

Quality Review Report

**Prince Chapman Academy
4808 East Paulding Road
Fort Wayne
Indiana
46816**

**Principal: Thelma Green
Dates of review: October 14 - 15 2009
Reviewer: Richard Woolf**

Cambridge Education (LLC)

Content of the report

Part 1: The School Context

Background information about the school

Part 2: Overview

What the school does well

What the school needs to improve

Part 3: Main findings

Part 4: School Quality Criteria Summary

Part 1: The School Context

Information about the school:

Prince Chapman Academy serves 460 students from grade six through grade eight. The student body comprises 62 percent Black students, 6 percent Hispanic, 9 percent White, 15 percent Asian, and 8 percent other students. There are 15 percent special education students and 27 percent of students are English language learners. Males account for 48 percent of students and females, 52 percent. Seventy-five percent of students have free or reduced cost lunch eligibility, which is on a par with that of the State average. Attendance figures are level with the State average at about 96.2 percent. The school is currently in year 4 of the Indiana state classification of academic probation.

Part 2: Overview

What the school does well:

- Students enjoy coming to a bright, clean, and modern school facility resulting in high rates of attendance.
- The integration of students from new cultures into the school's academic and social values is a strength.
- Relationships between students and staff are generally positive and most students feel there are adults they can turn to if they are in difficulty.

Areas for Improvement:

Responsibility of the school:

- Develop a comprehensive system for all staff to analyze student data in order to inform planning and to monitor student progress, academic achievement, and behavior.
- Raise achievement throughout the school by:
 - providing effective instructional leadership
 - developing and communicating whole school classroom expectations to students and staff
 - ensuring that all teachers are consistent in delivering those expectations
 - creating a common grading and assessment policy for the school
- Raise the quality of learning and teaching by:
 - improving the pace and rigor in all lessons to promote the engagement of all students
 - increasing teachers' knowledge and use of data to differentiate instruction that matches the individual needs of all students
- Engage all stakeholders in developing a vision for the school's future improvement that expresses and demands high expectations for all students, drives all actions and routinely underpins decision-making.
- Ensure the alignment of professional development to teacher need, as identified through the administration's monitoring of instruction.
- Develop strategies to communicate with and involve all parents and the wider community in the life of the school.

Responsibility of the School Corporation:

- Establish more effective and genuine partnerships with the school in every aspect of school improvement.

Part 3: Main Findings

Overall Evaluation: The school's overall performance

The overall performance of this school is unacceptable.

Over a number of years, the school has undergone changes in leadership at both the school and corporation level. On each occasion teachers, students and parents have had to adapt to new ideas and philosophies of educational thinking. The outcome is a lack of sustainability or continuity of practice. Students and staff do not have strong enough leadership to affect the changes the school requires to move forward.

The school provides students with a pleasant physical environment. However, lessons do not fully engage students and there is a lack of urgency in tackling this problem. There are too many inconsistencies in the ways that classrooms are managed. The lack of a formal curriculum or core program of study also contributes to this inconsistency. The school has new remediation programs in place to help students increase their reading levels and general achievement. However, there is little effective monitoring undertaken to examine the effectiveness of these programs. The staff do not have a clear understanding of the individual needs of each student, as they do not use data robustly enough to differentiate or plan their instruction. Systems of accountability are weak. The principal and staff do not rigorously hold themselves accountable for student achievement.

There is no vibrant vision to guide the school in building upon best practice and demanding the highest standards from staff and students alike. A number of parents are active in working with the school, though the school does not yet have in place strategies to increase either the numbers or their future involvement. There are no systematic processes to provide either students or staff with individual learning goals. Consequently, the administration is unable to hold people to account with any degree of rigor. Organizational weaknesses, such as the lack of common planning time or the opportunity for staff to meet more regularly have inhibited the school's capacity to tackle, with urgency, low levels of performance. The administration are unable to articulate with any clarity the teacher's professional development needs because the management of lesson walkthroughs is not robust enough.

