SCHOOL CHECK

SCHOOL CHECK: 2017

Printed on
October 22, 2024

The data below provides a summary of how well you are organizing your resources based on the principles that high-performing schools use to make resource allocation decisions. There is an average score for each resource allocation principle and detailed scores by strategy and by specific practices within each strategy. The blue bars display the number of people who chose each answer by practice and the green check displays your answer by practice. The "Group Results" section on the right displays the other group reports that you can access and if you are a member of more than one group you can change groups to view additional group summary reports.

Assessment	★ Level 1	★★ Level 2	★★★ Level 3	★★★★ 20/20 Best Practice
Empowering Curricula, Instruction, and Assessment				
Expert-led Collaboration and Professional Learning				
Talent Management and Teacher Leadership				
Personalized Time and Attention				
Responsive School Community				
Growth-oriented Adult Culture				

HOW DO I INTERPRET MY RESULTS?

Your results show how your responses compare to "best practice." Our definition of "best practice" is based on nearly 10 years of work with large urban districts, as well as deep study of the research into what makes high-performing school systems succeed.

You can read more about our vision for urban school system transformation in **One Vision, Seven Strategies** or in the **School System 20/20** section of our website.

These results are not an evaluation of your school—they are the beginning of a strategic conversation. We hope they spark crucial discussions with your colleagues, and point to where more research and data may be needed. Get a detailed report of the questions and your answers by **selecting each strategy above**.

WHAT'S NEXT?

Learn What Your Peers Think: School Check is most useful when used in a group. For example, an entire school leadership team can take the self-assessment as a part of the yearly school planning process. Each person's answers are kept private, while the group result is visible to all. **Email Kristan Singleton**, Director of Tools and Technologies, if you'd like to set up a group.

Get more ideas and tools: Learn more about our vision for strategic school design:

- **School Design Resource Guide**
- **The Strategic School Book**
- **School Design in Action Site** (Detailed profiles of how schools are optimizing resources)
- **Video: Turnaround in Action**

Understand the big picture: Learn more about our vision for transforming school systems through:

- **The School System 20/20 infographic**
- **The One Vision, Seven Strategies paper**
- **The School System 20/20 site** which is filled with publications, case studies, videos, and step-by-step worksheets to help you better understand how your district organizes people, time, and money currently, and to learn best practices for using your resources to meet students' needs.

Empowering Curricula, Instruction, and Assessment

Your Score:

Assessment	★ Level 1	★★ Level 2	★★★ Level 3	★★★★ 20/20 Best Practice
CCRS-aligned Curricular Materials				
Common Interim Assessments				
Informal Formative Assessment Tasks				
Instructional Vision				
Timely and Useful Data Reports				

CCRS-aligned Curricular Materials

All core teachers have access to and effectively use vetted CCRS-aligned curricular materials for ELA and math including scope and sequence, unit plans, daily lesson plans, and student work exemplars.

1   Based on a rigorous subject-specific evaluation tool and criteria (e.g., IMET, GIMET-QR, EdReports), core curriculum has been effectively vetted as CCRS-aligned and high-quality in:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Few grades or none
- **Level 2:** Some grades
- **Level 3:** Most grades
- **20/20 Practice:** All grades

2   Based on a rigorous subject-specific evaluation tool and criteria (e.g., EQUIP), individual unit and lesson plans have been effectively vetted as CCRS-aligned and high-quality in:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Few grades or none
- **Level 2:** Some grades
- **Level 3:** Most grades
- **20/20 Practice:** All grades

3   Based on a CCRS-aligned observation tool (e.g. IPG), the proportion of classrooms that display a high degree of high-quality CCRS-aligned instruction is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

4   Teachers consistently use CCRS-aligned curriculum and materials for the vast majority of their instruction:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

Common Interim Assessments

Common interim assessments are aligned with CCRS/end-of-year goals and administered by all same-subject teachers in a grade at least 4-6 times per year.

