Indiana Department of Education
SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Follow Up Review Report: Final Visit

John Marshall Community High School

Review Date:	May 9 - 10, 2012
Address:	10101 E 38th St Indianapolis, IN 46236
Principal:	Mr. Michael Sullivan
Lead Reviewer:	Jim Larson, IDOE

Table of Contents

Part 1: Information about the Follow-Up Review Process ……...……. 1

Part 2: The School Context……...…….. 2

Part 3: Main Findings ……. 6

A. Overall School Performance……..……..…..….. 6

B. **Domain 1: Readiness to Learn**

1.1: Safety, Discipline, and Engagement ...…….…….. 8

1.2: Action Against Adversity...…….…….. 10

1.3 Close Student-Adult Relationships……... 11

C. **Domain 2: Readiness to Teach**

2.1: Shared Responsibility for Achievement……...…… 13

2.2: Personalization of Instruction ….……..... 14

2.3: Professional Teaching Culture ……....……. 17

D. **Domain 3: Readiness to Act**

3.1 Resource Authority……... 19

3.2: Resource Ingenuity …….……...….... 20

3.3 Agility in the Face of Turbulence…….. 21

Part 4: Summary of Findings…….…... 23

Part 5: Recommendations ……..…… 28

Part 1: Information about the School Quality Review

In 1999, the Indiana General Assembly enacted Public Law 221 (P.L. 221) which serves as Indiana's accountability model for schools and districts. As a part of the accountability process, the Indiana Department of Education conducts a quality review of schools in year five of probationary status, building on the previous year's School Quality Review Report written by the technical assistance team (TAT).

The goal of the follow-up review process is to continue to support John Marshall Community High School (JMCHS) as they work to implement their school improvement plan based on the recommendations made on the School Quality Review report from the previous year. The follow-up review process consists of three visits throughout the year aimed toward providing real-time, targeted feedback to school and district leaders to inform ongoing decision making throughout the year.

Following the School Quality Review, the IDOE review team selected four indicators on which to focus their attention during each of the three follow-up visits:

1.1: Safety, Discipline, and Engagement –
Students feel secure and inspired to learn.

2.2: Personalization of Instruction –
Individualized teaching based on diagnostic assessment and adjustable time on task.

2.3: Professional Teaching Culture –
Continuous improvement through collaboration and job-embedded learning.

3.2: Resource Ingenuity –
Leaders are adept at securing additional resources and leveraging partner relationships.

Each prioritized indicator was selected based on recurring themes identified in the School Quality Review report. It is expected that providing real-time feedback based on these four indicators will allow school and district leadership to inform ongoing, strategic decision making to drive school improvement.

To conduct a comprehensive summative review, IDOE officials extended the third follow-up visit over two days to provide ample opportunities to collect data from different stakeholder groups. More specifically, the review team (1) met with school and district administrators, (2) visited over fifteen classrooms for a minimum of fifteen minutes each, (3) conducted two teacher focus groups, (4) met with the instructional coaches, (5) and held a student focus group. Using the information gathered in these formal settings, along with information collected through observations throughout the visit, the review team developed an accurate and complete picture of the school's performance and improvements that have been made following the School Quality Review the previous year.

This report summarizes the key findings for each indicator of the School Quality Review rubric, with a particular focus on progress made throughout this year. It is the intention of the IDOE that this report serve as a comparison tool, used to illustrate the overall performance and improvement at JMCHS over the past two years.

Part 2: The School Context

Location: John Marshall is an Indianapolis Public School (IPS) and is located on the far Eastside of Indianapolis, about ten miles from downtown.

History: According to the school's official website, John Marshall was the last senior high school built by the district, opening in 1968 on the city's far Eastside. Since then, it has had several identities. After over two decades as a senior high school, the school was closed in 1987. Shortly after, in 1993, John Marshall was reopened as a middle school. In 2008, John Marshall began conversion from a middle school to a community high school. One grade level has been added each year as part of this conversion, and the first cohort of high school graduates will receive diplomas in 2012.

In July of 2010, the IDOE selected JMCHS for a School Improvement Grant (SIG). The school has completed its second year under the SIG, and used the additional funding to provide optional extended day opportunities to students, hire additional staff members, and implement new initiatives surrounding professional development and data-driven instruction. This year, the school is in the second of the potential three-year grant and will need to begin focusing on a sustainability plan as they move into the final year of the additional funding.

Student Demographics: JMCHS currently serves 615 students. The demographic breakdown of the student population is as follows:

- 82 percent black, 10 percent hispanic, 5 percent white, and 3 percent identify as other. English Language Learners comprise approximately 8 percent of the entire student population.
- The 2010-2011 free/reduced lunch population was 75.3 percent, far above the state average of 46.8 percent.
- The Special Education population is 27.2 percent, nearly double the state average of 14.7 percent.

The school's mobility rate is higher than average, reported by the school to be upwards of 82 percent. In a previous visit, the principal discussed how students often switch between JMCHS and township schools that are not too far away. During this visit, the assistant principal mentioned that JMCHS has received over 30 new middle school students in the past couple of weeks, due to students transferring from other IPS schools that are slated for state takeover starting with the 2012 – 2013 school year. Given the school's location near the district borders, effectively developing systems to support students who transfer into JMCHS is critical to the overall success of the school.

School's Performance: Academic performance data from 2010 to 2012 show improvement at the high school level on ECA performance, but middle school ISTEP performance has been inconsistent. Student performance on both assessments at JMCHS is also well below state and district averages. The ISTEP+ passing percentages at JMCHS for English/Language Arts (ELA) were 31 percent and 29.6 percent for 2010 and 2011,

respectively. Comparatively, the 2011 state average pass rate was 77.7 percent in ELA. In mathematics, 37 percent of JMCHS students passed ISTEP+ in 2010 and 36.3 percent passed in 2011. The average passage rate for the state was 79.3 percent for 2011. The number of students passing both the ELA and Math portions of the ISTEP+ assessment was 21.4 percent in 2010 and 19.4 percent in 2011; lower than the district average of 44.6 percent and the state average of 71.3 percent in 2011.

TEST	YEAR	JMCHS	IPS	STATE
E/LA	2012	29.8%	58.8%	79.4%
	2011	29.6%	56.2%	71.7%
	2010	31.0%	55.8%	69.3%
Math	2012	44.4%	62.7%	82.1%
	2011	36.3%	57.8%	80.1%
	2010	37.0%	59.6%	78.3%
E/LA & Math	2012	23.0%	48.3%	72.4%
	2011	19.4%	44.6%	71.3%
	2010	21.4%	45.1%	69.3%

In 2012, the number of students passing both sections of ISTEP+ improved by 3.6% from 2011, but is up only 1.6% from 2010. The greatest gains occurred in Math, up 8.1% from the previous year, with 44.4% of students passing. English/Langauge Arts performance improved by .2% from 2011, but overall is down 1.2% from the 2010 performance.

Academic performance on the English 10 ECA assessment has increased each year from 2010 to 2012, but it is lower than the district average and the state average. Performance on the Algebra 1 ECA also improved from 2010 to 2012, but passing rates are still below average.

