how their own social-emotional readiness to teach was undermined by the lack of shared behavior management systems. ○ Outside the classroom, the SQR observed a significant number of students in the hallways during class time, roaming, hanging-out, horse playing, etc. In addition the Team observed excessive student cell phone usage. This included students making calls, texting, videotaping, taking photos, playing games, using the internet, etc. Several teachers reported that inappropriate cell phone usage undermined instruction and that they had given up trying to manage them. ○ In response to these challenges, the school was implementing several strategies that appeared to be in various stages of implementation. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership was implementing PBIS through monthly teacher professional learning sessions; a discipline matrix that defined levels of infractions and clarified the expected response; a range of alternatives to suspensions, including Saturday school; implementation of Restorative Justice practices, including conflict mediation. • In an effort to “take back the hallways”, leadership was coordinating a set of actions:

			<p>teachers were asked not to give passes to students in the first and last 15 minutes of each period; security officers conducted tardy sweeps each period; two case managers worked with those students who swept up and monitored the data; formal SART hearings were being held for any student with greater than 5 tardies; and the COST identified the needs causing the repeated tardiness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence gathered from teacher, student, and parent interviews suggested that these strategies had not substantially shifted the school culture. Representative comments included: “The tardy policy is helping but it hasn’t really changed student behaviors.” “I don’t know what the Discipline Matrix is.” “Saturday school isn’t working because the coordinator is out.” “PBIS feels like it’s not fully bought into. I think we are not fully into the program; we don’t analyze the data or have school-wide agreements. For example we don’t have a consistent technology policy which makes it very difficult for us to be consistent. What one teacher allows another will not.” “It feels like the Tier 1 Interventions are in place but we are still lacking in Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions.” “We agree with RJ as an approach, and we’re trying it in our classes, but we don’t have the people and systems in place to do it effectively.” “We make referrals, get no or slow response from administration, and see no results. Students are talked to, but no discipline is recorded.” “PBIS, the way it is applied is a farce. Students know that they can get away with anything. Teachers have lost almost all credibility and all backup.” • Similar to the evidence reported above for Standard 1.8, the SQR Team observed that the Career Academies, the Special Education classes, and, in a preliminary way, the 9th grade houses provided some effective social-emotional interventions/supports for students. For example, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The 9th grade families had “Your Days”, coordinated by the Wellness Center, that built unity among the students within a family. Teachers in each family met weekly in teams to discuss students, grades, curriculum, etc. The ninth grade teams had begun to implement “No Nonsense Nurturing” during the school year. ○ Similarly, Academy teachers reported that they met together to talk about struggling students and figure out next steps to take. They coordinated to address concerns and support students. When it appeared that a student’s social-emotional needs exceeded their capacity, they would make a referral to the Wellness Center. • The SQR Team found <u>substantial</u> evidence that Oakland High had coordinated and integrated systems of support in place through a partnership with the EBAYC Wellness Center on campus. Within the Wellness Center there was strong evidence of a broad menu of on-site strategies and services and partnerships that responded to the health, safety, and social-emotional
--	--	--	--

			<p>student and family needs. According to the Wellness Center reports, 750 students used the Wellness Center for at least one service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A web-based referral system, Shop 55, has been developed by the Wellness Center to assist parents, teachers, and staff in making referrals for students struggling with a variety of psychosocial emotional concerns. These referrals were followed up with a risk assessment, to understand better why a student was struggling and then handed over to the school COST—consisting of mental health providers, the director of the Wellness Center, a juvenile case manager, an AAMA representative, a District 9 representative, and a PEC teacher. • Outside these organizational structures, the SQR Team found limited evidence of systems for tracking student progress as social-emotional supports were implemented and for communicating between the Wellness Center and the academic staff about students. Staff at the Wellness Center reported on their struggle with a communication and coordination gap between themselves and the academic side. Teachers reported making referrals but only inconsistently hearing back about the follow-up. Frustrated with student behavior challenges and the seeming limited impact of their referrals and the school’s supports, the SQR Team heard some teachers expressing a hardened “deficit” view of students, who they believed could not really be “helped” and should be referred to other, “more appropriate” programs.
2.6	<p>Inclusive, Welcoming & Caring Community</p> <p>Safety, trust, feel known, New students Relationships across lines Caring communication Conflicts/RJ Positive school climate</p>	<i>Beginning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SQR Team gathered some evidence of students feeling safe and free from threat, bullying and discrimination. Overall, students reported that they felt safe on campus. They said that in most classes they did not worry about things like bullying or discrimination, but that some classes where there were management issues they had to be alert. A few described incidents where they heard that a student had had a weapon on campus, but they believed the administration had dealt with it right away. In contrast, most of the English Learners or Newcomers interviewed reported feeling unsafe in specific places in the school; they said they experienced getting picked on and having their phones stolen. During the visit, the SQR Team did observe several fights and observed students passing around videos of fights on their cell phones. • The SQR Team gathered some evidence of students experiencing positive, trusting relationships with adults in the school. Most students interviewed reported that they had an adult on campus they could go to for support. Some did describe teachers with “attitudes” who were rude to students. • Teachers talked more of struggles in teacher-student relationships that they experienced—students boldly defying their directions or disrespecting them. Several teachers reported that they didn’t feel safe at times with students, particularly when approaching tardy students in the hallway. Some teachers praised the principal for how he talked to students and treated

them with respect.

- Several teachers and students reported that, while across the school there are challenges in the relationships between adults and students, the Career Academies are places where adults and students are in quite positive relationship. Students talked positively about their peers in the academies and described a closeness and collective focus—this was not mirrored by students outside the academies. Career academy students talked about their teachers positively. They trusted them and felt known by them, and this was mirrored by the academy teachers. Teachers who taught both academy and non-academy classes said that academy students have a different focus and behave quite differently. Interestingly they did not connect this specifically to anything the adults were doing, but rather that these were just different characteristics the students brought to their classes.
- The SQR Team gathered some evidence of procedures to make new students feel like members of the school community. Summer Bridge was an optional program that welcomed and prepared about 100 9th graders. 9th grade Orientation the week before school started was another example. Newcomer students entered the school through the Newcomer Program which supported them to understand and adapt to their new country and school. The SQR Team gathered no specific evidence of systems for students who arrive new during the year, beyond the normal registration process.
- Students consistently reported that the Wellness Center and their after-school programs were places where they experienced positive adult relationships and where they experienced “safe and inclusive environments.”