5 Based on a rigorous subject-specific evaluation tool and criteria (e.g., AET, Assessment Quality Criteria Checklists), interim assessments have been effectively vetted as CCRS-aligned and high quality in:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Few grades or none
- **Level 2:** Some grades
- **Level 3:** Most grades
- **20/20 Practice:** All grades

6 Common interim assessments are administered by all same-subject teachers in a grade 4-6 times a year according to a set schedule:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:**
- **Level 3:** For most grades or core subjects
- **20/20 Practice:** For all grades or core subjects

Informal Formative Assessment Tasks

All teachers have access to and regularly use rigorous informal formative assessment tasks aligned to the CCRS and the curriculum.

7 High-quality rigorous student tasks are embedded in the curriculum and materials that teachers use:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** In some lessons
- **Level 3:** In most lessons, 3-4 times per week
- **20/20 Practice:** In all lessons daily

8 Most teachers use informal assessment tasks to collect useful student data that informs instruction:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than twice a month
- **Level 2:** At least every other week
- **Level 3:** 1 to 3 times per week
- **20/20 Practice:** 3 or more times per week

Instructional Vision

School leaders and teachers have collective ownership over a clearly articulated instructional vision which defines their approach to teaching and learning, includes subject-specific practices, and is informed by rigorous expectations for excellent teaching.

9 The school's instructional vision includes expectations for student learning that:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Are not college-and-career-ready-standards (CCRS) aligned
- **Level 2:** Include skills and content, are CCRS-aligned, but aren't consistently subject- and/or grade-specific
- **Level 3:** Include skills and content, are subject- and grade-specific, and are CCRS-aligned, for most grades
- **20/20 Practice:** Include skills and content, are subject- and grade-specific, and are CCRS-aligned, for all grades

10 The school's instructional vision includes expectations for teaching that are:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Not clearly defined
- **Level 2:** Clearly defined but not consistently CCRS-aligned
- **Level 3:** Clearly defined and CCRS-aligned
- **20/20 Practice:** Clearly defined, CCRS-aligned, and directly connected to student learning goals

11 The proportion of school staff who can describe the school's instructional vision and how it plays out in teaching and learning practices is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

12 The percentage of teachers who consistently and effectively enact the instructional vision is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

> ### Timely and Useful Data Reports
>
> Timely, useful data reports from interim assessments are made available to staff and used to adjust instruction.

13 Data from all assessments is made available in a timely manner (no more than one week between administration of assessment and completion of grading):

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

14 Data from common interim assessments is made available to teachers in easy-to-use reports which facilitate question-level analysis:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

Expert-led Collaboration and Professional Learning

Your Score:

Assessment	★ Level 1	★★ Level 2	★★★ Level 3	★★★★ 20/20 Best Practice
Collaborative Teacher Teams				
Feedback Systems				
Qualified Instructional Experts				
Deliberate Assignments				
Schoolwide Professional Growth				
Differentiation Based on Teacher Need				
Sufficient Collaboration Time				

Collaborative Teacher Teams

Teaching teams are organized to collaboratively design rigorous CCRS-aligned instruction, target supports for students, improve culture, and deepen teachers' understanding of professional growth topics.

1 Teaching teams are accountable for accomplishing specific purposes during collaborative planning time (CPT):

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

2 The percentage of core subject teachers who participate in shared content teams that collaboratively design rigorous CCRS-aligned instruction, including planning instruction, analyzing student work and data, and grouping students for targeted support is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

3 The percentage of core subject teachers who participate in vertical teams (teams with same content across grades) is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

4 The percentage of core subject teachers who participate in shared student teams (teams focused on RTI, culture, family engagement, etc.) is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

5 Productive CPT is supported through clear objective-driven agendas and protocols and tools for making decisions and completing work:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

6   Time in teams is intentionally used for teachers to deepen their understanding of professional growth topics introduced in faculty or district PD and continued through to individual coaching:

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

7 Observation and coaching tools are specific to subject, grade band, and CCRS.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

---

8 Observation and coaching tools are aligned with the school's/district's formal teacher evaluation tool:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

---

9 During the school year, cycles of observation and coaching are provided to each teacher on average:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Three times or fewer
- **Level 2:** Four times
- **Level 3:** Every three weeks
- **20/20 Practice:** Every two weeks or more

---

10 Coaching is specific, actionable and sustained on the target skill until proficiency is consistently observed:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