TEST	YEAR	JMCHS	IPS	STATE
Algebra I	2012	32.7%	N/A	N/A
	2011	29.6%	38.9%	71.6%
	2010	31%	30.8%	62.0%
English 10	2012	37.6%	N/A	N/A
	2011	25.2%	38.8%	70.7%
	2010	22.5%	38.4%	65.3%
Eng 10 & Alg I	2012	28.6%	N/A	N/A
	2011	21.3%	34.3%	70.6%
	2010	16.8%	28.7%	58.5%

School Staff: Following each of the first two visits, the administrative staff at JMCHS has changed. What initially seemed like, and may have been, an intentional effort to focus additional administrative resources to JMCHS, now seems to have caused greater instability and inconsistency. In January, Mr. Michael Sullivan was notfied that his contract would not be renewed following the 2011-2012 school year. Although he continues to serve as the principal of the school, the district announced that Mr. Sullivan will become the principal of another district elementary school next year. Notably, Mr. Sullivan was not present during the two-day visit in May, due to illness. Mr. Chad Gray, the current assistant principal at JMCHS, served as the point person for the two-day visit, and was announced by the district as one of the two co-principals for the 2012 – 2013 school year. There have been additional changes made at the assistant principal level as well. The school year began with two

assistant principals, Mr. Chad Gray and Mr. Michael Chisley. Shortly into the year, Mr. Chisley left his position on medical leave. He was replaced by an assistant principal who came over from Manual High School, Mr. Arthur Dumas. Mr. Dumas was only in the school a few months before he was transferred to Broad Ripple Magnet High School in January. The vacant assistant principal position was then filled with two new assistant principals, Dr. Williams and Mrs. Allen, expanding the administrative team and increasing capacity. Mr. Sullivan assigned each of them to a middle school grade level and gave them autonomy to run their designated area. In March, Dr. Williams went out on medical leave; once again creating uncertainty and inconsistency at the administrative level. Mrs. Allen quickly assumed the role for which Dr. Williams was previously responsible, and the team has been unchanged since. Lastly, the IPS Board of Commissioners has approved additional changes to the administrative team for the 2012 to 2013 school year. Mrs. Allen has been approved to become an elementary school principal in another district building, so she will not return next year, and Mr. Brian C. Dinkins has been assigned as a school principal along with Mr. Gray.

The majority of the teaching staff at JMCHS is relatively new to the building. Of the teachers that completed the survey prior to our initial visit, almost 70 percent of them had been in the building for less than one full year and only one teacher had been in the school for more than three years. The principal has made it a priority to recruit Teach For America corps members and Indianapolis Teaching Fellows, contributing to the greater than average amount of first and second year teachers in the building. The instructional staff has changed throughout the year. According to the district's school board personnel records, JMCHS has lost six teachers this year as well as added six. Evidence gathered from the meeting with Mr. Gray suggests there may have been additional turnover on the instructional staff, but the review team did not receive a specific number.

Summary of Previous Visits: This report follows the third and final visit to JMCHS during the 2011 – 2012 school year. The following information provides a summary of the main findings during the initial visit and second visit to JMCHS.

Initial Visit: The initial follow-up visit to JMCHS occurred on October 11, 2012. Key findings from this review suggested that steps had been taken in response to the previous year's School Quality Review; however significant gaps in instructional and behavioral expectations remained. Evidence gathered during the visit pointed to a more structured environment in the school building, with quiet hallways during class, an orderly cafeteria during lunch, and a feeling that school was a safe place on a superficial level. Students were no longer forced to remain in in-school suspension all-day for not being prepared for class. New systems had been developed to document and track minor offenders and immediately send them back to class. In the classroom, however, the atmosphere was not as secure. Although there were a few classrooms where students were held to high academic and behavioral expectations, lack of engagement, lack of rigor, and poor classroom climate were the norm. In an attempt to improve academic performance at the school, JMCHS began using the "8-Step Process for Continuous Improvement." During this visit, teachers and administrators were still figuring out how they were going to effectively implement all of the operational components of the 8-Step process. Even though it was not operating as effectively as possible, the implementation of the plan was a step toward data-driven instruction. Following the visit,

IDOE officials recommended that the school increase transparency around performance data to help invest students in their growth and progress.

Second Visit: During the second visit, on February 6, 2012, the review team found that some steps had been taken to address the areas for improvement that were identified in the initial report. In an effort to increase transparency around student data, all core content teachers were required to create a data wall for their classroom. Teachers reported an immediate increase in student engagement, and seemed to be accepting of the new requirements; however, classroom observations did not show demonstrable improvements in overall classroom engagement and student performance. Additionally, in an effort to increase the effectiveness of peer observation and feedback, the instructional leadership team implemented a new "Growth Partners" model. The new peer observation structure allowed for two teachers to build a professional relationship to help maximize the impact of their collaborative development. Another discovery during the second visit was that the professional services contract between JMCHS and Dr. Pat Davenport, lead trainer for the school's 8-Step process training, had been discontinued. Mr. Sullivan cited the importance of having individuals in the classrooms, working with teachers, as his main reason for making a switch from the 8-Step process training to hiring Pearson Learning consultants. On top of all of the changes to the instructional program at the school, JMCHS received two new assistant principals just before this visit, and their roles were still being defined. Given the number of changes that occurred in the month or two leading up to the second visit, it was difficult to gauge the effectiveness of the new initiatives. In the report, the review team acknowledged the steps being taken by school leadership in response to IDOE recommendations, however there was minimal evidence to suggest these steps had a positive impact on academic and behavioral outcomes throughout the school.

Part 3: Main Findings

This section of the report includes detailed evidence and ratings for each domain of the School Quality Review rubric. Given that this is the final report and it includes evidence for every indicator on the rubric, each prioritized indicator will be labeled as such to designate them from the remainder of the rubric.

A. Overall school performance: Informed by the evidence collected during all three visits, the following list of strengths and areas for improvement reflect the results of a comprehensive review conducted at the school over the past year.

Areas of Strength

- The school facility is a clean and inviting environment. The Principal worked to instill discipline within the students, increased participation in the JROTC program and enforced requirements such as carrying a student ID badge and being in dress code.
- The school corporation has provided school leadership the freedom and flexibility to make decisions regarding school improvement. For example, members of the school administration stated that the district was flexible regarding staffing placement and other creative, but somewhat controversial decisions. Despite the additional flexibility, school leadership has not taken advantage of the opportunity to spur innovation and creativity.