The principal is constrained by the corporation in hiring sufficient teachers to help move the school forward. This is holding back the school's development. The same lack of freedom extends to other aspects of the administration's work and is a similar impediment. The staff do not expect students to achieve enough, often believing that their students are incapable of reaching high academic standards. The school does not reach out to external partners to help them in the battle of challenging academic poverty although there are growing numbers of organizations who are seeking to link with schools. The corporation has yet to develop the most effective ways of working in partnership with the school in order to realign their goals and support them effectively. Neither the principal nor the corporation is providing the necessary instructional leadership. As a result, there is little impact on student learning.

1: Readiness to Learn

This area of the school's work is poor.

1.1: Safety, Discipline, and Engagement

The school culture, environment and student engagement are poor.

The school provides its students with a clean, bright, modern, and welcoming facility. There is an expectation that all its students will behave well. The school adopts the rules and regulations of the corporation. Staff, students, and parents receive these in a handbook at the commencement of the school year. However, there is an inconsistency in the application of those rules, as not all teachers

apply them with the same rigor. Students observe that they know which teachers insist on standards and those that are inconsistent.

In terms of welcoming new students and cultures to their fraternity, the school is successful, especially in its work with the Burmese community. While there are few incidents of bullying or racial harassment, the school does not undertake regular monitoring of such incidents to verify if there is any impact upon learning. Nor does it chart the number of incidents of low-level misdemeanors occurring in the classroom in order to determine whether it is the same students committing offences or staff having difficulties with classroom management. Classrooms and hallways do display student work but it is very limited. There is little or no celebration of academic achievement or show casing of exemplar pieces of student work.

There is not a robust core program in place nor is there a curriculum to guide teachers in meeting the challenges of these young people. The corporation currently is writing a curriculum. To assist in meeting the challenge of school improvement, the corporation has implemented programs such as Read 180, National Urban Alliance (NUA), and Rigorous Mathematical Thinking (RMT). Technology is available for teachers and students to use but the school has not consistently embedded it to support learning and skills development in all classrooms. As well as subject teaching, the school offers enrichment activities, like the athletic program that motivates and engages students. Other programs include band, tutoring, and ROCK, which emphasizes drug and alcohol issues facing young people. However, there is no teaching of a foreign language. Students participate in a careers program but the school does not assess the impact it is having in determining the pathways for students as they progress to high school and beyond. There are no formal procedures in place for the regular setting of students' academic or personal goals. As a result, the school does not systematically raise the expectations of its students.

1.2: Action against Adversity

The way the school directly addresses student's poverty-driven deficits is poor.

The school does understand and appreciate the personal needs of its students and the effect poverty and low community expectations have on them. Nevertheless, it lacks the drive and the leadership to improve student achievement, and has yet to establish systems that set all students high academic goals. Staff have no clear understanding of the data to know what each student's starting point is on the continuum of academic excellence. The school does have some connections with local providers to support staff in meeting student needs, the strongest being links, through the churches, in assisting the growing numbers of Burmese students within the school. The provision includes a worker who liaises between the school and families and a translator within school, both of which help students feel at ease and ready to learn. There are no similar levels of support available for the many other students with high dependency needs that are both social and educational. Students do have the opportunity to advocate for themselves through a school council. Students can apply to become a member but the group does not meet directly with the principal to raise issues of student concern. The monitoring of the effectiveness of this, like many other aspects of the school's work, does not happen with any regularity.

1.3: Close Student- Adult Relationships

The students' relationships with mentors/teachers is poor.

The parent teacher association is active in supporting a range of ventures. This year the school saw an increase in the number of parents attending parent-teacher conferences. This is a very positive development on which the school can build so more parents can feel part of their child's education. Parents receive newsletters and have access online to their child's grades. However, only parents with internet facilities are able to access the program, which debars a significant number of families. The school has yet to work with the wider community and council members to seek ways of narrowing the family deficit in internet provision. Some workshops are in operation to attract parents to the school and provide them with the skills to help their children improve in core subjects. However, the uptake is poor.