Quality Indicator 3: Learning Communities Focused on Continuous Improvement

Focus Standard	Focus Standard	Rubric Rating	Summary Explanation of Ratings
3.1	Collaboration	<i>Beginning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SQR Team gathered substantial evidence that Oakland High teachers met several times a month for collaborative planning and inquiry focused on student learning. Teachers collaborated in grade level groups, by departments, career academy teams, and in a variety of committees (e.g., Teacher Instructional Leadership Team; the PBIS/School Culture committee; the Career Academy leadership team). Teachers collaborated during formal work time, and sometimes outside, during lunch or after school. Evidence of specific strengths and challenges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ According to the professional development schedule established at the beginning of the year, academics departments planned to meet once a month, but several teachers and administrators reported that this schedule had been interrupted, such that most departments had met only 2-3 times this year, at the time of the February SQR visit. The Principal noted that last year department planning time on Wednesdays was two times a month. This year, one of those Wednesdays had been given over to PBIS/Culture & Climate content to address the challenges reported above in standard 2.2 and 2.6. ○ The Environmental Science Academy team also noted that their twice monthly meeting schedule had changed this year also. At the direction of the principal, one meeting a month was now facilitated by the Linked Learning coach to address program issues and improvements—such as recruitment and enrollment, mission and goals—that addressed the challenges described above in standard 1.10. ○ Teachers in 9th grade families reportedly met once a <u>week</u>. They shared student academic and social-emotional information, identified student needs, organized supports and interventions, made plans to call homes and engage with families, and made referrals if necessary. ○ Biology teachers reported that they met once a week after school on their own time to plan curriculum. ○ The Public Health Academy reportedly met once a week during their common prep and collaborated outside the duty day using special funding to pay teachers. • The SQR Team gathered evidence that the quality of teacher collaboration varied in its focus on mapping curriculum backwards from important learning goals and standards; collaboratively making curricular choices, sharing “best practices,” and planning

			<p>assessment. There was little evidence of systematic training or guiding protocols to ensure high quality processes and outcomes for teacher collaboration, as found in Professional Learning Community or Community of Practice collaboration. For example, leadership reported that an AVID protocol was used by Academy teams to organize their focus on students, but no teachers confirmed this. Given this, the quality of Oakland High’s teacher collaboration varied depending on the will, skill, and knowledge of each teacher team and its lead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was little evidence that teachers used planning time to regularly look at evidence of student learning (formative and summative assessment data or student work) to understand students’ level of mastery of the learning objectives. As teachers consistently reported: “We don’t use data very much at this school.” “We have little access to common data. We just got a big download of student data. For any request of what we can find beyond ABI, we don’t have time to do it. Within the curricular groups, then yes. School wide or department wide, no. We have looked at Lexile scores. If it’s the district’s desire for us to look at certain data, then make it easy and immediate. If we are trying to design our curriculum around data, then we need to see immediate data.” “It felt like the data that was provided in the teachers’ mailboxes was given punitively, and segmented. It was not the full picture of the student and was presented like ‘you need to improve your practice.’” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ One exception to this pattern of limited data use appeared to be the ELA department. The department chair reported that four years ago the department decided to focus on the EAP and work together on how a focus on this would shape ELA instructional practices. Teachers agreed to embed an EAP-like formative assessment in every literature unit. They set the goal that 30% of their students would pass or conditionally pass. While they have not yet reached this goal, they continue to use this measure to focus some of their planning. • There was little evidence to support that all teachers took responsibility for creating and maintaining a quality PLC by participating fully, supporting an agenda, recording notes and decisions, and following up with assigned tasks. In focus groups interviews, teachers reported that planning time was lost waiting for all teachers to attend meetings. Some teachers said that the planning time was often used to complain about behavioral concerns.
3.4	Professional Learning Activities	<i>Developing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SQR Team gathered substantial evidence that professional learning activities at Oakland High build teacher will, skill, and knowledge to deliver challenging and meaningful curriculum using a variety of instructional strategies. Over the last few years, teams of Oakland High teachers have attended AVID trainings, which several

teachers reported as the “best training”. As a result of this professional learning, Oakland High leadership focused on specific AVID strategies like the Cornell Notes process, collaborative discussion, and “marking the text” as key instructional improvement strategies. In turn, these improvement strategies became the focus of some of the school’s instructional collaboration activities.

- As noted above, professional learning one Wednesday a month focused on classroom and school-wide strategies to build a positive school culture (PBIS, working with students who are victims of trauma, etc.). Reportedly the 9th grade teacher teams also participated in No Nonsense Nurturing training. Teachers presented a wide range of views, from supportive to dismissive, on how this learning was addressing the current needs of students and teachers and whether therefore it was valuable learning for them. It was notable to the SQR Team that administrators and teachers did not articulate a connection between this learning and two needs that were strongly evident in SQR observations and interviews: 1. The need for a shared practice on the use of social-emotional learning (SEL) strategies in the classroom that would build the readiness of students to engage academically; and 2. The need for consistent behavior management strategies across classrooms and school-wide that could support the social-emotional readiness of the adults to teach.
- Beyond these school-wide activities, the SQR Team gathered substantial evidence of individual teachers and teacher teams (departments and academies) engaged in a variety of professional learning activities that did not specifically align to school-wide priorities. These included: District-led content training; DBQ implementation; new teacher coaching; and Academy “content” conferences and trainings. Teachers spoke positively of this learning, often noting that it was teacher initiated and/or teacher led.

Quality Indicator 4: Meaningful Student, Family and Community Engagement/Partnerships

Focus Standard	Focus Standard	Rubric Rating	Summary Explanation of Ratings
4.2	Working Together in Partnership	<i>Developing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SQR Team gathered substantial evidence of Oakland High partnering with families through key formal, collaborative structures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Families participate in a School Site Council that effectively shares decision-making about school improvement priorities and the resources to enact those priorities. Reportedly the SSC is the largest it has been in years, as a result of aggressive recruiting led by the school’s parent liaison. Observation of an SSC meeting noted that there were 6 students and 5 parents present, along with staff members. ○ Even though it is no longer mandated, Oakland High continues to hold ELAC meetings with students and families of English Learners. Reportedly, the ELAC has been an important structure for communicating with and supporting Newcomer families. ○ Oakland High also has an active Parent Booster Club which supports the football, basketball, and baseball teams primarily. Reportedly they met every month and were a good resource from which to recruit parents for the SSC. • As noted above, Oakland High hired a Parent Liaison this year, who coordinated monthly Family Nights on different parent education topics, while trying to build parent engagement strategies for the school. Reportedly, she is working to revitalize a PTA at the site. • In addition, the SQR Team gathered some evidence of the school’s relationships with parents/families. Staff reported contacting parents when students exhibited bad behavior or were failing. The Team heard reports of a few events held by individual academies, houses, or programs which included parents.
4.5	Student/Family Engagement on Student Progress	<i>Beginning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SQR Team gathered some evidence of activities which engaged students and families in knowing how the student was progressing academically and engaging in the school community. For these activities, however, the evidence suggested there were challenges with their quality and consistency. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The SQR Team heard reports that Oakland High has implemented various strategies to help students learn about the career academies and other academic programs and about the steps they need to take to access classes and graduate college and career ready. These included 9th grade information events; PA announcements; robo-calls; the PASS2 program. Student interviews revealed mixed effectiveness of these activities, although it appeared that, because of recent efforts in the 9th grade houses and by the academies, students were learning this information earlier in their career at Tech. However parent

			<p>and staff reports made clear that “parents are generally not in the conversation” and that they do not know how classes are chosen, what the criteria is, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Several teachers identified engagement with families about student progress as a major school challenge. They reported that, because of the OUSD Options process and because so many students lived out of the neighborhood, it was difficult to get families to come to campus and to engage with teachers. One teacher noted, “We have parent family nights and when we have 100 families, we consider that a good turn out even though it’s abysmal. We have not given parents a distinct reason to come.” Teachers reported that parent Involvement was a struggle, and that even contacting parents could be difficult because ABI was out of date.○ Other teachers, staff and parents had different views of this. They said that there was no consistent expectation that teachers should be communicating with families. Others said that there are many teachers who resist contacting parents and cite the teachers contract to say they do not have to do this. One teacher reported that “lots of teachers are afraid of calling home. If you don’t make that initial introduction call at the beginning of the year, then it’s harder to have the first call be about a problem.”● The SQR Team gathered some evidence of activities that enable parents to know how their child is progressing—including Back to School Night, various career academy engagements, individual teacher communication and conferences, quarterly progress reporting, teacher websites, and the on-line ABI system. There was strong evidence that the Oakland High did not have a shared expectation and accountability system for teachers engaging with parents on student progress. Some teachers had strong communication procedures with families through cell calls, email and teacher websites; some teachers did not use these tools. The variability and inconsistency in the use of these systems across teachers created much frustration for teachers, students and families and had a negative drag on the school’s stakeholder cultures.
--	--	--	--