Areas to Improve

- Additional attention must be directed to developing a comprehensive vision for the instructional program at JMCHS. Classroom instruction and instructional development at the school are fragmented and lack a unifying vision. Multiple programs and initiatives have been implemented at the school, which currently work parallel of one another, operating simultaneously, but rarely intersecting. Intentional steps must be taken to weave different programs and initiatives together in order to maximize efficacy and consistency of implementation.
- High academic and behavioral expectations for students continue to be inconsistent from classroom to classroom. A significant number of classrooms observed by the review team were unstructured and lacked a clear academic focus. There was no evidence of an academic vision that included challenging goals for all students. School administrators must work to instill a sense of urgency throughout the staff and ensure high expectations for students exist in every classroom.
- Evidence collected during the final visit suggests a disconnect between students and adults in the building. During a focus group, students suggested that upwards to 65% of teachers in the building seem like they "do not care." Steps must be taken to intentionally develop opportunities for students and adults to develop student/mentor relationships.
- The overall impact of planning, instruction and assessment has not led to effective student learning. Although the 8-Step process has been adopted as a structure for data driven instruction and decision-making, minimal evidence exists to show that it is being implemented effectively. Significant attention must be paid to how students are performing not only on the initial assessment, but also after receiving three weeks of

remedial instruction in "Success Period." Without intentional follow-up on student performance, Success Period becomes ineffective, and both students and teachers lose investment. Given both the school and district's focus on the 8-Step Process, additional focus must be given to identifying best practices and incorporating them into how JMCHS runs its system. If not, the school must identify a school-wide planning, instruction, and assessment model that leads to improved student learning.

- Many initiatives brought into the building through the SIG are working separately from one another. A strategic plan for how each of the different interventions relate to one another and fit together is essential in order to maximize the impact of the external support. Additionally, a similar strategic plan must be developed at an administrative level to help identify clear roles and responsibilities, along with performance goals for the additional staff members that have been brought into the building and funded through the school improvement grant.

- The turnover at the assistant principal level that occurred this year is alarming and must be addressed. Of the three assistant principals that left the building throughout the year, two of them announced their retirement and subsequently went on medical leave. The third was transferred to another building as an assistant principal. In order to increase the likelihood for dramatic school improvement, all future administrators brought into the building must be invested in the urgency and critical nature of this work. In order to create a clear vision for the school, it is important that the leadership team stays consistent. Before assigning an administrator to the building, the district must take steps to ensure that individual is committed to the work and not likely to leave the school mid-year.

B. Domain 1: Readiness to Learn

1.1: Safety, Discipline, and Engagement (Prioritized Indicator) – Poor

Students, teachers and administrators all acknowledged that JMCHS is a much more secure and safe place than it was in the past. Systems and structures are in place, and routinely enforced, to create a stimulating environment; however inconsistent academic and behavioral expectations continue to inhibit learning in the classroom. An insufficient core instructional program matched with limited high interest enrichment opportunities has led to feelings of apathy and lack of engagement.

There is consistent evidence to suggest steps have been taken to improve the school's culture. Students at JMCHS expressed a lot of pride in their school and those who had been there for several years consistently referenced the significant improvements to school safety overall. One student, who left the school a few years ago and just returned, was hesitant to come back; but when he started this year, he was pleasantly surprised by how much the school had improved. Both students and teachers credit the Principal with leading the charge to improve student culture at JMCHS. Students mentioned that expectations such as carrying a student ID badge and dress code are now routinely enforced, and students cannot get away with "doing what they want." Teachers expressed a similar sentiment, stating that students who disrupt class and jeopardize instruction are more routinely removed and dealt with by administration so the class can move on. Throughout all three visits, hallways were mostly quiet and orderly during instructional periods. Before the final visit, The Principal ran a school-wide competition to see which hallway could create the most stimulating, academically-focused hallway display. Hallways throughout the building were covered in student work, adding to the overall feeling of an academic environment.

Although the hallways and other common areas portrayed a stimulating academic environment, they fell short of fostering high academic and personal expectations for students throughout the building. IDOE officials consistently observed a stark disconnect between the expectations that were written on the walls throughout the building, and what actually occurred in classrooms. Expectations such as raising your hand and staying in your seat often went unenforced, and peer-to-peer interaction was extremely negative. While leadership committees had been developed to help delegate authority, it is evident that the Principal carries most of the power in the building and students often behave differently when he is not around. Student behavior varies throughout the building, and it is clear that students were not held to the same academic or behavioral expectations in every classroom.

During group work in one classroom, the teacher pulled four different students into the hallway during a ten minute period for disruptive behaviors such as cussing, arguing with their partner, and throwing their materials on the floor. Little support was provided for students who were struggling academically, due to these constant disruptions. Throughout the class, students were out of their seat, talking loudly, and less than a quarter were completing the assignment. There was no evidence of an accountability system for students who were not completing the assignment or those who were taken into the hallway; consequently, the teacher's efforts to address misbehavior did not yield improvement for the class as a whole.

When the review team visited the school in November, the instructional coach shared a school-wide incentive program, which involved handing out tickets to students who were behaving well in class. When the review team observed the instructional coach go into a

classroom during the final visit, students continued to disrupt the lesson and violate expectations. She observed the classroom for approximately five minutes and then left without addressing a single student. There was no evidence that tickets had been used to effectively encourage students to behave well, relate well to others and have a positive attitude towards learning. When an instructional leader walks into a classroom where students are not learning, it is essential that they intervene immediately to redirect the class. Although the tickets are an effective way to do so, the system has been inconsistently executed and resulted in no demonstrable improvement in student behavior.

Along with poorly developed systems to encourage students to behave well, the lack of a robust core program with a laser-like focus on reading, writing and math, with vertical and horizontal alignment, also limits the ability for students to develop key learning and personal skills. Although attempts were made to develop horizontal alignment, with science and social studies teachers integrating math and reading instruction into their lessons, minimal evidence was observed to suggest this was being executed effectively. In a science classroom, where the objective for the day focused on genes and human traits, the students spent the final 30 minutes of class matching algebraic expressions written in standard form to the same expression written in word form. During the 15 minute observation, students worked in partners or groups to cut out cards and find matching expressions. The content was not aligned between the two assignments (human genes and algebraic expressions), and students struggled to execute the activity because the teacher did not provide direct instruction on the math objective. This activity seemed forced and unnatural, thus not an effective way to integrate math into a science classroom. Consequently, students were disengaged and hardly any learning took place.

In a social studies classroom, students were observed reading a passage along with the teacher, but there was minimal evidence of reading instruction taking place. Students were consistently questioned about the content of the text, but there was not any mention of reading strategies or "marking the text" procedures that were integrated from the students' ELA classroom. Evidence gathered by the review team over all three visits suggests little coherence between content areas, thus students' skills and knowledge are not developing quickly enough. The attempts to include opportunities for group or partner learning and integrate cross-curricular instruction have been ineffective. Teachers are attempting to implement instructional strategies without completing the necessary preparation work to develop the key skills within their students needed to be successful.

Furthermore, the school does not provide a well-rounded curriculum with enrichment activities to add interest and relevance into the classroom. The minimal evidence derives from unique opportunities students receive in certain classrooms that represent "islands of excellence" within the school. For example, in an eighth grade reading classroom, the review team observed the students perform a mock trial based on a book they recently read in class. In an ECA preparation course, the teacher created a life-size board game to help students review for the upcoming English 10 ECA. Although these opportunities help add interest and relevance to the instructional program, there is minimal evidence that they have been institutionalized throughout the building.