Parents acknowledge they have access to the principal and teachers and they appreciate this open door policy. However, the school has not explored the potential of working in partnership with the corporation in developing district wide initiatives to engage parents in the education process. Its current links between home and school are too ineffectual.

Most students feel that there are adults they can turn to if they experience problems of an academic or a personal nature. The principal is visible in hallways and the cafeteria, along with members of the leadership team and students appreciate their accessibility. Relationships between adults and students are generally good although some students feel a few teachers do not relate well to them.

Criterion 2: Readiness to Teach

This area of the school's work is unacceptable.

2.1: Shared Responsibility for Achievement

The school's organizational structure is unacceptable.

The principal understands the importance of having strong accountability systems in place. However, the reality is that the school does not hold teachers to account for poor student achievement. Consequently, neither staff nor students are set sufficiently challenging goals to raise the level of expectation the school requires to move it forward from its current low academic position. It is clear that staff do not use data to understand the exact capabilities of their students. They do not receive clear guidance on students' capability or the expectations where they should reach by the end of a school year or throughout their time in school. Accounting for teacher performance through the monitoring of lessons is at best limited. Therefore, there is no universal expectation or understanding of the importance that preparation and planning play in improving the academic results and outcomes of young people. The faculty does not fully appreciate the importance of holding themselves and each other accountable for their actions.

There appears to be a lack of drive and commitment from some staff and an inevitability that the students are unable to perform at a higher level of academic challenge. Many changes in principal and superintendents and a plethora of new initiatives, each intended to bring about improvement but none evaluated effectively exacerbated this further. Staff feel that with every change there are more obstacles in their way with nothing being consistent. For example, although some staff have received training in some initiatives, because the training is phased over three years, others have not received training to deliver the programs. Similarly, because there are so many initiatives, teachers do not have the opportunity to embed best practice into their work.

Overall, accountability procedures are inadequate and are a weakness of the school's leadership and management. At present, the corporation appears not to be driving the accountability agenda with sufficient zeal to encourage the staff, parents, and wider community to strive together in their attempts to increase the school's academic outcomes.

The school's mission statement is on display in a number of classrooms. The principal is able to articulate a vision of improving students' vocabulary. However, there is some confusion among teachers as to what constitutes the vision and the mission to bring it about. Few classrooms provide evidence of how subject teaching is helping improve student vocabulary. There is no evidence in hallways and other parts of the school building to show exactly what the school is hoping to achieve with its students throughout the year, in terms of improving reading and other test scores. There are no individual grade level targets or subject targets. As a result, students do not know how to rise to these unspecified challenges, as staff do not articulate and share them.

2.2: Personalization of Instruction

The use of assessment data to personalize instruction is unacceptable.

The school can demonstrate that it collects some data for school wide purposes and individual student information. However, it does not interrogate such data with a robustness and rigor designed to improve student learning and outcomes. There is little evidence to show that this data translates into the delivery of better instruction. Data usage is currently limited among teachers and its effective development to inform instruction is still in the embryonic phase within the school. On several occasions, staff have had to ask for data or extract it from the school computer system, as it is not routinely available. There is little use of everyday assessment and an over emphasis on the use of outcomes from external tests to drive instruction. Teachers do not sit with students to share data, for example, on outcomes from reading tests, and then set individually negotiated learning goals, nor do they include students in assessing their own work and then renegotiating next step learning goals. From lesson observations and a review of student work, it is apparent that assessment is a weak area of the school's work. There is no common grading or assessment policy so teachers do not have a coherent approach to an important facet of their work. Teachers do not use data to differentiate their instruction and therefore they cannot provide students with the learning strategies they require to meet their individual needs.