---

11 The coaching and supervision structure ensures each instructional expert's span of review (i.e., number of people he/she is responsible for supporting) is no more than 12 to 1:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** For no instructional experts
- **Level 2:** For a few instructional experts
- **Level 3:** For some instructional experts
- **20/20 Practice:** For all instructional experts

12   Prior to hiring and/or assignment, instructional experts demonstrate their expertise by subject and grade level, and in particular in the context of CCRS:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

13   Instructional experts are assigned to facilitate teams and observe and coach teachers in the content areas and grade bands in which they have demonstrated expertise in the context of CCRS:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

14   Instructional experts receive training, pursue ongoing professional learning, and formally support each other to continuously build both CCRS content knowledge and instructional application, and their effective coaching practices and tools:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

Deliberate Assignments

Teachers and instructional leaders are deliberately assigned to teams to maximize the collective learning and teaching potential of the group.

---

15   School-wide, the percentage of shared content teams that have the necessary combination of CCRS knowledge and instructional expertise to collaboratively design CCRS-aligned instruction is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

---

16   School-wide, the proportion of shared content teams that include the special education and English learner teachers at all regularly scheduled CPT meetings is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

---

17   School-wide, the proportion of shared content teams that are consistently supported by an instructional expert with CCRS expertise in the related content and grade band is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

> ### Schoolwide Professional Growth
>
> Schoolwide professional growth is focused on a few topics informed by student and teacher data, aligned to a CCRS-informed instructional vision, and realized through a comprehensive, yearlong professional growth plan to ensure sufficient learning and practice time to achieve mastery.

18 Student and teacher data and the CCRS instructional vision inform the selection of a few topics for sustained professional growth support annually:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

---

19 The school's year-long professional growth plan:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Doesn't exist
- **Level 2:** Includes key professional development dates
- **Level 3:** Focuses on a few topics and includes key professional development dates and assessment/ analysis windows
- **20/20 Practice:** Focuses on a few topics and includes key professional development dates, assessment/ analysis windows, and collaborative planning time and coaching themes

---

20 Teachers receive enough support and coaching to practice a new skill until they attain mastery:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

> **Differentiation Based on Teacher Need**
>
> Individual professional growth support is differentiated based on teacher need, as measured through multiple data sources

21 Individual professional growth goals linked to performance standards and school priorities are collaboratively developed at the start of the year.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

22 Data is used to identify teachers' professional growth needs and differentiate support needed:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

23 New and struggling teachers receive more and targeted professional growth support from instructional experts:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

> **Sufficient Collaboration Time**
>
> Sufficient time is scheduled for collaborative work and professional growth.

24 Time scheduled for collaborative planning time for teaching teams that share content is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Not scheduled
- **Level 2:** Less than 60 minutes weekly
- **Level 3:** Between 60-90 consecutive minutes weekly
- **20/20 Practice:** 90 or more consecutive minutes weekly

25 Time scheduled for collaborative planning time for teaching teams that share content vertically is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Never
- **Level 2:** 1 time annually
- **Level 3:** 2-3 times annually
- **20/20 Practice:** Quarterly

26 Time scheduled for collaborative planning time for teaching teams that share students is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Not scheduled
- **Level 2:** Less than 60 minutes weekly
- **Level 3:** Between 60-90 consecutive minutes weekly
- **20/20 Practice:** 90 or more consecutive minutes weekly

---

27 All faculty participate in the following number of days for professional growth before the start of the school year:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** No days
- **Level 2:** 1 to 3 days
- **Level 3:** 4 to 5 days
- **20/20 Practice:** 6 to 10 days

---

28 The school year calendar includes the following time for faculty professional development:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Infrequent meetings and/or PD sessions
- **Level 2:** Monthly faculty or ILT meetings only
- **Level 3:** 1 to 3 half days every month
- **20/20 Practice:** 1 half day every full week (or time equivalent by month)

---

29 Instructional experts spend the following proportions of their time observing, coaching, and evaluating teachers; planning for and facilitating data-driven CPT meetings and other professional development; and improving their own CCRS knowledge and coaching skills:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 40%
- **Level 2:** 40-59%
- **Level 3:** 60 to 80%
- **20/20 Practice:** More than 80%

