MARIAN UNIVERSITY
Indianapolis

Academy for Teaching and Learning Leadership School Evaluation

Enlace Academy

Prepared For:	Office of Education Innovation, Office of Mayor Gregory A. Ballard, City of Indianapolis
Site Visit Date:	October 22, 2014
Principal:	Mr. Kevin Kubacki
Evaluators:	Cynthia Farren Sr. Jeanne Hagelskamp Dr. Jeffery Kauffman James Larson LaTonya Turner

Table of Contents

Part I: School Evaluation Overview and Methodology 3

Part II: Enlace Academy Background Information 5

Part III: Core Question Four Indicator Ratings 6

Part IV: Findings[1] 7

Indicator 4.1: Curriculum and Supporting Materials 7

Indicator 4.2: Pedagogy 10

Indicator 4.4: Assessment 13

Indicator 4.5: Talent 16

Indicator 4.6: Mission 19

Indicator 4.7: Climate 20

Indicator 4.8: Communication 22

Indicator 4.9: Special Education 24

Indicator 4.10: English as a New Language 26

Part V: Recommendations 28

[1] Because Enlace Academy does not serve high school students, Indicator 4.3 (i.e., supporting students for post-secondary options) is not addressed in this report.

Part I: School Evaluation Overview and Methodology

Enlace Academy ("Enlace") is a public charter school sponsored by the Indianapolis Mayor's Office of Education Innovation ("OEI"). Enlace is in the second academic year of its first charter term with OEI. During the second academic year of the first charter term, OEI requires its sponsored schools to undergo a comprehensive review guided by its performance framework. The OEI performance framework includes four core questions:

1. Is the educational program a success?
2. Is the organization in sound fiscal health?
3. Is the organization effective and well-run?
4. Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success?

The school evaluation described herein addresses OEI's fourth core question. This report includes:

1. An explanation of the school evaluation process
2. An overview of Enlace Academy's demographic data
3. Findings from the school evaluation
4. Recommendations for school improvement

Process

The school evaluation process involved three phases – document review, survey analysis, and site visit. Prior to the site visit, the evaluation team reviewed Enlace's mission statement, school improvement plan, and school discipline policy. This review informed the questions asked during site visit focus groups and one-on-one

interviews. Also before the site visit, the team analyzed staff responses to survey questions aligned to core question four. Themes from the survey also helped to shape our learning agenda and objectives for the site visit. Finally, the site visit consisted of the following components:

- Document analysis (e.g., scopes and sequences, pacing guides, lesson plans)
- Classroom and shared space observations
- Focus groups with teachers, students, and family members
    - Teachers
    - Students
    - Family members
- Interviews with the principal, dean, Special Education teacher, and English as a New Language ("ENL") services coordinator
- Review of files and supports for Special Education students
- Review of files and supports for ENL students

Part II: Enlace Academy Background Information

Enlace Academy is an independent public charter school located on the west side of Indianapolis. Founded in 2013, Enlace initially served students in grades kindergarten through three, and this year began offering fourth grade. Over the next four academic years, Enlace hopes to add a grade per year until it serves students in kindergarten through eighth grade.

Enlace's mission is to "foster the character, cultivate the intellect, and ignite the imagination of her students as they become leaders who choose their own future in high school, college, and beyond. The school's vision is to "focus on strong habit formation, critical thinking skills, and positive relationships so her students can grow to be the best version of themselves as they become agents of change in their communities."

Student Demographics

As reported on the Indiana Department of Education's "Compass" data center, Enlace Academy enrolled 106 students during the 2013-2014 academic year.[2][3] 97.2% of students were eligible to receive free or reduced price meals. The ethnic breakdown of the student population was as follows: Hispanic (60.4%), Black (34%), White (3.8%), and Multiracial (1.9%). Roughly 7% of students took part in the school's Special Education program, while approximately 55% of students were considered to be English Language Learners.

---

[2] Indiana Department of Education. (2014, Fall). Enrollment Overview. *IDOE: Compass*. Retrieved November 7, 2014, from http://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/enrollment.aspx?type=school&id=5667.
[3] As of December 2014, the Indiana Department of Education has not yet published official enrollment data for the 2014-2015 school year.

Part III: Core Question Four Indicator Ratings

The fourth core question of the OEI's performance framework consists of ten indicators[4] and three possible ratings.

Does not meet standard	School exhibits significant concerns in two or more elements of the indicator
Approaching standard	School exhibits significant concerns in one element of the indicator
Meets standard	School does not exhibit significant concerns in any elements of the indicator

The chart below provides a synopsis of the evaluation team's ratings of Enlace Academy.

Core Question Four Indicator	Rating
4.1: Curriculum and Supporting Materials	Meets standard
4.2: Pedagogy	Approaching standard
4.4: Assessment	Meets standard
4.5: Talent	Approaching standard
4.6: Mission	Meets standard
4.7: Climate	Meets standard
4.8: Communication	Meets standard
4.9: Special Education	Approaching standard
4.10: English as a New Language	Approaching standard

[4] Because Enlace Academy does not serve high school students, Indicator 4.3 (i.e., supporting students for post-secondary options) is not addressed in this report.