The school does provide a number of students with additional support and help through the Read 180 and RMT programs. Currently, the programs do not service all those students who may benefit from a more targeted small group approach that Read 180 provides. The adoption of the NUA methods is proving helpful in engaging students within the learning process. However, only one third of the staff has received the appropriate professional development with an additional third currently undergoing similar training. This is limiting the impact of the program school wide. The principal has yet to monitor the effectiveness of the NUA approach in improving the school's external examination results.

Although there is evidence to show the school adapts the master schedule to meet the specific needs of some students, it does not undertake a rigorous analysis of its sub-groups and their specific needs within the improvement agenda. Taking into consideration all aspects of assessment and the use of data to inform instruction and planning, for the majority of students there is no significant impact upon their learning. While teachers work very hard, they lack the effective instructional guidance or leadership required to move the school forward.

2.3: Professional Teaching Culture

The professional culture within the school is poor.

Teachers strongly believe a strength of the school is the faculty itself; for many it is an association that goes back a number of years. There is some cynicism about the constant round of changes in what many consider is the latest "flavor of the month to improve students' outcomes" and a belief that the decision to remove daily planning time was retrograde. The school closes earlier one day a week for the faculty to take part in a round of meetings that include subject level meetings and professional development sessions. As a result, there is limited opportunity to undertake peer visits to observe excellent practice. Minutes of meetings indicate that discussions focus around resources rather than the improvement of learning and teaching. There is an inconsistent approach to the way teachers work across both subjects and grade levels. The school has the opportunity, which it is not utilizing, during these meetings, to develop a common approach to all issues affecting student learning and not leave it to individuals to determine.

From lesson observations, there is no clear understanding of how teachers can use a variety of data sources to plan lessons that take into consideration students' individual learning needs. Some staff do not welcome administrators into their lessons for informal observations, considering visits to be a distraction and opportunity for students to move off task. The principal has not undertaken sufficient informal observations, thereby missing an opportunity to monitor instruction and understand where strengths and weaknesses lie. Staff receive professional development although there is some concern

as to its appropriateness in furthering their skills, as it does not take into account individual teacher need. There is an expectation that staff who take part in external professional development will share with colleagues but there is no effective monitoring to ensure this takes place.

Criterion 3: Readiness to Act

This area of the school's work is unacceptable.

3.1: Resource Authority

The principal's freedom in making decisions is poor.

The principal lacks the authority to appoint staff to positions that she feels would address some issues the school currently is facing. Nevertheless, the school does not evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of its current staff members in order to realign their talents in addressing the school improvement agenda. Likewise, the school does not identify key teachers to model good practice.

It is evident that the position of subject chair has little impact on learning. Those who hold these positions are unable to perform lesson observations or assist other subject members in the classroom. The administration undertakes few informal lesson observations and, as a result, they cannot make judgments to balance the teacher's individual professional development needs with the needs of the whole school in order to raise academic performance.

The corporation recognizes the needs of the school. It has implemented a number of initiatives to increase achievement. However, the principal identifies that they meet the needs of only a few students and reports there is no opportunity for open dialogue about initiatives to reach a greater number of students. The several different externally driven schemes to improve instruction and learning, initiated by the corporation, are still awaiting rigorous analysis as to their effectiveness in improving the school's examination results. In addition, the principal does not have the freedom to select staff to meet the needs of the school as she perceives them. This is a source of tension and frustration.

3.2: Resource Ingenuity

The principal's resourcefulness and ingenuity is unacceptable.

The development of links with external partners to improve student learning and outcomes is very weak. Although the business world has a great deal to offer schools in terms of leadership and management support for staff and mentors for students, the school is not capitalizing on this. Currently, the school has a few links with local churches, some of whom assist the Burmese community, and the fire department. The school does utilize its school-based police officer in helping with a number of adolescent issues. Some parents volunteer to help with school activities but it is not a regular feature of the school's work. Despite there being an active and growing parent teacher association, the parents do not have a strong input into the school's decision-making processes. There are parents on the group who are part of the school improvement team but they have little positive impact on outcomes of policy making within the school. There are pockets of good teaching and learning occurring within some classrooms. However, the school does not encourage new ideas or risk taking. There is no overt encouragement for teachers to become innovative in their practice. Similarly, there is little evidence that the corporation is playing its part in developing strategic partnerships with the business world to draw upon their expertise and help work with the schools to improve the educational chances of future generations. There are business developments taking place within Fort Wayne but the school has yet to explore links with such ventures.