Quality Indicator 5: Effective School Leadership and Resource Management

Focus Standard	Focus Standard	Rubric Rating	Summary Explanation of Ratings
5.4	Vision Driven	<i>Beginning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SQR Team found that Oakland High did have a written vision and “Expected Student Learning Results” (ESLRs) that were well focused on student learning and high expectations for students. However, there was little evidence that the vision/ESLRs were widely known or shared or that they were actively guiding decision making about academic program, culture and climate, staffing, or partnerships. Leaders and staff were not consistently knowledgeable about them. While there was little evidence of a school-wide vision driving improvements, the SQR Team did gather some evidence of improvement initiatives being vision driven. The principal noted that “several strands of work—9th grade families, Career Academies, AVID, PEC program—have distinct visions.” Teachers associated with these strands similarly reported on these specific visions. The challenge, as the principal reported, is “unifying our distinct efforts”.
5.5	Focused on Equity	<i>Developing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SQR Team found strong evidence that school leadership, including administrators and teacher leaders, consistently articulated the need to interrupt patterns of inequity. For example, leadership was raising questions about disproportionate enrollment in the academies and about the related impact of AP classes as they were integrated into academy programs. These questions were targeting particularly the engagement, readiness to learn, and college/career awareness of lower performing and African American and Latino students. Efforts to address these equity concerns were being led through several initiatives: the 9th grade families, the re-vamping of admission procedures for the academies; AAMA Manhood Development classes; etc. Related to this, school leadership was addressing some of the equity challenges within the school climate conditions described in School Quality Indicator 2. Students who were habitually tardy to class and chronically absent were disproportionately African American and Latino students. Leadership created systems for getting a clearer picture and better data on who these students were through the tardy sweep policy and for addressing them through the case manager supports. School leadership had not yet created the teacher leadership and teacher collaboration conditions that would enable the school to address the deeper school culture conflicts occurring between teachers and students described in School Quality Indicator 2. The SQR Team observed that, at root, these conflicts are fundamentally equity issues.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SQR Team found that school leadership consistently worked with learning data (SRI, grades) and “student culture/climate” evidence (attendance, suspension, student voice, CHKS data) in focusing on equity. Leadership did not collect and analyze “richer” types of student learning data (formative/summative assessment data or student work) to understand, overall and by sub-groups, students’ mastery of learning objectives. Without this full data picture, the SQR Team judged it would be difficult for leadership to push the focus on equity more deeply with teachers.
5.6	Supports the Development of Quality Instruction	<i>Developing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SQR Team gathered evidence of several structures through which leadership guided and supported instructional decisions and initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Teacher <u>Instructional Leadership Team (TILT)</u>, composed of Department Chairs and Academy Leads, was described as the team that held responsibility for school-wide instructional decisions. Several members of the team reported that TILT had been focused on literacy performance. They monitored SRI data and planned how different departments could use this data to inform their instruction. As a team, they planned at the start of the year that Oakland High teachers would focus on AVID strategies, specifically “marking the text” and Cornell note-taking. Many teachers had already been trained at AVID conferences, and they expected that departments could focus on this work through the year. Unfortunately, as noted above in School Quality Indicator 3, the <u>department teams</u> reported that they had not done much follow-up on this initiative. By schedule, departments planned to meet once a month, but several teachers reported that this schedule had been repeatedly interrupted, such that most departments had met only 2-3 times at this point in the year. The SQR Team also found that there was not consistent clarity within the department teams about this year’s school-wide instructional priority. When interviewed, some department teams said the school was also focused on implementing Academic Discussion; some said Academic Discussion was from last year. Only one department could describe how they were monitoring how academic discussion was being used in the classroom and its impact. <u>Department chairs</u> reported that they played a role in supporting the development of quality instruction through their teacher recruitment and hiring. The principal added that department chairs were taking on additional responsibilities with the school’s recent loss of Teaching and Learning coaches. Department chairs were being asked to assume more responsibility to hold the improvement focus and work for the department. From the chairs themselves, the SQR Team heard considerable differences in how they saw themselves holding peers accountable for implementing improvement practices.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An <u>academy leads committee</u> met every other week, with the principal and Linked Learning coach, to plan and monitor initiatives in the career academies. At the time of the SQR visit, this committee was redesigning the academy admission process and grappling with the issue of how AP courses would mesh with the career academies. ● As noted above, the SQR Team gathered evidence that Oakland High’s improvement focus was on “marking the text”. The SQR Team did not see this practice consistently in classrooms and did not hear teachers consistently describing it as a focus for them. Reportedly, the focus was selected because it addressed both a District priority on Close Reading and a school priority to implement AVID strategies across content areas. The SQR Team wondered how this focus could actually drive instructional improvement given that there was no data being collected or monitored on its implementation or impact. ● Evidence gathered by the SQR Team suggested that the primary way that administrators themselves supported the development of quality instruction at Oakland High was through observation and feedback. The principal reported setting an expectation that administrators would do 10 informal observations with written feedback each week. Several teachers reported that, when they experienced administration’s observation and feedback, it was valuable because it pushed their instructional practice to improve. Teachers reported, however, that such observation and feedback did not occur often enough. One teacher noted, “It feels like our leadership team is burdened with so much that instruction gets short changed. We always get excited about instruction at the beginning of the year (e.g. academic discourse and annotated close reading) but that focus falls off. ... And unfortunately, we rarely visit each other formally doing peer observations.”
5.9	Culture of Mutual Accountability	<i>Beginning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● As noted earlier, Oakland High had defined specific Expected Student Learning Results (ESLRs) through their previous WASC work, but the evidence suggested that these were not being used by staff for accountability purposes. ● Efforts were being led to have productive difficult conversations about equity, disproportionality, access, and differential support, but as yet these efforts had not greatly impacted or focused staff collaboration and had not yet significantly impacted staff work with students and their families. ● While emerging, the evidence in general suggested that Oakland High did not yet have the data practices and the teacher leadership/collaboration conditions that held staff mutually accountable—to defined student outcomes for learning and behavior and to widely shared practices around family communication and engagement. The SQR Team found only one academic department (ELA) where the teachers had defined shared academic metrics and

			<p>goals. Without shared department targets and shared ways to measure student progress, efforts to define, monitor, and improve curricular choices and instructional practices could only have weak impact. Teachers, if motivated, appeared to be figuring out how to improve their practice largely by themselves. District-led efforts to support the implementation of the common core standards were only beginning to gain traction with some teachers, according to the evidence gathered by the SQR Team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were however niches in the school—the career academies, the 9th grade families, the Wellness Center—where staff were having more focused conversations about the impact of their work and were setting more specific student outcome goals. In these niches, the SQR Team saw greater evidence of staff holding themselves mutually accountable.
5.10	Organizational Management	<i>Developing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SQR Team gathered substantial evidence that Oakland High leadership had developed systems and allocated resources in support of the school’s improvement efforts (in the absence of a driving school vision). For example, funding was supporting: teacher professional development in AVID strategies; teacher collaboration time in the 9th grade families and career academies reforms; interventions to improve school culture. • The SQR Team did note the absence of evidence that resources (in the broad sense of time, money, and people) were being directed toward significant school needs, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ developing a tiered academic interventions/supports system (see standard 1.8); ○ implementing a school-wide behavior management system (standard 2.2); and ○ creating more effective collaborative planning (could the T&L coaching that had been lost be restored?). • As noted above, the SQR Team gathered some evidence of coordination challenges in Oakland High’s organizational management. Oakland High had considerable student support and intervention resources, yet the SQR Team heard reports of inconsistent communication (e.g., between the Wellness Center and teachers) and incomplete alignment. The SQR Team wondered if the available resources were being maximized.