Despite having a school improvement grant to help fund an extended day program and pay for an extended day coordinator, the only opportunities students are offered after school is to attend remediation sessions with their teachers. When asked about other opportunities for students during extended day, neither administration nor teachers were

able to provide an example of a club or enrichment program that exists other than very limited opportunities for small groups of students. Additionally, enrichment groups during Success Period, those composed of students who do not need remediation, have been assigned to the special area teachers. For these students, Success Period is scheduled into the day to provide the opportunity to enrich their education, but it has been ineffectively implemented. The assistant principal identified the continued improvement of the enrichment block as an area of ongoing focus for the school. The lack of a coherent enrichment program during Success Period, accompanied by an absence of diverse opportunities for students to engage in after-school programs that add interest and relevance to their education has contributed greatly to the lack of investment and engagement identified in classrooms throughout the school. Given that the schedule has been designed to promote it – and an employee, funded through SIG, is designated as the extended-day coordinator – intentional steps must be taken to expand opportunities for students to engage in high-interest activities and experiences.

Lastly, career education and personal goal setting has not been effectively used to raise student aspirations and motivation. During the first visit, school administrators identified individual student data resumes as an attempt to incorporate personal career and academic goal setting into the school culture. Over the next two visits, minimal evidence was available to suggest these data resumes were used effectively to motivate and encourage students to perform well in school. Although upper-level high school students are able to take business and other career focused courses, there is little evidence to suggest career and academic goal setting has been intentionally used, school-wide, to motivate students.

Overall, evidence exists that both teachers and administrators are implementing systems and strategies to improve safety, discipline and engagement; however, these attempts did not lead to any substantive improvements in student engagement and classroom instruction. Student safety and discipline has improved over the past few years. Other than that, student investment and engagement, along with classroom behavior, continue to fall well short of what is necessary to drastically improve academic achievement. Although some classrooms exhibit high expectations for students, the majority do not. Throughout the building, students are not held to the level of expectation necessary to improve achievement. School-wide attempts to improve engagement and achievement have been ineffectively implemented due to the absence of a clear vision, or the necessary preparation to ensure success.

1.2: Action against Adversity - Poor

Although school administrators and teachers seem to recognize the unique personal and academic needs of their students, the school lacks a systematic approach to addressing these needs has been developed.

Anecdotal data gathered throughout all three visits suggests the administrative team knows and understands the personal, as well as academic needs of the students; however intentional steps have not been taken to address the effects of students' poverty head-on. Although school administrators and teachers speak to the challenges their students face, no systematic approach to meet their needs is in place. Well focused and personalized student goals have not been developed, thus many students lack investment and motivation. Other than the district provided social service programs, the school has not developed connections with a broad range of health and social service providers in an attempt to directly address students' needs.

Although JMCHS has a full-time parent liaison, programs to systematically address the needs of families so they can better support student learning outside of school were very limited. The review team did not observe or hear of any effective parent classes or other community development opportunities offered by the school. Although the parent liaison may conduct one or two workshops throughout the year, the school has failed to invest parents and community members in a comprehensive skill development program.

Students at the school also lack critical skills, behaviors and values that would enable them to advocate for themselves. Although the twelve upperclassmen we spoke with during the student focus group had clearly developed these skills, behaviors and values, they shared concern for the students that were in the grades below them. They expressed a belief that the younger students lacked the focus and maturity to be successful; evidence that key skills and behaviors still need to be developed. Despite an identified need for additional development, the school is not systematically addressing any of these needs. The principal has increased participation in JROTC, but the majority of students at JMCHS are without a structured program to help develop the key skills and behaviors necessary to advocate for themselves.

The totality of evidence suggests that school administrators and teachers have recognized the unique personal and academic needs of their students and families; however the school has not developed a systematic approach to addressing those needs. Students and families lack opportunities to develop the key skills, behaviors and values that would enable them to advocate for themselves.

1.3: Close Student - Adult Relationships – Poor

Student-to-adult relationships are often fragile, lack warmth, and are not respectful. There is minimal evidence that the school has developed strategies specifically designed to promote a sense of connection between students and adults. The lack of respectful student-adult relationships often forces classrooms to have a behavior management focus, rather than an academic focus.

Little evidence exists to suggest that the school implements a variety of strategies specifically designated to promote a sense of connection between students and adults. During the teacher focus group, staff members repeatedly emphasized that what made JMCHS special was that the teachers truly cared about the students. When asked about collaboration and the professional teaching culture, teachers often responded by saying they have little trouble working together because of their shared commitment to the students. Students in the focus group articulated a distinctly different instructional environment. One student stated that "a lot of teachers do not care about the students." When asked to quantify "a lot," the students verbalized that "about 65% of teachers did not seem to care about their students." When asked what differentiated the 65% of teachers who seem to not care from the 35% who seem to really care, the students pointed to the teacher's ability to build relationships with students. During the discussion, students shed light on critical skill deficiencies that exist throughout the instructional staff, limiting their ability to develop strong mentor relationships with students. According to students, teachers decide they "dislike" particular students very early in the year, which allow teacher/student conflicts to interfere with instructional time. Additionally, students reported that many teachers lacked the knowledge and background to build worthwhile relationships with their students which lead to increased investment and achievement.

The extended day program is a great opportunity for teachers to host clubs or run other programs to provide a chance for students to connect with staff members through interactions outside of the classroom, but the only programs offered after school are remediation classes with core content teachers. The lack of programs and clubs specifically designed to build a sense of connection between students and adults in the building has led to a significant disconnect between teacher and student perceptions.

There are staff members in the building who have developed strong mentor relationships with students; however most of them rely on the adult's personality and ability to connect with students naturally. The principal is a great example. Based on evidence gathered from students and review team observations, it is clear he has developed very respectful and professional relationships with many students at JMCHS. Students in the focus group all pointed to the principal as someone they could go to if they needed support. A math teacher was also identified as a key role model in the building, but her ability to connect with students is limited because her teaching assignments are limited to the high school. Students also identified non-instructional staff members as partners in the building, but overall, there are few faculty and staff members that the students consistently identify as role models and mentors.

The lack of a strong connection between students and adults continues to negatively impact behavior in classrooms. Students reported that their peers have identified which teachers they feel do not truly care about them, and that these classes are often disrupted by arguments and other unruly behavior, negatively impacting instruction and limiting the likelihood for achievement. During classroom observations, the review team confirmed the report from students described in the focus group. In one classroom, a student urged her peers to be quiet so she could focus on the assignment while the teacher ineffectively attempted to redirect the class. The students continued to disrupt the lesson and did not respond to the student or the teacher. Similar situations were observed in other classrooms, where students consistently disrupted class and did not respond to redirection from the teacher. It was clear that adult/student relationships lack respect and trust.

C. Domain 2: Readiness to Teach

2.1: Shared Responsibility for Achievement – Poor

The organizational structure at JMCHS is weak and lacks strong accountability for student achievement. Inconsistency and turnover at the administrative level and a failure to invest teachers in a clear vision for success has limited the development of a shared sense of responsibility for improvement.

Although the principal articulated a sense of urgency and accountability for student achievement, faculty and staff lack a shared responsibility and accountability for that vision. Although the principal has required consistent posting of classroom expectations throughout the building and implemented the "Instructional Clock" model to institutionalize this vision, staff and students lack the missionary zeal necessary to drive improvement. Beginning with the first visit, it was clear that the principal was focused on improving student behavior. Students received a handbook for the first time in years and school-wide expectations were posted in almost every classroom.