---

30 Time allocated to support the professional learning of instructional experts, including instructional expert development meetings, group learning walks, outside/district professional development, and weekly principal supervision, is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Not scheduled
- **Level 2:** Less than 60 minutes bi-weekly
- **Level 3:** Between 60-90 consecutive minutes bi-weekly
- **20/20 Practice:** More than 90 consecutive minutes bi-weekly

Talent Management and Teacher Leadership

Your Score:

Assessment	★ Level 1	★★ Level 2	★★★ Level 3	★★★★ 20/20 Best Practice
Clear and Fair Evaluation Processes				
Rigorous Interview Process				
School Vision and Assets				
Staff Assigment				
Supervision and Support				
Teacher Leader Roles				

> ### Clear and Fair Evaluation Processes
>
> Clear and fair evaluation processes accurately recognize and support the retention of the most effective teachers as well as the persistent exit of low performers.

1 Clear and fair evaluation processes accurately recognize and support the retention of the most effective teachers as well as the persistent exit of low-performers.

NO ANSWER

Teachers who chronically under-perform are exited efficiently through fair evaluations:
- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

> ### Rigorous Interview Process
>
> A rigorous interview process, as early as possible in the district's hiring cycle, guides hiring and assignment decisions, and includes demonstration lessons, faculty interviews and reference checks.

2 Hiring decisions are made:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** After other area schools—all positions are not filled until after school begins
- **Level 2:** After the end of the previous school year, but all positions are filled before the start of the year
- **Level 3:** Before the end of the previous school year
- **20/20 Practice:** By mid-spring of the previous school year

3 Regarding an interview process that includes a) demonstration lessons b) faculty interviews and c) reference checks, my school:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Does not include these components
- **Level 2:** Includes at least one of these components
- **Level 3:** Includes at least two of these components, including demonstration lessons
- **20/20 Practice:** Includes all these components for every teacher candidate

4 New hires are selected based on their belief in the school's core values and practices and ability to fill missing instructional content and skill gaps in teaching teams:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

School Vision and Assets

The school vision and assets (i.e. what makes this school an excellent place to work) are defined and marketed to attract great teachers who fit hiring priorities.

5 My school has deliberately defined assets (e.g., collaborative culture, frequent coaching) that attracts high-quality candidates to our highest priority positions:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Strongly disagree
- **Level 2:** Disagree
- **Level 3:** Agree
- **20/20 Practice:** Strongly agree

6 My school leader and those who support recruitment and hiring consistently use updated print and online marketing materials that highlight school vision and assets, and uses these materials in outreach to candidates (e.g., job fairs):

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Strongly disagree
- **Level 2:** Disagree
- **Level 3:** Agree
- **20/20 Practice:** Strongly agree

7 My school has partnerships or internal structures (ie. Intern, apprenticeship programs) that consistently supply effective teachers:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Strongly disagree
- **Level 2:** Disagree
- **Level 3:** Agree
- **20/20 Practice:** Strongly agree

Staff Assigment

Staff assignment is based on the school's needs and individual's strengths.

8 In high-priority areas, the percentage of teachers who are effective or highly effective is approximately:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 25%
- **Level 2:** Between 25% and 50%
- **Level 3:** Between 50% and 75%
- **20/20 Practice:** Between 75% and 100%

9 Teachers are assigned to specialized roles according to their strengths:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

Supervision and Support

Clear lines of supervision support the growth and development of all staff members.

10 The supervision structure clearly documents each person's direct supervisor, who is accountable for his/her growth and development:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** For no staff members
- **Level 2:** For a few staff members
- **Level 3:** For some staff members
- **20/20 Practice:** For all staff members

11 Each staff member's job responsibilities are clearly documented and updated as needed:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** For no staff members
- **Level 2:** For a few staff members
- **Level 3:** For some staff members
- **20/20 Practice:** For all staff members

12 The supervision structure ensures each supervisor's span of review (i.e., number of people he/she is responsible for supporting) is no more than 12 to 1:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** For no supervisors
- **Level 2:** For a few supervisors
- **Level 3:** For some supervisors
- **20/20 Practice:** For all supervisors

> ## Teacher Leader Roles
>
> Teacher leader roles extend the reach and support the retention of highly effective teachers

13   Teacher leader roles include different position descriptions, clear selection criteria (e.g. content expertise) and processes, as well as accountability systems:

       NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

---

14   Roles for highly effective teachers offer meaningful opportunities to extend their reach, including coaching other teachers, facilitating collaborative planning time, refining curriculum and/or leading professional development:

       NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

---

15   The compensation and/or additional time provided to teacher leaders matches the responsibilities for which they are accountable:

       NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Strongly disagree
- **Level 2:** Disagree
- **Level 3:** Agree
- **20/20 Practice:** Strongly agree

---

16   The teachers that teacher leaders directly support have high or improving student performance outcomes:

       NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Strongly disagree
- **Level 2:** Disagree
- **Level 3:** Agree
- **20/20 Practice:** Strongly agree

---

17   High performing teachers are more likely to stay at my school because they have access to leadership roles:

       NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Strongly disagree
- **Level 2:** Disagree
- **Level 3:** Agree
- **20/20 Practice:** Strongly agree

Personalized Time and Attention

Your Score:

Assessment	★ Level 1	★★ Level 2	★★★ Level 3	★★★★ 20/20 Best Practice
Differentiated Strategies and Supports				
Frequent Adjustments to Supports				
Learning Environments that Meet Needs				
Resources Deliberately Matched				
Rigorous Grade-Level Instruction				

Differentiated Strategies and Supports

Instructional strategies and supports are differentiated in all courses to ensure students have the right supports to meet academic goals.

1 Students within the same classroom receive different supports and instructional strategies, such as small group instruction, based on relevant student data, to meet the same content mastery goals:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

Frequent Adjustments to Supports

Supports, interventions, and student groupings are adjusted frequently based on data of student progress.

2 Targeted student groupings for extra support (including changes to group size, content focus, tech use, and/or assignment to teachers) are:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Fixed - changes are made only at year's end
- **Level 2:** Adjusted infrequently
- **Level 3:** Adjusted at least four times a year
- **20/20 Practice:** Adjusted more than four times a year based on student progress

3 Assignments and adjustments to differentiation and intervention structures are based on:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** No formal data informs adjustments or interventions
- **Level 2:** Anecdotal data and/or assessments that are not common among teachers
- **Level 3:** A limited number of data sources, at least one of which includes informal formative assessment tasks, interim assessments, or end of course assessments
- **20/20 Practice:** Several data sources, informal formative assessment tasks, interim assessments, and end of course assessments

Learning Environments that Meet Needs

All students are enrolled in learning environments that meed their needs while maximizing opportunities for heterogeneous settings.

4 Special education and ELL (specialists) services are: NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Isolated from core instruction
- **Level 2:** Delivered mostly through pullout—however, there is good communication between specialists and regular education teachers on student goals, progress, and interventions
- **Level 3:** Delivered through an inclusion model whenever possible and integrated into the school's skill-based grouping strategy—however, specialists serve students with disabilities or ELLs only
- **20/20 Practice:** Delivered through an inclusion model whenever possible and integrated to align smoothly with core instruction; specialists form skill-based groups that may include general education students

5 Students spend the following amount of time in heterogeneous classes: NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Almost none
- **Level 2:** Some
- **Level 3:** Most
- **20/20 Practice:** Almost all

Resources Deliberately Matched

School resources are deliberately matched to student needs to ensure sufficient time, expertise, and attention for content mastery for all students.

6 The percentage of students who have sufficient time in their course schedules for them to master core content is: NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

7 The percentage of students who have more than 1 period/day that is unscheduled is: NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** More than 20%
- **Level 2:** 11-20%
- **Level 3:** 5-10%
- **20/20 Practice:** Less than 5%

8   Students who are struggling are allocated: NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** No additional targeted learning time
- **Level 2:** Some additional time in target area
- **Level 3:** 50% more time in target area than students who are at proficient levels
- **20/20 Practice:** More than 50% more time in target area than students who are proficient

---

9   High-priority areas (high-priority subjects, transition grades, courses for struggling students) are assigned the most effective and expert teachers: NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

---

10   Group sizes are reduced for high priority areas (high priority subjects, transition grades, remedial/support courses, courses for struggling students) by assigning additional staff and/or scheduling varying period lengths: NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

---

11   For subjects that require extensive feedback (e.g., writing) and/or settings where students need more individualized attention, teacher loads (total number of students a teacher teaches throughout the week) are: NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** 100+ students
- **Level 2:** 100-70 students
- **Level 3:** 50-70 students
- **20/20 Practice:** Fewer than 50 students

> ### Rigorous Grade-Level Instruction
>
> Core content course provide rigorous grade-level instruction for all students using CCRS-aligned curriculum and materials.