SUMMARY RATINGS CHART

In addition to the Academic Strands ratings found on pp. 23-24, the following Summary Ratings Chart provides the ratings for standards 1.8 and 1.10 in Quality Indicator 1 and the focus standards for Quality Indicators 2-5.

Standard #	Focus Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
1.8	Academic Intervention & Enrichment Support		X			
1.10	Equitable Access to Curriculum		X			
2.2	Coordinated & Integrated System of Academic Learning Support Services		X			
2.6	Inclusive, Welcoming & Caring Community		X			
3.1	Collaboration		X			
3.4	Professional Learning Activities			X		
4.2	Working Together in Partnership			X		
4.5	Student/Family Engagement on Student Progress		X			
5.4	Vision Driven		X			
5.5	Focused on Equity			X		
5.6	Supports the Development of Quality Instruction			X		
5.9	Culture of Mutual Accountability		X			
5.10	Organizational Management			X		

Appendix—School Quality Standards

OUSD School Quality Standards—Summary Version With Focus Standards highlighted

Focus Standards are identified high leverage standards directly supporting the District's key Strategic Plan goals

Quality Indicator 1: Quality Learning Experiences for All Students *(School conditions standards)*

A quality school...

1. provides students with curriculum that is meaningful and challenging to them.
2. provides safe and nurturing learning environments.
3. ensures that the curriculum follows state and district standards, with clear learning targets.
4. uses instructional strategies that make learning active for students and provide them with different ways to learn.
5. uses different kinds of assessment data and evidence of student learning to plan instruction.
6. ensures that all teaching is grounded in a clear, shared set of beliefs about how students learn best.
7. ensures that students know what they're learning, why they're learning it and how it can be applied.
8. provides academic intervention and broader enrichment supports before, during, and after school.
9. uses leadership and youth development curriculum and extra-curricular content to engage students.
10. provides and ensures equitable access to curriculum and courses that prepare all students for college.
11. has a college-going culture with staff and teachers who provide college preparedness resources.
12. provides opportunities for students to learn career-related skills and to develop 21st century work habits.

Quality Indicator 2: Safe, Supportive, & Healthy Learning Environments *(School conditions standards)*

A quality school...

1. is a safe and healthy center of the community, open to community use before, during, and after the school day.
2. offers a coordinated and integrated system of academic and learning support services, provided by adults and youth.
3. defines learning standards for social and emotional development and implements strategies to teach those standards.
4. adopts rituals, routines and practices that promote achievement so it is “cool to be smart”.
5. identifies at-risk students and intervenes early, to help students and their parents develop concrete plans for the future.
6. creates an inclusive, welcoming and caring community, fostering communication that values individual/cultural differences.
7. has staff that is committed to holding students to high expectations and helping them with any challenges they face.
8. has clear expectations and norms for behavior and systems for holding students and adults accountable to those norms.
9. ensures that the physical environment of classrooms and the broader school campus supports teaching and learning.
10. supports students to show initiative, take responsibility, and contribute to the school and wider community.
11. helps students to articulate and set short- and long-term goals, based on their passions and interests.

Quality Indicator 3: Learning Communities Focused on Continuous Improvement *(School conditions standards)*

A quality school...

1. makes sure that teachers work collaboratively, planning and using data and evidence to focus on student progress.
2. ensures that staff regularly analyze multiple kinds of data about student performance and their experience of learning.
3. has staff that continuously engages in a broad variety of professional learning activities, driven by the school's vision.
4. provides professional development that models effective practices, promotes teacher leadership, and supports teachers to continuously improve their classroom practice.
5. ensures professional learning has a demonstrable impact on teacher performance and student learning/social development.
6. provides adult learning opportunities that use student voice and/or are led by students.
7. provides learning opportunities that build capacity of all stakeholders to give input, participate in, or lead key decisions.
8. provides adult learning opportunities that use different instructional strategies to meet needs of individual adult learners.
9. has a collaborative system, involving all stakeholders, for evaluating the effectiveness of its strategies and programs.

Quality Indicator 4: Meaningful Student, Family and Community Engagement/ Partnerships *(School conditions standards)*

A quality school...

1. builds relationships and partnerships based on the school & community vision/goals, needs, assets, safety and local context.
2. shares decision-making with its students, their families, and the community, as part of working together in partnership.
3. allocates resources equitably to achieve higher and more equal outcomes.
4. partners with students by listening to their perspectives and priorities and acting on their recommendations for change.
5. works with students, their families, and the community, to know how the student is progressing and participating in school.
6. provides opportunities for families to understand what their child is learning; why they're learning it; what it looks like to perform well.
7. builds effective partnerships by using principles of student and family/community engagement.

Quality Indicator 5: Effective School Leadership & Resource Management *(School conditions standards)*

A quality school has leadership that...

1. builds the capacity of adults and students to share responsibility for leadership and to create a common vision.
2. shares school improvement and decision-making with students and their families.
3. provides student leaders access to adult decision-makers and supports them to be strong representatives of students.
4. ensures that the school's shared vision is focused on student learning, grounded in high expectations for all.
5. creates and sustains equitable conditions for learning and advocates for interrupting patterns of inequities.
6. guides and supports the development of quality instruction across the school.
7. develops and sustains relationships based on trust and respect.
8. perseveres through adverse situations, makes courageous decisions, and assumes personal responsibility.

9. collaboratively develops outcomes, monitors progress, and fosters a culture of accountability.
10. develops systems and allocates resources in support of the school's vision.
11. is distributed, through professional learning communities, collaborative planning teams, and select individuals.

Quality Indicator 6: High Quality Central Office in Service of Quality Schools (*Central Services conditions standards*)

A quality central office...

1. monitors each school, provides supports, and holds staff accountable, based on standards for school quality.
2. provides coordinated and integrated fiscal, operational and academic systems that have a demonstrable impact.
3. models the planning and action strategies that result in the greatest improvement in school and system-wide performance.
4. equitably allocates resources to achieve higher and more equal outcomes.
5. ensures that each school is a safe and healthy center of the community, with high quality facilities, open and integrated into community life.
6. governing body and administration are effectively focused on student learning and support the schools' efforts to raise student academic and social outcomes.
7. builds capacity of adults and students to share responsibility for leadership and decision-making, to create and sustain FSCS.
8. facilitates the collection, analysis and sharing of relevant data among partners to inform decision-making.
9. has a clear, collaborative system, involving all stakeholders, for evaluating the effectiveness of its strategies and programs.
10. helps schools manage key student transitions between grades, among levels of schooling, and between schools.
11. develops, supports and sustains partnerships with key public and private entities such as philanthropy, city, county, community-based organizations, higher education, business, and community and family representatives.

Appendix—School Quality Standard Rubrics

Quality Indicator 1: Quality Learning Experiences for All Students

The Oakland Unified School District is committed to supporting high levels of learning for every student, ensuring that students are prepared for success in college, in their careers, and as citizens. Central to this commitment is the creation of quality learning experiences for all students.