Throughout the year, although expectations have been posted throughout the building, the review team rarely observed evidence of students being held accountable for inappropriate behavior. For example, the expectations in one classroom were: follow directions the first time they are given, be prepared, be respectful, and be urgent. During partner work, less than half of the class was engaged in the assignment, and two students were asleep. Additionally, several students were getting out of their seats and disrupting other students. Cussing and name-calling were heard throughout the room, and many students lacked urgency in their work. The teacher seemed to be using a "warnings" list on the board to identify students who violated expectations; but despite several observed student behaviors that warranted writing down names, only one was written on the list for most of the lesson. In another classroom, one student was redirected for taking out his phone and attempting to charge it in an outlet. Subsequently, the student moved seats and attempted to plug it into a different outlet. Once again the teacher asked him to put the phone away. When the student attempted to charge the phone for a third time, the teacher asked the student to hand over the phone and the charger. The student promised to put it away, and the teacher eventually relented and allowed the student to keep his phone. These behaviors were observed throughout all three visits. As such, there is little to suggest consistency with school-wide expectations has improved. The school lacks strong accountability for student achievement and behavior. As a result, disruption, apathy, and disrespect were a consistent theme in classrooms throughout the building.

The school corporation is insufficiently rigorous in promoting a shared responsibility for student achievement. Although the district has taken steps to increase autonomy for school leaders and secure additional funding for the school, actions taken at the school level have limited the ability of school leaders to develop a strong organizational culture, characterized by trust, respect, and mutual responsibility. The amount of turnover at the administrative level in JMCHS is evidence of the lack of a strong culture, and inhibits the school's ability to develop a shared, sustained vision for success. Seventh and eighth grade teachers in the building have gone through multiple grade level administrators throughout the year. Teachers expressed that each time a new administrator came into the building, there was an adjusting period that needed to take place to determine how they would work together.

The absence of a shared vision for student success at JMCHS inhibits the school's ability to uphold high expectations for all students throughout the building. After observing several

classrooms throughout the year and talking to students at the school, it is clear that the vision of success at JMCHS is disjointed and lacks continuity. Turnover at the administrative level throughout this year has also limited the school's ability to develop and invest teachers in a strong accountability agenda.

2.2: Personalization of Instruction (Prioritized Indicator) – Poor

Existing diagnostic and formative assessment opportunities are not used effectively to inform instructional decisions and promote student learning. Although the district implemented the 8-Step process for data-driven instruction at JMCHS, the lack of ownership and investment from school leadership has limited the impact of the program. JMCHS lacks a school-wide vision of a coherent system to track and analyze data, and as a result student learning suffers.

JMCHS, as part of a district initiative, adopted the 8-Step Process for Continued Improvement prior to the 2011 – 2012 school year. Teachers and instructional leaders in the building received training on how to effectively implement the process to ensure students received the appropriate remediation or enrichment. The foundation of the 8-Step process is an effective use of the Success Period, a 30 minute remedial or enrichment block incorporated into the schedule each day. Students are to be assigned to a particular "success group" based on their results on the previous assessment. Students who perform well are offered enrichment during success period; those who do not master the tested standards are placed into a remedial block. These groups ideally change throughout the year, following each formative assessment. Although teachers are still expected to differentiate and remediate in their own classroom, the 8-Step process provides a structured time designated for targeted, personalized instruction, with the goal of limiting the amount of remediation that must go on during the regularly scheduled class.

To support the 8-Step process district wide, the central office developed a series of assessments, combined with a system for detailed tracking and analysis of results, to help inform the components of the 8-Step Process. Teachers use the Acuity assessment, district created benchmarks and scrimmages, and self-made assessments to track student learning. Every three weeks, students take a formative assessment based on the standards taught during that window. The assessments are graded and student results are organized into standards-based, color-coded spreadsheets. These spreadsheets are then returned to the teacher where he/she is expected to use the data to create success groups and inform ongoing instruction. Although the dissemination of results differed between the high school and the middle school, teachers reported receiving data quickly enough to inform their instruction. A few teachers mentioned using data in their classrooms, but observations of Success Period and regular classes produced minimal evidence that teachers were effectively differentiating instruction. The review team observed three Success Period classes, all of which were loosely planned and lacked a clear instructional focus. In one, the teacher attempted to have students practice remedial math skills by calling out questions to the class and soliciting answers from the group, without any deliverables or visuals. When it was time for student practice, the teacher handed out one worksheet to each group of 4 to 6 students, which resulted in one student doing most of the work. Others were out of their seats, talking to their peers, and disengaged. One student was heard saying, "Why are we doing this, we already did this, this is our fourth time," suggesting that Success Period lacked a clear scope and sequence aligned to student needs. Similar stories played out during other Success Period observations; the consistent theme was an unstructured environment with limited academic rigor and very low student engagement

throughout. Given its importance to the overall impact of the 8-Step Process, the evidence collected during Success Period observations was of significant concern.

Evidence from meetings and focus groups yielded similar results as to what was gathered at the classroom level throughout all three visits. Conversations with school leaders, instructional coaches, and teachers revealed the glaring absence of a unified vision for what data-driven instruction should look like in the building and as a result, teachers were unable to continuously adapt their instruction to ensure that students were able to grasp challenging concepts.

The principal also required teachers to administer a weekly quiz as a formative assessment of student learning. These assessments were intended to inform instruction on a more consistent basis, so adjustments could be made within the three-week testing window. Although teachers reported issuing the assessments, the resulting data was not being effectively used to plan instruction and other activities that matched the learning needs of students. Throughout the six visits, six different classrooms were observed that had two teachers. In each of them, the lead teacher was instructing the entire class while the co-teacher or special education inclusion teacher was circulating the room and redirecting students when necessary. During one period, the lead teacher wrote sentences on the board with spelling and grammatical errors while the co-teacher circulated the room and assisted teams of students who were trying to correct them. Each group consisted of four to six students, but had only one white board. Some students were not participating in their group, either due to the limited resources or a lack of understanding. No structures were in place to provide these students differentiated support. Although the co-teacher circulated the room correcting behavior, it was evident that this activity was not appropriate for all learners. Approximately one quarter of students in the class had their heads down or were disengaged from the instruction. Similar situations played out in the five other classrooms observed. The review team observed few attempts to differentiate instruction based on student data, despite the increased instructional capacity in the classroom and use of weekly quizzes.