12 The school has shared and CCRS-aligned expectations for the level of rigor in student tasks and how they are assessed/graded:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** For only some grades and/or content areas
- **Level 2:** For most grades, in ELA and math only
- **Level 3:** For all grades, in ELA and math only
- **20/20 Practice:** For all grades and content areas

---

13 Your course taking sequence:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Is not aligned with rigorous graduation requirements or college and career ready standards
- **Level 2:** Is deliberately designed to enable some students, regardless of entry point, to graduate college and career ready
- **Level 3:** Is deliberately designed to enable most students, regardless of entry point, to graduate college and career ready
- **20/20 Practice:** Is deliberately designed to enable all students, regardless of entry point, to graduate college and career ready

---

14 Based on a CCRS-aligned observation tool (e.g. IPG), the proportion of classrooms that display a high degree of high-quality CCRS-aligned instruction is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

---

15 Highest priority content areas are allocated:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 15% additional learning time
- **Level 2:** Between 15% and 30% more time than other content areas
- **Level 3:** Between 30% and 50% more time than other content areas
- **20/20 Practice:** More than 50% more time than other content areas

Responsive School Community

Your Score:

Assessment	★ Level 1	★★ Level 2	★★★ Level 3	★★★★ 20/20 Best Practice
Expectations and Routines				
Intensive Support				
Social-Emotional Competencies				
Social-Emotional Feedback Loop				
Student Relevancy				
Student-Adult Relationships				
Student-Student Relationships				

Expectations and Routines

Consistent expectations for behavior and school-wide routines are grounded in a vision for school values fully shared by the students, families, and staff.

---

1   My school's values, grounded in a vision for how we should treat each other:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Don't exist, or exist in a very limited way
- **Level 2:** Exist, but without strong buy-in
- **Level 3:** Exist, and the majority of teachers and staff buy in
- **20/20 Practice:** Exist and are fully embraced by the whole school community

---

2   The percentage of parents/families who agree that school values are communicated clearly to them is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

---

3   The percentage of parents/families who feel welcomed and participate in school:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

---

4   Expectations for behavior and routines are promoted through:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Isolated systems in individual classrooms
- **Level 2:** No school-wide systems, but some team-generated common systems
- **Level 3:** Common, school-wide systems—however, implementation is inconsistent
- **20/20 Practice:** Common, school-wide systems with consistent implementation

---

5   Structures exist that dedicate time and staff to upholding school values (e.g., professional development, morning meeting, Dean of Culture, etc.):

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** In some cases, and do not fully meet needs
- **Level 3:** Mostly, but do not fully meet needs
- **20/20 Practice:** Always, and fully meet the continuum of students' needs

> ### Intensive Support
>
> Students who need more intensive support are identified and linked to effective services quickly, using outside providers when necessary.

6 Relevant data on social-emotional indicators is used to inform interventions:

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

---

7 Students who need more intensive social-emotional support are referred to external providers:

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Too slowly- students' needs typically intensify before accessing support
- **Level 3:** Quickly enough for some students who require support but not others
- **20/20 Practice:** Quickly for all students who require support

---

8 A clear system to link students to external providers when necessary is:

- **Level 1:** Non-existent
- **Level 2:** Defined, but not used with fidelity
- **Level 3:** Functional for most students
- **20/20 Practice:** Highly efficient with clearly defined roles

> ### Social-Emotional Competencies
>
> Students have developmentally appropriate opportunities to learn and practice core social and emotional learning competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making.