“Quality Learning Experiences for All Students” happen when every child is engaged and learns to high standards. The quality school makes sure that the school curriculum is challenging and connects to the needs, interests, and cultures of its students. It ensures that students learn in different ways inside and outside the classroom, including having opportunities to work with their peers, to investigate and challenge what they are taught, and to develop knowledge and skills that have value beyond the school. The quality school supports students to take risks and intervenes when they struggle. It inspires students to see how current learning helps them achieve future goals. In a quality school, each child’s learning is regularly assessed in different ways. This assessment information is used to plan their learning, to provide strategic support, and to empower the students and their families to manage their academic progress and prepare for various college and career opportunities.

The following rubrics enable key school stakeholders to assess the development of a school toward the “quality learning experiences” standards, based on evidence from a range of sources. In addition, school leaders, central office personnel, and coaches will use these rubrics to design improvement strategies and support schools’ ongoing development. The unit of analysis for these rubrics is the school, not individuals within the school. These rubrics will not be used for the evaluation of school leaders, teachers, or other school personnel.

Undeveloped	There was little evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard.
Beginning	There was some evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard.
Developing	There was substantial evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard.
Sustaining	There was strong & consistent evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard.
Refining	There was strong & consistent evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard, and the school has implemented systems to review and improve these practices/conditions.

Definitions

Learning experiences: Structured learning experiences found in the classroom during the day; in on-campus academic intervention and enrichment opportunities before, during, and after the school day; in mentoring, internship, and work-based learning opportunities organized by the school.

Quality Indicator 1: Quality Learning Experiences for All Students

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 1.1: Meaningful and Challenging Curriculum <i>A quality school provides students with curriculum that is meaningful and challenging to them. Such curriculum is shaped by student input, targets their assessed learning needs, and takes advantage of their strengths and experiences. It educates them about their history and culture, and that of others. It shows how what is learned in school can help students to solve real problems in their lives.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>The school provides learning experiences that show strong and consistent evidence of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Learning builds on students’ prior knowledge/ skills/ experiences. b. Students apply learning to questions or problems connected to their interests, goals, experiences, and communities. c. Students communicate their thinking, supported by teacher/peers, using the language and reasoning of the discipline. d. Curriculum reflects an academic push, from the teacher, to have all students progress far and attain high levels of mastery. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems, including student input, to review evidence of these practices to ensure that all students experience meaningful and challenging curriculum across the day and across the campus.</p>

Quality Indicator 1: Quality Learning Experiences for All Students

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 1.2: Safe and Nurturing Learning Experiences** <i>A quality school provides safe and nurturing learning environments where adults and students care for each other, feel trust, and have relationships that fully engage students in their learning and inspire them to work hard and push toward higher levels of achievement.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>The school provides learning experiences that show strong and consistent evidence of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Students are safe and learn free from intimidation, bullying, and/or discrimination. b. Routines & structures support students to build positive relationships across different individual and cultural “lines”, so that they can effectively work and learn together. c. The classroom is an “accepting” environment in which the contributions, culture and language of each student is validated, valued, and respected. d. All students manage their emotions to persist through difficult academic work. e. The physical environment of the classroom is clean and organized to be safe and supportive of learning. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems, including student input, to review evidence of these conditions to ensure that all students experience safe and nurturing learning experiences across the day and across the campus.</p>

****Note that this standard is focused on conditions in the classroom (or locations where the core activities of teaching and learning are happening). Broader, school-wide conditions of safety and nurture are addressed in Quality Indicator 2.**

Quality Indicator 1: Quality Learning Experiences for All Students

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 1.4: Active and Different Ways of Learning <i>A quality school uses instructional strategies that make learning active for students, that provide them with different ways to learn, and that respond to their different learning needs (including language and literacy needs). Instruction is geared toward the construction of meaning, disciplined inquiry and the production of writing and problem-solving that has value beyond the school.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>The school provides learning experiences that show strong and consistent evidence of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Students actively “work”—reasoning, reading, writing, and/or speaking the language of the discipline. b. Students “work” <u>together</u> in the discipline, and their collaboration facilitate deep learning. c. Students learn using various learning modalities and/or multiple intelligences. d. Students use language support scaffolds (sentence frames, multiple choice oral responses, diagrams and other representations) to engage in learning. e. Students develop questions, pose problems, make connections, reflect on multiple perspectives, and/or actively construct knowledge. f. Students explain and revise their thinking and build on and evaluate the thinking of others. g. The pacing of learning reflects an academic push to have all students complete learning activities and reach expected high levels of mastery. (“Every minute is used well.”) h. Various technologies are used to make learning active and to meet the learning needs of students. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems, including student input, to review evidence of these strategies to ensure that all students experience active and different ways of learning.</p>

Quality Indicator 1: Quality Learning Experiences for All Students

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 1.7: Students Know What They are Learning, Why, and How it can be Applied</p> <p><i>A quality school ensures that students know what they're learning, why they're learning it and how it can be applied. It ensures that students understand what it looks like to know, perform, and interact "well" (i.e. with quality). It makes sure that students play an active role in managing and shaping their learning and in developing an individualized learning plan for improvement.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the "Sustaining" column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the "Sustaining" column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the "Sustaining" column.</p>	<p>The school provides learning experiences that show strong and consistent evidence of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Students know the learning objectives for the lesson. b. Students recognize the connection between today's learning and long-term outcomes. c. All students have their learning checked with immediate feedback regarding their progress toward the day's learning objectives. d. Students make "real world" connections about how their learning can be applied. e. Students understand what it looks like to know or perform "well". f. Students can accurately assess how close they are to mastering expected learning outcomes. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the "Sustaining" column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems, including student input, to review evidence of these strategies to ensure that all students know what they are learning, why they are learning it, and how that learning can be applied.</p>

Quality Indicator 1: Quality Learning Experiences for All Students

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 1.8: Academic Intervention and Enrichment Supports** <i>A quality school provides resources and programs before, during, and after school that ensure that all students have the academic intervention and broader enrichment supports they need to be academically successful and engaged as a whole person.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence that the school provides:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Classroom strategies and school-wide systems identify which students are struggling and need academic support and which students are mastering targets and need academic enrichment. b. Classroom strategies and school-wide systems identify <u>specifically why</u> students are struggling to reach expected learning targets. c. School-wide systems efficiently refer students to needed academic supports, monitor their effectiveness, and adjust—ensuring that students “get in and get out” as progress occurs. d. Patterns of shared student characteristics are considered when identifying student academic needs and providing supports. e. Classroom and school-wide strategies—before, during, and after school—provide a variety of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Universal” academic supports (e.g., classroom & on-line resources, teacher “office” hours, ASP homework help, advisory class); ▪ “Targeted” academic supports (e.g., classroom push-in or pull-out homogeneous grouping, specific EL supports, ELD or intervention class, 504 accommodations, Saturday or summer programs); ▪ “Intensive” academic supports (Small-group intervention class, assigned tutor or mentor, Special Ed IEP and class) f. Classroom and school-wide strategies—before, during, and after school—provide a variety of academic enrichment opportunities for identified students (e.g., “elective” or ASP academic content; leadership; technology; media). 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems, including student input, to review evidence of these supports to ensure that all students experience needed academic intervention and enrichment.</p>