The inconsistent nature of data-driven instruction at JMCHS provides for limited academic feedback to students. Students are not effectively involved in the analysis of their data and the setting of individual achievement goals. The expectations set around data walls serve as an example of an attempt to increase transparency around performance data and provide additional student feedback, but it has ultimately been ineffective. In response to the IDOE recommendation to increase transparency around student data following the first visit, the principal required teachers to post a data wall in their classroom. The expectations required every classroom to have at least two pieces of student level data posted on the wall. Despite receiving standards based data from the district every three-weeks, data walls in several classrooms ended up being weekly print-outs of student grades. After speaking with the data coach and several teachers during the final visit, it was clear that the potential positive impact of posting student data was limited due to the absence of a clear vision and lack of accountability. When different instructional staff members were asked to describe the vision for their data wall, the review team received inconsistent answers. One staff member described the purpose of a data wall as an investment tool, developing a sense of global competition amongst students where they can compare their performance to peers in their class, the school, and the district. Another staff member expressed that posting standards-based student performance on a

data wall was unnecessary because if the student sees that they earned an "F," then they probably failed to master any standards as well. The few teachers who had developed a standards based data tracking system in their classroom were able to describe the importance of their data wall. They explained it as a tool to help students understand where they are performing well and where they are in need of additional support. Few students were able to articulate how the information on the data wall helped them or how they used the feedback to identify specific areas where they need additional support. Although some classrooms used data walls as an effective tool for student feedback, there is minimal evidence to suggest a systematic structure was in place to ensure all students in the school had opportunities to reflect on their performance and identify areas where they need to improve. The inconsistency and lack of a school-wide vision for data walls limited the overall impact of these important components of a comprehensive data-driven instruction model.

The daily schedule at JMCHS has been used flexibly to adjust to student needs in some cases; however, it has also been identified as a limiting factor in others. As a required component of the 8-Step Process, school leaders redesigned the schedule before this school year in order to include a 30 minute Success Period each day. Additionally, when 9th and 10th grade students, those being tested on the ECAs, were not coming to the extended day remediation classes, school leadership redesigned their schedule to include the additional remediation within the school day. On the other hand, the schedule was a limiting factor for high school Success Period and the professional growth partner initiative. High school teachers met in content teams rather than as a grade level, which limited their ability to place students in success groups as a grade level team. As a result, high school students did not change success groups and were assigned to a group based on ECA performance or predicted ECA performance rather than ongoing progress monitoring. Although the students were strategically grouped, the lack of mobility within groups limited the effectiveness of the 8-Step Process and data-driven instruction as a whole. Additionally, teachers in the building were assigned a "growth partner" as part of an initiative to encourage them to learn and support their peers through observation and feedback. Middle school teachers expressed frustration about not being able to partner with someone from their content area, due to schedule conflicts. Because of the way teacher prep periods are organized, teachers had to select someone with a shared prep, which limited them to partnering with someone on their grade-level team.

Overall, there is minimal evidence that the impact of planning, instruction and assessment leads to effective student learning. The most critical limitation is the lack of a clear vision and expectations around the 8-Step process. Even though the district has implemented 8-Step as the fundamental structure for data driven instruction, the process has been poorly executed at JMCHS. In January, the professional services contract between the 8-Step process trainer and JMCHS was terminated. The school continued to implement the 8-Step process, but the monthly progress checks that occurred from August to January ended. The effectiveness of Success Period has been limited due to poor planning both logistically and instructionally. The review team observed multiple Success Periods and determined students do not receive targeted individual instruction on a consistent basis. Although a few teachers used student data effectively during the regular class period, classroom observations revealed little evidence to suggest data is tracked and used throughout the building to improve student outcomes. Despite receiving student data

every three weeks, the inconsistent execution of the 8-Step process and the fractured vision for a school-wide data tracking and analysis system has created an academic environment that lacked a clear data driven focus.

2.3: Professional Teaching Culture (Prioritized Indicator) – Poor

Although job-embedded professional development opportunities have increased since the 2010-2011 school year, there is little evidence to suggest the professional teaching culture as a whole leads to improved instruction school-wide. New initiatives have been put into place without a plan for how the different systems and structures will interact. Systems for classroom observation and feedback lack coherence, thus efficiency and efficacy of the entire system is limited.

Systems and structures have been put into place to help cultivate a professional teaching culture at JMCHS; however, there is a lack of continuity and clear vision for the program as a whole. In response to the School Quality Review Report from the 2010 – 2011 school year, and recommendations made during the first two follow up visits this year, school leadership implemented new initiatives to improve the professional teaching culture in the building. Professional development, data analysis, and collaborative sessions were built into teachers' schedules. Teachers were also paired with a professional growth partner, which helped to build relationships between colleagues to foster honest feedback and drive improvement. The increased opportunities for collaboration and professional development provide evidence that the school has attempted to improve the professional teaching culture in the building.

During focus groups, teachers identified the occurrence of collaboration and support throughout the building. Teachers communicate and collaborate in an attempt to improve instruction, but the quality of outcomes is limited and inconsistent. In the middle school, grade level teams met for PLCs three days a week and were provided an uninterrupted collaborative planning period once a week. Despite the existence of structures to help formalize collaboration, teachers explained that the bulk of their interaction is informal and driven by the individual teachers, not a coherent system for professional development and collaboration. The professional growth partners model that was initiated in February is an example. Teachers were happy to have the opportunity to build a professional relationship with a colleague, but the schedule limited middle school teachers to working with someone on their grade-level team, rather than someone in the same content area. As a result, middle school teachers reached out to teachers in the same content area to provide additional assistance. The administrative team was aware of this issue, but given that it was so late in the year, a schedule change was not implemented. Even with increased collaboration and professional development opportunities, classroom observations throughout the year provide little evidence to suggest any significant positive impact on classroom instruction has occurred.

Teachers at JMCHS received formal and informal observations and feedback from multiple individuals. The principal or assistant principal, instructional coach, data coach, representatives from Pearson Learning, and peer growth partners all spent time observing classrooms. Although there was a wealth of opportunities for teachers to receive feedback, every one of the observers listed above gave feedback using different tools. The instructional coach used a comprehensive checklist of highly effective instructional strategies to identify trends in each teacher's practice. The principal, or assistant principal, provided feedback through informal follow-up emails that summarize what they observed, focusing on the required components of the lesson cycle. Pearson Learning

representatives, only working with middle school teachers in reading and math, used a form that was developed by their organization to track specific instructional goals. Professional growth partners sent feedback using a different tool, developed to track progress on individually identified "areas of focus." It is clear, based on conversations with staff members at JMCHS, that teachers received a considerable amount of feedback on their instruction; however the feedback was haphazard and not streamlined to help teachers effectively integrate it into practice. The instructional coach stated that her observations often focused on the topics worked on in PLCs. During the final visit, there was a particular focus on differentiation. The professional growth partner focused on teacher-selected areas of focus, which may or may not be related to what is going on in PLCs. Although it may seem logical that teachers would select an area of focus that aligns to what they are working on with the instructional coach, teachers often chose areas of focus based on individual needs in addition to those monitored by the instructional coach. Lastly, teachers received feedback from Pearson Learning and school administrators, which may or may not have been aligned to other areas of focus; any alignment would have been purely coincidental given the absence of a formal structure to ensure consistency. It is essential to strategically select particular areas of improvement on which to focus, and develop growth goals based on those targeted areas. Teachers at JMCHS set annual growth goals as a component of their formal evaluation; however they received feedback on several components of their instruction. Although feedback is necessary to improve instruction, without a coherent system to organize all of it, instructional development is limited. Teachers reported that prioritizing and reflecting on the feedback they receive is not difficult for teachers who viewed their role as a "professional," but there is not a streamlined classroom observation system in place to effectively improve teaching and learning for those who struggled.