9 A research-based, developmentally appropriate curriculum is used with fidelity:

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** In some classrooms
- **Level 3:** In most classrooms
- **20/20 Practice:** In all classrooms

---

10 Sufficient time is dedicated during the student day to learning and practicing these competencies (e.g., morning meeting or advisory):

- **Level 1:** Strongly disagree
- **Level 2:** Disagree
- **Level 3:** Agree
- **20/20 Practice:** Strongly agree

Social-Emotional Feedback Loop

A feedback loop exists between classroom teachers, external and school-based social and emotional learning support providers and students' families

11 A feedback loop among classroom teachers, external and school-based social and emotional learning support providers and students' families is implemented:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** Sometimes
- **Level 3:** Most of the time
- **20/20 Practice:** Always

12 Classroom teachers work with external and school-based social and emotional learning experts on how to better support high-needs students:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Rarely or never
- **Level 2:** On an ad hoc basis
- **Level 3:** Regularly, but not through a defined process
- **20/20 Practice:** Regularly, through a clear process with defined roles

Student Relevancy

Students have the opportunity to connect with their school's community on the basis of personal interests and motivations.

13 The percentage of students who feel personally connected to their school community on the basis of personal interests and motivations is:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

Student-Adult Relationships

Each student is known deeply by adults in the school.

14 The percentage of students who feel well known in my school is: NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

---

15 In high-priority areas, low loads (number of distinct students a teacher is responsible for knowing) are often used as a tool to support deep relationships between students and teachers. In high-priority areas in my school, teacher loads are: NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** 100+ students
- **Level 2:** 100-70 students
- **Level 3:** 50-70 students
- **20/20 Practice:** Fewer than 50 students

Student-Student Relationships

Students have deep and respectful personal relationships with other students.

16 Students have deep and respectful personal relationships with other students. The percent of students who agree that they have deep and respectful relationships with other students is: NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

Growth-oriented Adult Culture

Your Score:

Assessment	★ Level 1	★★ Level 2	★★★ Level 3	★★★★ 20/20 Best Practice
Collaborative Problem Solving				
Collective School Improvement Goals				
Constructive Conflict				
Continuous Learning				
Mutual Trust				
Shared Vision				

Collaborative Problem Solving

Colleagues and leaders solves problems together and work in a collaborative envrionment

1 Percentage of teachers agreeing with the following statement: Colleagues and leaders problem solve and work together in a collaborative environment.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

Collective School Improvement Goals

There is collective agreement over school improvement goals and visibility into progress against these goals over time.

2 Percentage of teachers agreeing with the following statement: There is collective agreement over school improvement goals and visibility into progress against these goals over time.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

3 Percentage of teachers agreeing with the following statement: These measures of progress inform daily actions and decisions.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

Constructive Conflict

Colleagues and leaders are open to difficult conversations and engage in constructive conflict.

4 % of teachers agreeing with the following statement: Teachers and leaders are open to difficult conversations and engage in constructive conflict.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

Continuous Learning

Colleagues and leaders have a shared commitment to the continuous learning of adults and students

5 Percentage of teachers agreeing with the following statement: My school leader is committed to improving my instructional practice.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

---

6 Percentage of teachers agreeing with the following statement: Teachers demonstrate a shared commitment to the continuous learning of adults and students.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

---

7 Percentage of teachers agreeing with the following statement: Teachers receive feedback and coaching that can help them improve teaching.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

---

8 % of teachers agreeing with the following statement: Teachers at my school are encouraged to reflect on their own practices.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

> ### Mutual Trust
> Colleagues and leaders trust each other

9 Percentage of teachers agreeing with the following statement: Teachers in my school feel comfortable raising issues and concerns that are important to them.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

---

10 Percentage of teachers agreeing with the following statement: Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

---

11 Percentage of teachers agreeing with the following statement: Teachers in my school feel safe taking instructional risks/innovating when they think it will benefit their students, and ask for help in doing so:

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

---

12 Percentage of teachers agreeing with the following statement: I feel that my school leadership genuinely listens to me and that my voice is heard.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%

> ## Shared Vision
>
> There is collective ownership among faculty and staff over a vision for what effective teaching and learning looks like. *This refers to shared ownership over the instructional vision for what teachers can and should do in their classrooms on a daily basis.

13 Percentage of teachers agreeing with the following statement: Teachers at my school share a common vision for effective teaching and learning.

NO ANSWER

- **Level 1:** Less than 49%
- **Level 2:** 50-74%
- **Level 3:** 75-89%
- **20/20 Practice:** 90-100%