****This standard and rubric describe how a school provides a coordinated and integrated system of academic supports and enrichment that promote quality learning experiences for all students. In Quality Indicator 2, Standard 2, the standard and rubric describe how the school provides a coordinated and integrated system of other supports and enrichment—specifically health, safety, social-emotional, and youth development services—that are necessary to promote quality learning experiences for all students.**

Quality Indicator 1: Quality Learning Experiences for All Students

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 1.10: Equitable Access to Curriculum</p> <p><i>A quality school provides curriculum and courses (including A-G and AP courses at the high school level) that prepare students for college, and it ensures equitable access to such curriculum and courses, for all students, through academic interventions that catch and support students to complete a college preparatory course work.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence that the school provides the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Diverse groups of students are proportionally represented in the academic programs. b. The school offers academic interventions that identify and support specific learners who experience on-going discrimination or who are part of historically lower-achieving groups, which gives them access to challenging curriculum and enables them to achieve high standards. c. These specific students are fully integrated into a challenging core curriculum with appropriately trained teachers. d. All teachers and staff in key gate-keeping roles (e.g., counselors) have received training about access and equity issues, and operate with clear guidelines for ensuring full access. e. All services at the school are coordinated efficiently and effectively to support student learning. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems, including student input, to review evidence of these supports to ensure that all students have equitable access to curriculum.</p>

Quality Indicator 1: Quality Learning Experiences for All Students

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 1.11: College-going Culture and Resources</p> <p><i>A quality school has a college-going culture with staff and teachers who provide college preparedness resources to inform students and families about the importance of college, their college options, the entrance requirements, and the supports needed to successfully complete college.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>The school provides learning experiences that show strong and consistent evidence of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Students connect how their learning in class prepares them for future college and/ or career opportunities. b. Teachers are explicit that certain skills and dispositions (e.g., peer collaboration, study/organizational habits) particularly prepare students to be successful in college and careers. c. School staff helps students develop concrete plans for the future and counsels them about college and career options. d. Students use a variety of resources to understand the importance of college, their college options, the entrance requirements, and the supports needed to complete college. e. Families use a variety of resources to understand the importance of college, their college options, the entrance requirements, and the supports needed to complete college. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems, including student input, to review evidence of these conditions to ensure that a college-going culture and resources are experienced by all students.</p>

Quality Indicator 2: Safe, Supportive, & Healthy Learning Environments

The Oakland Unified School District is committed to supporting high levels of learning for every student, ensuring that students are prepared for success in college, in their careers, and as citizens. Central to this commitment is the creation of learning environments that are safe, supportive, and healthy for all students.

“Safe, Supportive, and Healthy Learning Environments” recognize that all members of the school community thrive when there is a broad, coordinated approach to identifying and meeting the needs of all members. The quality school is a safe, healthy center of its community. Its students, their families, the community, and school staff feel safe because school relationships, routines, and programs build respect, value individual and cultural differences, and restore justice—in the classrooms, hallways, and surrounding neighborhood. Its members are healthy and ready to learn, work, and parent because they have access to services—before, during, and after the school day—that address their academic, emotional, social, and physical needs. In such a quality school, the adults in the community coordinate their support so that students plan for and are prepared for future success.

The following rubrics enable key school stakeholders to assess the development of a school toward the “Safe, Supportive, & Healthy Learning” standards, based on evidence from a range of sources. In addition, school leaders, central office personnel, and coaches will use these rubrics to design improvement strategies and support schools’ ongoing development. The unit of analysis for these rubrics is the school, not programs or individuals within the school. These rubrics will not be used for the evaluation of school leaders, teachers, or other school personnel.

Undeveloped	There was <u>little</u> evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or build the conditions described in the standard.
Beginning	There was <u>some</u> evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or build the conditions described in the standard.
Developing	There was <u>substantial</u> evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or build the conditions described in the standard.
Sustaining	There was <u>strong & consistent</u> evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or build the conditions described in the standard.
Refining	There was <u>strong & consistent</u> evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or build the conditions described in the standard, and the school has <u>implemented systems to review evidence</u> of these practices/conditions.

Quality Indicator 2: Safe, Supportive, & Healthy Learning Environments

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 2.2: Coordinated and Integrated System of Support Services <i>A quality school has systems to identify at-risk students and to intervene early. The school provides 1) health and social-emotional services and 2) a youth and community development component to help students acquire the attitudes, competencies, values, and social skills they need to facilitate academic learning.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>The school provides learning environments that show strong and consistent evidence of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Systems are in place to identify which students are struggling and why they are struggling and to support their health/social emotional issues. b. Systems are in place to refer students to the supports that address their need(s) following the RTI model. c. A broad menu of on-site strategies, services and partnerships respond to student/family needs. d. The school has effective behavior management systems that create a social-emotional foundation for learning in the classroom and a positive school climate (rewards, progressive discipline plan, celebrations to recognize improvement/ achievement, daily routines that reinforce culture of the school, etc.) e. Students are provided healthy food and health-focused physical activity. f. Health education is integrated into classrooms, programs, and services. g. The school has a youth development component (citizen/values programs, advisory, leadership class, student council, internships, etc.) to help students acquire the attitudes, competencies, values, and social skills they need to facilitate academic learning. h. Strategies and/or organizational structures (e.g., houses, academies, etc.) provide social supports for all students. Staff can modify these strategies/structures to meet students’ needs. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column. In addition, the school monitors, reviews, and adjusts these practices with input from the various stakeholders of the school, including students, in order to ensure that the school provides a coordinated and integrated system of academic and learning support services.</p>

Quality Indicator 2: Safe, Supportive, & Healthy Learning Environments

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 2.6: Inclusive, Welcoming, and Caring Community* <i>A quality school creates an inclusive, welcoming, safe, caring and nurturing community which: 1. Fosters respectful communication among students, families, staff, and community. 2. Values individual and cultural differences. 3. Engages and partners with students, families, and community. 4. Creates a positive school climate that includes behavior management as well as structures that recognize improvement, achievement, and growth.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>The school provides learning environments that show strong and consistent evidence of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Students and parents feel safe and free from threat, bullying, and/or discrimination. b. Students and parents trust staff. c. Students and their families are “known” by school staff. d. Procedures and practices support new students and their families to quickly feel like members of the school community. e. Staff, students, and their families intentionally build caring and supportive relationships across different individual and cultural “lines”. f. Interactions are characterized by caring communication. g. Procedures and practices support students to resolve and heal conflicts and “restore justice” to the school community. h. Structures and activities before/during/and after school create a safe and inclusive environment for students (main office, playground, hallways, cafeteria, etc.) 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column. In addition, the school monitors, reviews, and adjusts these practices with input from the various stakeholders of the school, including students, in order to ensure that students and their families experience an inclusive, welcoming, safe, caring and nurturing community.</p>

**This standard addresses systems and practices outside of the classroom and it complements QI 1.2*

Quality Indicator 3: Learning Communities Focused on Continuous Improvement

The Oakland Unified School District is committed to supporting high levels of learning for every student, ensuring that students are prepared for success in college, in their careers, and as citizens. We believe that thriving schools consistently endeavor to develop as robust learning communities.

A “Learning Community Focused on Continuous Improvement” describes a school that consistently and collaboratively works to improve the school and to produce higher and more equitable outcomes by students. The school staff – in collaboration with students, families and the broader community – study, reflect, and learn together to strengthen their individual and collective efforts. They consistently look at data, plan, monitor, and evaluate their work. Through these efforts, they share decision-making, responsibility, and accountability.