Overall, the school leadership team at JMCHS has taken steps to incorporate new systems and structures to improve the professional teaching culture. However, new programs and initiatives have been implemented without a clear vision for how they will work together, leaving teachers to sort through and make sense of large amounts of information and feedback. The lack of continuity between the new structures and initiatives has limited the effectiveness of the expanded professional teaching culture. Classroom observations throughout all three visits suggest instructional execution is still far below what is expected school-wide.

D. Domain 3: Readiness to Act

3.1 Resource Authority – Fair

The principal at JMCHS has some freedom to make streamlined, mission-driven decisions to drive improvement, but that freedom is limited and inconsistent. Although the district directs resources to the school differentiated by need, limitations exist which inhibit the principal's ability to drive school improvement.

The principal at JMCHS has the authority to select and assign staff to positions without regard to seniority; however it is limited and inconsistent. In conversations with the principal and assistant principal, they reported that the district gave the school freedom to select teachers to fill vacant positions throughout the year. The assistant principal also stated that school leadership had the authority to identify underperforming teachers and move them out of the building, but that no teachers had been moved out of the building due to a lack of quality candidates to replace them. Another example of the principal's limited authority was the turnover at the assistant principal level. As described earlier in the report, JMCHS has had five different assistant principals in the school this year. Of the three individuals that have moved on this year, two of the three announced their retirement and subsequently requested a medical leave. Although there is no way to predict if someone is going to retire or request medical leave, the circumstances suggest that the district failed to select candidates for these positions that were committed to the work and planned on staying throughout the year. One of the assistant principals, who was moved to the school during the first semester, was transferred out of the school to be an assistant principal at Broad Ripple High School before winter break. The turnover rate in such a critical position begs the question regarding the decision-making process at the district level and suggests the school principal's authority is limited in this capacity.

Throughout all three visits, the review team did not encounter any evidence to suggest the district limited or interfered with the school leader's autonomy and freedom to make decisions regarding school programs. The principal had the freedom to make decisions and the authority to implement controversial, yet innovative practices. Despite the district-wide implementation of the 8-Step process, when the principal proposed switching instructional development partners to Pearson Learning, the district agreed and successfully lobbied the Indiana Department of Education to allow the switch to take place using School Improvement Grant dollars. This decision may be the greatest example of the school leader's authority.

The district has made attempts to direct resources to the school differentiated on the basis of need, but overall it has been limited or inconsistent. The district developed a district-level turnaround office and also applied for a 1003(g) School Improvement Grant on behalf of the school, both examples of the district's willingness to direct resources to the school differentiated by need. The turnaround office is responsible for monitoring progress at each of the district's lowest performing schools, and ensuring each is on track to make the necessary gains in academic achievement to improve their performance rating. Additionally, the district applied for, and was awarded, a 1003(g) School Improvement Grant for JMCHS. The grant infused nearly $2 million into the school over the past two years, and as long as the school meets designated growth targets, will do so next year as well. On the other hand, the district was inconsistent in their attempts to focus resources to JMCHS. During a meeting with the assistant principal and the district's turnaround director at the final visit, the question was asked, "What has the school intentionally done

to help improve instruction?" Although the question may lead to some critical discoveries, the timing of the question was of concern. With JMCHS being the only school in the district that is currently in year 5 of "F" status, and potentially subject to state intervention next year, the district's director of turnaround should be well aware of the administration's intentional steps to improve instruction, if not having played an integral role in developing them.

Overall, the district has provided the school leaders with increased autonomy and flexibility; however, attempts to direct resources to the school in an effort to drive substantive school improvement have been limited or inconsistent. Little evidence exists to suggest school leadership has effectively capitalized on the increased autonomy and flexibility as well. The only controversial decision that has been made was the switch to Pearson Learning to provide instructional development services. Although this is a major shift, it has not resulted in noticeable improvement to classroom instruction.

3.2 Resource Ingenuity (Prioritized Indicator) – Poor

Minimal evidence exists to suggest the principal is adept at securing additional resources and leveraging partner relationships to improve academic achievement at JMCHS. Although steps were taken to improve community relationships at the beginning of the year, there was little evidence that these relationships continued to grow and develop throughout the year, and often times they dissolved all together.

During the initial visit to JMCHS in November, the principal stated that the school was strategically developing external partnerships to engender academic improvement. For example, Finish Line came into the school to conduct market research, and in return students were able to visit the Finish Line factory just down the street from the school. Additionally, partnerships were developed with a few community organizations near the school to provide students a safe place to go when they left the building in the afternoon. During the final visit in May, there was no evidence to suggest these partnerships consistently contributed to student investment or academic achievement. Although students may still go to the community centers after school, there does not seem to be a strategically developed partnership between the school and the community organizations.

As a part of a district-wide partnership with IUPUI, tutors worked at the school, staffing the learning center, which gave academic support to students who were removed from class, as an alternative to in-school suspension. Evidence gathered during the final visit suggests the tutoring program is inconsistent. The assistant principal shared that it was difficult to secure tutors at JMCHS, due to its distance from downtown. They often only had two or three tutors in the building, which limited their ability to effectively support all of the students who were removed from class. No steps were taken by school leadership to improve the partnership with IUPUI, thus the program had a limited impact on student achievement. Other than the IUPUI tutors, no other adult volunteers consistently worked in the building.

Although the principal began the year with a clear focus on developing community relationships to help engender academic improvement, the challenges of engaging and motivating the community ultimately thwarted the plan. By the final visit, the review team observed minimal evidence to suggest external partnerships were leveraged to secure additional resources and capacity at JMCHS. The district's partnership with IUPUI is an

example of efforts to direct resources to the school, but the overall impact of the program has been limited.

3.3 Agility in the Face of Turbulence – Poor

The culture at JMCHS has improved over the past two years; however critical gaps in the instructional program continue to limit student achievement. Decisions are often made without rigorous monitoring and evaluation, creating a disjointed and incoherent instructional program at JMCHS.

Throughout all three visits, the principal established a more secure and safe environment at JMCHS, but that critical gaps in instructional leadership still exist in the building. Over the past three years, attention has been focused on getting JMCHS under control and eliminating the negative perceptions of the school that exists throughout the community. The principal's skills have enabled him to build relationships with the majority of students in the building, which contributes to the overall atmosphere. Students look up to the principal as a role model and mentor. During the first two visits, while walking with the principal, hallway transitions were orderly, and students moved with a sense of urgency. It was clear that significant improvements had been made to the school culture at JMCHS and the principal was the driving force.

During the final visit, when the principal was not in the building, hallway transitions were noticeably more chaotic and disorderly. As mentioned earlier in the report, student behavior in the classroom was disruptive as well. When the principal and other well-respected members of the staff were present, students tended to behave well. When they were not, student behavior fell off drastically and the culture was often negative and not conducive to learning. Students at JMCHS are not invested in an overall vision of excellence and scholarship, so when certain adults are not present, student behavior significantly declined.

While the administrative team was able to secure the school, a lack of a clear instructional vision and accountability system still remains. Many new initiatives were implemented throughout the year, often inflating performance ratings in the reports from the first and second visit. Upon further observation, it was clear the new initiatives were implemented without rigorous monitoring and evaluation. Data walls lacked consistency from classroom to classroom and were not been integrated into the preexisting school-wide data management system. The growth partners model offered additional opportunities for teachers to collaborate and improve their practice, but it was at the expense of other professional development opportunities. It seems the principal has a vision for school improvement, but it is not shared sufficiently with the school community or focused on a clear strategic direction for the school.