3.3: Agility in the Face of Turbulence

The principal's inventiveness and flexibility during conflicts and challenges is unacceptable.

The principal has support from most colleagues in meeting the challenges of improving the outcomes of the school's students but the administration has not prioritized actions effectively. For example, there is more emphasis on dealing with behavioral matters than developing instructional leadership, even

though instructional leadership is a significant weakness throughout the school. While there is a responsibility on every faculty member to demand the highest expectations of its students, in practice this varies from teacher to teacher. The school does not have an agreed range of strategies for improvement, for example of student behavior or instructional practices. The monitoring and evaluation of projects, teaching, and learning are unacceptable and play no significant part in holding the faculty accountable for its practices.

The staff report that they are under pressure and overloaded with new schemes from the corporation arriving in school at regular intervals. While staff appreciate the value of the NUA scheme, so few are in receipt of the training that it has had little impact on student learning. The corporation does not analyze the data with sufficient rigor to enable it to establish why the school is constantly underperforming and provide additional targeted resources to effect improvements. There is a culture of inertia, which is resisting change. This, together with the lack of open and productive dialogue and effective partnership between the school and the corporation is seriously impeding the school's capacity to improve.

Summary of Findings

Prince Chapman Academy

October 14 2009

SCHOOL RATING				
		Findings		
		1-Unacceptable <i>No evidence</i>	2-Poor <i>Minimal evidence</i>	3-Fair <i>Present, though limited and/or inconsistent</i>
1 Readiness to Learn			X	
1.1: Safety, Discipline, and Engagement			X	
<i>Is the school culture environment safe and conducive to learning?</i>				
1.1a	Students are effectively encouraged to behave well, relate well to others and to have positive attitudes toward learning.			X
1.1b	Classrooms and hallways provide an attractive and stimulating environment that fosters high academic and personal expectations.		X	
1.1c	School routines and rules are implemented consistently and communicated clearly to students, parents and staff.		X	
1.1d	The school has effective measures for promoting good attendance and eliminating truancy and tardiness.			X
<i>Do students feel secure and inspired to learn?</i>				
1.1e	A robust core program ensures that students develop key learning and personal skills.	X		
1.1f	The school provides a well-rounded curriculum and enrichment activities add interest and relevance.		X	
1.1g	Career education and personal goal setting are used to raise student aspirations and motivation.		X	
1.2: Action Against Adversity			X	
<i>Does the school directly address students' poverty-driven deficits?</i>				
1.2a	The school knows and understands the personal as well as academic needs of the students in order to address the effects of students' poverty head-on.	X		
1.2b	The school addresses the needs of families so that they can better support student learning.		X	
1.2c	The school develops students' skills, behaviors and values that enable them to effectively advocate for themselves.		X	
1.3: Close Student-Adult Relationships			X	
<i>Do students have positive and enduring mentor/ teacher relationships?</i>				
1.3a	The school works with parents to build positive relationships and to engage them as partners in their children's learning.		X	
1.3b	The school is successful in implementing a variety of strategies specifically designed to promote a sense of connection between students and adults.			X