This Learning Communities rubric focuses on the members of the community whose primary responsibility is student learning: teachers and those who support teachers. This group of individuals is not *de facto* a learning community; however, they develop into a learning community as they collaborate, build trust, challenge one another, and support one another – in service of student learning.

This rubric enables schools to self-assess against the quality school learning community standards, based on evidence from a range of sources. In addition, the Quality Accountability and Analytics office, other central office personnel, and coaches will interact around this rubric to develop growth plans and support schools’ ongoing development. The unit of analysis for this rubric is the school, not individuals or teams within the school.

Undeveloped	There was little evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard.
Beginning	There was some evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard.
Developing	There was substantial evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard.
Sustaining	There was strong & consistent evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard.
Refining	There was strong & consistent evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard, and the school has implemented systems to review and improve these practices/conditions.

Quality Indicator 3: Learning Communities Focused on Continuous Improvement

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 3.1: Collaborative Planning, Data Collection and Analysis <i>A quality school ensures that teachers work together collaboratively, using meaningful data, focused on student progress</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column</p>	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Teachers meet at least once a month for collaborative planning and inquiry focused on student learning. b. Teachers use collaboration time to map curriculum backwards from high leverage, important learning goals/outcomes/standards; collaboratively make curricular choices; and plan instruction and assessments. c. Teachers regularly look at evidence of student learning (formative and summative assessment data or student work) to understand students’ level of mastery of the learning objectives. d. Teachers collect multiple kinds of data about student performance and their experience of learning. e. Teachers use their data analysis to identify specific needs for re-teaching, intervention, and extension for individual students. f. Based on this evidence of student learning, teachers share best practices, trouble shoot dilemmas, and plan re-teaching and extension activities. g. All teachers take responsibility for creating and maintaining quality collaboration structures by participating fully, supporting a clear agenda, recording notes and decisions, and following-up with assigned tasks. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems to review and improve the practices that ensure effective Professional Learning Communities focused on student progress.</p>

Note: While the original standard (written in 2010-2011) focused on DuFour’s definition of Professional Learning Communities as the ideal structure for teacher collaboration, current support for teacher collaboration (in OUSD in 2013-2014) is taking multiple forms, all of which prioritize building learning communities that are respectful, focused on student learning, and which use multiple data sources to examine student learning and experience of learning.

Quality Indicator 3: Learning Communities Focused on Continuous Improvement

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 3.4: Professional Learning Activities <i>A quality school has professional learning activities that are embedded in practice, promote teacher leadership, and support teachers to evaluate and revise their classroom practices.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column</p>	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence that high quality professional learning activities help teachers improve student learning.</p> <p>Professional Learning Activities at the school are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Embedded in practice. They are useful to teacher practice with students, and model effective instructional strategies. b. Aligned to the vision and mission of the school. c. Targeted towards and responsive to the current needs of students and teachers. d. Developmental and differentiated to meet the needs of all teachers at the school. <p>Professional Learning Activities at the school:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> e. Promote teacher leadership. f. Support teachers to evaluate and improve their classroom practices. g. May include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whole staff learning opportunities • Individual or small group coaching • Supervision • Peer Coaching • Peer observations • Lesson study • Cycles of Inquiry • Training in a specific item • PLCs • Participating in protocols such as “Looking at Student Work”, “Tuning”, Etc. • Study groups or book studies 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column. In addition, the school has implemented systems to review and improve the practices that ensure high quality professional learning activities for teachers.</p>

Quality Indicator 4: Meaningful Student, Family and Community Engagement/Partnerships

The Oakland Unified School District is committed to supporting high levels of learning for every student, ensuring that students are prepared for success in college, in their careers, and as citizens. Central to this commitment is meaningfully engaging students, families, and communities as key partners in this work.

“Meaningful Student, Family, and Community Engagement/Partnerships” result when the school staff ensures that students, families and the community are partners in creating quality learning experiences for all students and a “full-service” school for the community. A quality school draws on the strengths and knowledge of the students, their families, and the community to become a center of support to the community and to meet the needs of all its members. Students, families, and community groups are “at the table”—giving voice to their concerns and perspectives; looking at data; planning, monitoring, evaluating the quality of the school; and participating in key decisions.

The following rubrics enable key school stakeholders to assess the development of a school toward the “Meaningful Student, Family and Community Engagement/Partnerships” standards, based on evidence from a range of sources. In addition, school leaders, central office personnel, and coaches will use these rubrics to design improvement strategies and support schools’ ongoing development. The unit of analysis for these rubrics is the school, not programs or individuals within the school. These rubrics will not be used for the evaluation of school leaders, teachers, or other school personnel.

Undeveloped	There was little evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard.
Beginning	There was some evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard.
Developing	There was substantial evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard.
Sustaining	There was strong & consistent evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard.
Refining	There was strong & consistent evidence found that the school implemented the practice(s) and/or built the conditions described in the standard, and the school has implemented systems to review evidence of these practices/conditions.

Definitions

Leaders: Principals are the primary leaders of their schools; some schools have assistant principals, coaches, and/or teachers who also have formal roles as leaders. In addition, every member of a school community has opportunities to function as a leader, depending on the school’s needs and the individual’s specific skills.

School Staff: Staff includes the principal, other administrators, and teachers (certificated), as well as other adults who work in the school (classified).

School Community: The community includes school staff, students, students’ families, individuals from the neighborhood, community-based organizations, and support providers who are associated with the school.

Leadership Groups: Schools have a variety of groups that provide guidance for and make decisions regarding the school. All schools have school site councils (SSCs) that are responsible for strategic planning, and many schools have additional structures, such as an *Instructional Leadership Team*, which guide and support the ongoing work of the school.

Quality Indicator 4: Meaningful Student, Family and Community Engagement/Partnerships

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 4.2: Working together in Partnership</p> <p><i>A quality school shares decision making with its students, their families, and the community, as part of working together in partnership. They share information, have influence over school improvement and support the creation of policies, practices, and programs that affect students, thus becoming agents of change.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The school has high-quality activities and strategies which build the capacity of students, families, and community to work together in partnership. The school creates structures and mechanisms to bring families of all racial, ethnic, socio-economic backgrounds which are representative of the student body as partners and volunteers into the school. The school creates structures and mechanisms which continuously engage families, including those who are less involved, to get their ideas, input, and involvement. Student, family, and community groups (Coordination of Services Team, After School programs, community agencies, etc.), in partnership with the school, set clear and measurable goals that are aligned with the school wide vision and goals. The school has developed/adopted and implemented standards of meaningful engagement (either school or district approved) to build effective student, family, and community partnerships. Students and their families participate in both mandated representative bodies (SSC, ELAC, etc.) and other collaborative structures and share decision making around school programs, improvement plans, expected student outcomes, etc. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems to monitor the effectiveness of these practices to ensure that a school works together in partnership.</p>

Quality Indicator 4: Meaningful Student, Family and Community Engagement/Partnerships

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 4.5: Student/Family Engagement on Student Progress</p> <p><i>A quality school communicates with families effectively so they know how the student is progressing and how they participate in the school community. It allows clear two-way channels for communication. The school uses strategies that help families overcome the language, cultural, economic, and physical barriers that can limit their full participation.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The school has multiple high-quality activities and strategies which engage students and their family in knowing how the student is progressing academically and engaging in the school community. b. Families and school staff have trusting relationships and engage in regular, two-way, meaningful communication about student progress. c. These activities and strategies are designed to minimize language, cultural, economic, and physical barriers that can limit students and their families’ full participation. d. The school has created and implemented policies that encourage all teachers to communicate frequently with families about student academic progress and student engagement in the school community. These policies are well communicated with staff and families. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems to review evidence of the effectiveness of these practices to ensure effective student/family engagement on student progress.</p>

Quality Indicator 5: Effective School Leadership and Resource Management

The Oakland Unified School District is committed to supporting high levels of learning for every student, ensuring that students are prepared for success in college, in their careers, and as citizens. We believe that the leaders of a school play a critical role in this success: supporting students, nurturing and guiding teachers, and empowering families and the community – thriving together as a full service community school.