The overall lack of vision for several key initiatives led to an absence of accountability in several support positions. For example, despite having a designated extended day coordinator, only academic remediation was offered to students after school. Throughout all three visits, minimal evidence of effective community partnerships was observed, despite having a designated community liaison. The ninth grade graduation coach spent a significant portion of the first semester creating data resumes for every freshman in the building, an extremely time intensive task that produced little improvement. Although staff members were provided a diagram that illustrated how they each work together to efficiently and effectively support student achievement, there was little intentional collaboration between the support roles in the building.

Evidence exists to suggest the school culture at JMCHS improved since the principal was assigned to the building. Both students and staff reported feeling safe and secure in the building; sentiments that were not shared just two years ago. Despite these improvements, the school failed to improve academic achievement in any substantive way. The academic performance rating has not improved, and ISTEP+ and ECA scores continue to fall well short of district and state averages. Classrooms throughout the building lacked academic rigor and student engagement. The lack of consistency and coherence across classrooms can be attributed to the absence of a school-wide vision for high-quality instruction.

Part 4: Summary of Findings

John Marshall Community High School

May 9 - 10, 2012

Rating Description

IDOE uses the following rating scale with the School Quality Rubric. The school is rated on a 1-4 scale in each of the four prioritized indicators with 4 being the highest.

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 receives 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.

Ratings from the 2010 Technical Assistance Team School Quality Review are designated as TAT Rating. If the rating did not change on a particular indicator, only the 2012 rating is listed.

		Finding			
		1 **Unacceptable** No evidence	2 **Poor** Minimal evidence	3 **Fair** Present but limited and/or inconsistent	4 **Acceptable** Routine and consistent
Domain 1: Readiness to Learn			X		
	1.1: Safety, Discipline, Engagement		X		
Is the school culture environment safe and conducive to learning?					
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		
Do students feel secure and inspired to learn?					
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, adding interest and relevance.		X		
1.1g	Career education and personal goal setting are used to raise student aspirations & motivation.		X		
	1.2: Action Against Adversity		X		
Does the school directly address students' poverty-driven challenges?					
1.2a	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	X TAT Rating	
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		
Do students have positive and enduring mentor/ teacher relationships?					
1.3a	The school works with parents to build positive relationships and to engage them as partners in their children's learning	X TAT Rating	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		X TAT Rating	

		Finding			
		1 **Unacceptable** No evidence	2 **Poor** Minimal evidence	3 **Fair** Present but limited and/or inconsistent	4 **Acceptable** Routine and consistent
Domain 2: Readiness to Teach			X		
2.1: Shared Responsibility for Achievement			X		
Does the school have a strong organizational culture, characterized by trust, respect, and mutual responsibility?					
2.1a	The principal ensures that there is a strong accountability for student achievement throughout the school		X	X TAT Rating	
2.1b	The staff feels deep accountability and a missionary zeal for student achievement.		X	X TAT Rating	
2.1c	A shared commitment to a vision of the school which includes challenging goals for all students	X	X TAT Rating		
2.1d	The school corporation drives the accountability agenda.		X		
2.2: Personalization of Instruction			X		
Are diagnostic assessments used frequently and accurately to inform?					
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; 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		
Does the professional culture promote faculty and staff participation?					
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 TAT Rating	X		

		Finding			
		1 **Unacceptable** No evidence	2 **Poor** Minimal evidence	3 **Fair** Present but limited and/or inconsistent	4 **Acceptable** Routine and consistent
Domain 3: Readiness to Act			X		
	3.1: Resource Authority			X	
Does the principal have the freedom to make streamlined, mission-driven decisions regarding people, time, money, and program?					
3.1a	The principal has the authority to select and assign staff to positions in the school without regard to seniority.		X	X TAT Rating	
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 TAT Rating	X
3.1d	The school corporation enables the principal to have the freedom to make decisions.			X TAT Rating	X
3.1e	The school corporation directs resources, including staffing, to schools differentiated on the basis of need.		X		
	3.2: Resource Ingenuity		X		
Is the principal adept at securing additional resources and leveraging					
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	School corporation has district-wide structures and strategies to maximize external resources.		X		
	3.3: Agility in the Face of Turbulence		X		
Is the principal flexible and inventive in responding to conflicts and challenges?					
3.3a	The principal has the capacity to ensure school improvement.		X	X TAT Rating	
3.3b	The principal provides competent stewardship and oversight of the school.		X	X TAT Rating	

3.3c	Decisions are made & plans developed on basis of rigorous monitoring and evaluation.		X	X TAT Rating	
3.3d	Key faculty members have the capacity to support the work that is needed.		X		
3.3e	Principal reshapes and incorporates local projects & initiatives to meet students' needs.	X			
3.3f	The school corporation has the capacity to drive school improvement initiatives.		X		

Part 5: Recommendations

After reviewing and evaluating evidence and observations from all three visits throughout the 2011 – 2012 school year, the Indiana Department of Education presents the following recommendations to help drive substantive school improvement.

Primary Recommendations:

- Given the district-wide integration of the 8-Step Process, intentional steps must be taken to maximize the impact of a data-driven intervention system and increase the overall effectiveness of the planning, instruction and assessment process. School leadership must determine how to strategically implement the 8-Step process, or a similar model, at JMCHS that leads to the desired outcomes of a comprehensive data-driven instruction model.
- The absence of a school-wide vision for improvement severely limits the likelihood for substantive change at JMCHS. Given the school's current status, it is essential that school leadership develops a clear, targeted vision for instruction at JMCHS, and invest the entire staff in the execution of this vision. Under the current systems and structures already in place, it seems appropriate that the 8-Step Process and data-driven instruction be the foundation for the effort. In order to create a streamlined, manageable vision, some initiatives and interventions need to be removed, to free-up the capacity necessary for the entire staff to swiftly and effectively execute the vision.
- There is a critical disconnect between adults and students in the building. Using the increased capacity created by the 1003(g) School Improvement Grant, intentional steps need to be taken to develop structured opportunities for students and staff to build mentor/student relationships inside and outside of the classroom.

Secondary Recommendations:

- Develop a comprehensive human resource plan targeted at creating a stable administrative staff with clear roles and responsibilities, with built in opportunities to identify high-performing instructional staff for increased leadership opportunities. In order to implement the strategic improvement plan necessary to increase student achievement, the district must assign a highly-skilled leadership team with a track-record of success, eliminate turnover at the administrative level, and leverage leadership throughout the building.
- When JMCHS received a 1003(g) School Improvement Grant during the 2010 – 2011 school year, several new interventions and initiatives flooded the building. Going into the final year of the 1003(g) grant, district and school leadership must complete a comprehensive evaluation of the different interventions and initiatives currently operating in the school and develop a strategic plan which prioritizes those components that are directly aligned to the new vision for instruction and overall improvement. Those that are not aligned must be phased out and a long-term sustainability plan for their SIG must be put into place.