SCHOOL RATING

		Findings			
		1-Unacceptable <i>No evidence</i>	2-Poor <i>Minimal evidence</i>	3-Fair <i>Present, though limited and/or inconsistent</i>	4-Acceptable <i>Routine and consistent</i>
2 Readiness to Teach		X			
2.1: Shared Responsibility for Achievement		X			
<i>Does the school have a strong organizational culture, characterized by trust, respect and mutual responsibility?</i>					
2.1a	The principal ensures that there is a strong accountability for student achievement throughout the school.	X			
2.1b	The staff feel deep accountability and a missionary zeal for student achievement.		X		
2.1c	A shared commitment to a vision of the school includes challenging goals for all students.	X			
2.1d	The school corporation drives the accountability agenda.	X			
2.2: Personalization of Instruction		X			
<i>Are diagnostic assessments used frequently and accurately to inform instructional decisions and promote student learning?</i>					
2.2a	The school utilizes a coherent system to provide detailed tracking and analysis of assessment results.	X			
2.2b	Teachers use data gathered from multiple assessments to plan instruction and activities that match the learning needs of students.	X			
2.2c	Teachers give feedback to students and involve them in the assessment of their work and in the setting of achievement goals.	X			
2.2d	The schedule is used flexibly to ensure that individual student needs are met effectively.		X		
2.2e	The overall impact of planning, instruction and assessment leads to effective student learning.	X			
2.3: Professional Teaching Culture			X		
<i>Does the professional culture promote faculty and staff participation, collaboration and training to enhance student learning?</i>					
2.3a	The faculty works together, incessantly and naturally to help each other improve their practice.		X		
2.3b	The principal uses classroom observation and the analysis of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning.	X			
2.3c	Professional development is job-embedded and directly linked to changing instructional practice in order to improve student achievement.		X		

SCHOOL RATING

		Findings			
		1-Unacceptable <i>No evidence</i>	2-Poor <i>Minimal evidence</i>	3-Fair <i>Present, though limited and/or inconsistent</i>	4-Acceptable <i>Routine and consistent</i>
3 Readiness to Act		X			
3.1: Resource Authority			X		
<i>Does the principal have the freedom to make streamlined, mission-driven decisions regarding people, time, money and program?</i>					
3.1a	The principal has the authority to select and assign staff to positions in the school without regard to seniority.	X			
3.1b	The school has developed adequate human resource systems.		X		
3.1c	The principal has the authority to implement controversial yet innovative practices.		X		
3.1d	The school corporation enables the principal to have the freedom to make decisions.		X		
3.1e	The school corporation directs resources, including staffing, to schools differentiated on the basis of need.		X		
3.2: Resource Ingenuity		X			
<i>Is the principal adept at securing additional resources and leveraging partner relationships?</i>					
3.2a	External partnerships have been strategically developed to engender academic improvement.	X			
3.2b	The community is encouraged to participate in the decision making and improvement work of the school.		X		
3.2c	The principal promotes resourcefulness and ingenuity in order to meet student needs.	X			
3.2d	The school corporation has district-wide structures and strategies to maximize external resources.		X		
3.3: Agility in the Face of Turbulence		X			
<i>Is the principal flexible and inventive in responding to conflicts and challenges?</i>					
3.3a	The principal has the capacity to ensure school improvement.	X			
3.3b	The principal provides competent stewardship and oversight of the school.		X		
3.3c	Decisions are made and plans are developed on the basis of rigorous monitoring and evaluation.	X			
3.3d	Key faculty members have the capacity to support the work that is needed.		X		
3.3e	The principal reshapes and incorporates local projects and special initiatives to meet students' needs.	X			
3.3f	The school corporation has the capacity to drive school improvement initiatives.	X			
3.3g	The school corporation supports and enables flexibility and inventiveness within the school.	X			

RATING DESCRIPTION

Using the School Quality Rubric, the school is rated on a 1-4 scale in each of the three domains. The scale is described below:

1	Red = Unacceptable	The school shows no attempt to meet the standard.
2	Orange = Poor	The school has made minimal progress towards the standard.
3	Yellow = Fair	The school is making progress towards the standard.
4	Green = Acceptable	The school meets the standard.

The goal is that the school receive a rating of 4 (GREEN) for the school to be considered as performing that element to an acceptable level. The 4 rating indicates the school meets the standard.