“Effective School Leadership & Resource Management” happens when school leaders work together to build a vision of quality and equity, guiding the efforts of the school community to make this vision a reality. Leaders focus the school community on instruction, enabling positive academic and social-emotional outcomes for every student. Leaders guide the professional development of teachers and create the conditions within which teachers and the rest of the community engage in ongoing learning. These leaders manage people, funding, time, technology, and other materials effectively to promote thriving students and build robust, sustainable community schools.

This rubric enables schools to self-assess against the quality school leadership standards, based on evidence from a range of sources. In addition, the Quality Accountability and Analytics office, other central office personnel, and coaches will interact around this rubric to develop growth plans and support schools’ ongoing development. The unit of analysis for this rubric is the school, not individuals within the school. A separate tool guides the development of individual leaders, based upon OUSD’s Leadership Dimensions. This rubric will not be used for the evaluation of school leaders.

Undeveloped	There was little evidence found that the school has implemented the practice(s) and/or build the conditions described in the standard.
Beginning	There was some evidence found that the school has implemented the practice(s) and/or build the conditions described in the standard.
Developing	There was substantial evidence found that the school has implemented the practice(s) and/or build the conditions described in the standard.
Sustaining	There was strong and consistent evidence found that the school has implemented the practice(s) and/or build the conditions described in the standard.
Refining	There was strong and consistent evidence found that the school has implemented the practice(s) and/or build the conditions described in the standard, and the school has implemented systems to review and improve these practices/conditions.

Definitions

Leaders: Principals are the primary leaders of their schools; some schools have assistant principals, coaches, and/or teachers who also have formal roles as leaders. In addition, every member of a school community has opportunities to function as a leader, depending on the school’s needs and the individual’s specific skills.

School Staff: Staff includes the principal, other administrators, and teachers (certificated), as well as other adults who work in the school (classified).

School Community: The community includes school staff, students, students’ families, individuals from the neighborhood, community-based organizations, and support providers who are associated with the school.

Leadership Groups: Schools have a variety of groups that provide guidance for and make decisions regarding the school. All schools have school site councils (SSCs) that are responsible for strategic planning, and many schools have additional structures, such as an *Instructional Leadership Team*, which guide and support the ongoing work of the school.

Quality Indicator 5: Effective School Leadership and Resource Management

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 5.4:</p> <p>Vision Driven</p> <p><i>A quality school has leadership which ensures that the school's shared vision is focused on student learning, grounded in high expectations for all students, and guides all aspects of school life.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the "Sustaining" column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the "Sustaining" column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the "Sustaining" column.</p>	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The school's vision is focused on student learning and high expectations for all students. b. The school's vision guides all aspects of the school's programs and activities. c. The school's leadership engages all constituents in aligning their efforts to the vision. d. Members of the school community are knowledgeable about and committed to the vision. e. School leaders consistently act on core beliefs which reflect the vision and mission. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of this standard as described in the "Sustaining" column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems to review and improve the practices that ensure that all aspects of the school are guided by the shared vision, focused on student learning and high expectations for all.</p>

Quality Indicator 5: Effective School Leadership and Resource Management

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 5.5: Focused on Equity</p> <p><i>A quality school has leadership that creates and sustains equitable conditions for learning and advocates for interrupting patterns of historical inequities.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The school leadership consistently articulates the need to interrupt patterns of inequities. b. School leadership guides the development and quality of services that support all students to have equal access to learning (including academic, social-emotional, health, family well-being, adult attitudes, etc). c. The school staff consistently engages in practices that interrupt patterns of inequity. d. The school staff frequently collects and analyzes learning data by subgroup in order to monitor and adjust practices designed to interrupt patterns of inequity. e. The school staff has implemented programs to address specific subgroup needs based on their learning data. f. Resources are used to meet the needs of all students equitably: staffing, technology, materials, space, etc. g. School leadership fosters an ongoing dialogue among school and community constituents across race, class, age, and school and community to engage in bold change to achieve equitable school results. h. School leadership acts in concert with allies to systematically address inequities; help others navigate the system and remove or circumvent institutional barriers to student opportunity and achievement. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of this standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems to review and improve the practices that ensure that the leadership is focused on equity.</p>

Quality Indicator 5: Effective School Leadership and Resource Management

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 5.6: Supports the Development of Quality Instruction <i>A quality school has leadership that guides and supports the development of quality instruction across the school to ensure student learning.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence that the leadership of the school (principal, specialists, ILT, etc.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Guides, monitors, and supports curricular choices and interventions based on expected student learning outcomes and the school vision. b. Guides, monitors, and supports instructional practices that engage all students in high quality learning, are aligned with the school vision. c. Ensures that there is adequate professional learning, coaching, and supervision to develop quality instruction across the school. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of this standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems to review and improve the practices that ensure the development of quality instruction across the school to ensure student learning.</p>

Quality Indicator 5: Effective School Leadership and Resource Management

Standard	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 5.9: Culture of Mutual Accountability: Collaboratively develops outcomes & monitors progress <i>A quality school has leadership which collaboratively develops outcomes, monitors progress, and fosters a culture of mutual accountability.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p>	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The school staff has developed clear student outcomes and goals for learning and behavior. b. The school staff has developed clear professional expectations and goals for staff. c. The school staff monitors students’ progress. d. The school staff monitors staff expectations. e. The school staff follows clear processes and procedures to hold themselves accountable to one another and the goals and expectations. f. There is a culture of mutual accountability within the staff – staff members have productive difficult conversations that continually improve their collaboration and work with students and families. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of this standard as described in the “Sustaining” column.</p> <p>In addition, the school has implemented systems to review and improve the practices to collaboratively develop outcomes, monitor progress and have a culture of mutual accountability.</p>

Quality Indicator 5: Effective School Leadership and Resource Management

STANDARD	Undeveloped	Beginning	Developing	Sustaining	Refining
<p>Standard 5.10: Organizational Management</p> <p><i>A quality school has leadership which develops systems and allocates resources (time, human, financial, and material) in service of the school's vision.</i></p>	<p>There is little evidence of the standard as described in the "Sustaining" column.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of the standard as described in the "Sustaining" column.</p>	<p>There is substantial evidence of the standard as described in the "Sustaining" column.</p>	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The school's resources are allocated in service of the school vision b. The school's resources are maximized in service of the vision c. The school leadership effectively leverages district and community resources, grants and partnerships in service of the school vision d. The school leadership effectively uses the district's budgeting systems (RBB, IFAS, etc.) to maximize use of state and federal funds in service of the school vision e. The assignment and use of TSAs, coaches, etc. are appropriate, effective, and focused in service of the school vision f. The school leadership seeks out additional resources to meet identified student needs and aligned to the school vision. 	<p>There is strong and consistent evidence of this standard as described in the "Sustaining" column.</p> <p>In addition, the school staff regularly reflects on their approach to resource allocation, and has adjusted their approach and systems to better allocate resources in service of the school's vision.</p>