Part IV: Findings

Indicator 4.1: Curriculum and Supporting Materials	Meets standard

Element	Evaluation
a) Does the curriculum align with state standards?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• Enlace uses Core Knowledge and Singapore Math as their core curricula for English/Language and Mathematics, respectively. • Both Core Knowledge and Singapore Math are well aligned to the Common Core State Standards and the new Indiana Academic Standards.	

Element	Evaluation
b) Does the school conduct systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• While Enlace does not yet have a formalized curriculum review protocol and process, the school's leadership team did thoroughly review the school's curriculum this summer, informed by student-level summative assessment data. • As a result of this analysis, a few significant changes were made to the curriculum for the 2014-2015 school year. For example, data analysis showed kindergarten students needed a few weeks of lessons bridging them from their existing knowledge and skills to the Core Knowledge curriculum. As such, these lessons were created over the summer and added into the kindergarten curriculum for the 2014-2015 school year.	

Element	Evaluation
c) Does the school regularly review its scopes and sequences to ensure presentation of content in time for testing?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• School leaders and teachers use a battery of benchmark (e.g., i-Ready, STEP, locally-developed formative assessments) tests on a quarterly basis to identify gaps in students' learning. These benchmark assessments are designed to ascertain the extent to which students are mastering core content and essential skills. Informed by their analyses of assessment results, teachers modify their lesson plans accordingly. Capitalizing on the school's model of rotating students through three different instructional delivery modes, teachers modify students' online instruction, teacher-led instruction, and/or collaborative activities based on assessment results.	

Element	Evaluation
d) Does the school have a sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas that focuses on core (prioritized) learning objectives?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• The Core Knowledge and Singapore Math curricula provide Enlace's leaders and teachers clear and detailed scopes and sequences for all current and future grades served.	

Element	Evaluation
e) Does the staff understand and uniformly use curriculum documents and related program materials to effectively deliver instruction?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• The school leader reports that all teachers are bought into Enlace's instructional model and understand how to utilize curriculum materials and resources to actualize said model. • During this summer's staff professional development, trainers from both Core Knowledge and Singapore Math delivered professional development. The school leader noted these trainings also afforded teachers opportunities to ask detailed questions about how best to implement the curriculum after having delivered it during the previous school year. • The evaluation team's classroom observations did not surface any significant variation in how the curriculum is implemented across classrooms.	

Element	Evaluation
f) Does the staff have programs and materials to effectively deliver the curriculum?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• 100% of respondents to the staff survey agreed (n=3) or strongly agreed (n=16) that they have the materials and resources needed to effectively deliver their curriculum. • 100% of respondents to the staff survey agreed (n=3) or strongly agreed (n=16) that the materials and resources they have access to are high quality. • 100% of respondents to the staff survey agreed (n=4) or strongly agreed (n=15) that Enlace has a clear procedure for acquiring additional materials and resources. • During classroom observations and the teacher focus group, the evaluation team did not observe or hear any evidence that the school lacks any programs or materials needed to effectively deliver its curriculum.	

Indicator 4.2: Pedagogy	Approaching standard

Element	Evaluation
a) Is the curriculum implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• Enlace's school model consists of three different instructional delivery mechanisms – teacher-led instruction, online instruction, and collaborative activities/stations. • The evaluation team observed this model and its varied learning strategies in practice across all core classroom observations.	

Element	Evaluation
b) Does the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery possess the appropriate rigor and challenge?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• In the majority of classrooms observed, activities, assignments, and groupings of students were found to have the appropriate level of rigor and challenge for students. • For those classrooms where pacing and rigor were noted as being only partially appropriate, the prevailing issue involved how students were engaging with material in the absence of direct support from the lead teacher or instructional aide. Please refer to section 4.2.d for more information about this growth area.	

Element	Evaluation
c) Is instruction, as delivered, focused on core learning objectives?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• With one exception, all classrooms were delivering instruction in a manner tied to an explicit and posted core learning objective. Even in the case of the exception, the instruction was focused on a core learning objective, but said objective was not visible in the classroom.	

Element	Evaluation
d) Do instructional activities possess variety and/or use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities, and learning needs?	Yes / **No**
Findings	
• When students were not working directly with the lead teacher or instructional aide at a station, observers commonly noted a decrease in student engagement and an increase in student misbehavior. Additionally, teachers flagged in their focus group wanting additional training on how best to work collaboratively with their instructional aides to promote student engagement and learning throughout lessons. • Thus while instruction was generally strong across classrooms, it is worth noting that improving in this area will likely allow Enlace's instructional model to be implemented with full fidelity.	

Element	Evaluation
e) Does the school supply sufficient feedback to staff on instructional practices?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• All but one respondent to the staff survey strongly agreed (n=13) or agreed (n=5) that Enlace has a clear procedure for providing teachers with feedback on their instruction. • Similarly, all but one respondent to the staff survey strongly agreed (n=12) or agreed (n=6) that they receive timely feedback on their instruction. • The vast majority of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=16) or agreed (n=2) that the feedback they receive on their instruction helps them improve their practice.	

Indicator 4.4: Assessment	Meets standard

Element	Evaluation
a) Are the standardized and/or classroom assessments accurate and useful measures of established learning standards/objectives?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• 100% of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=12) or agreed (n=7) that Enlace's formative assessments are aligned to their classes' scopes and sequences. • Enlace utilizes formative assessments designed to monitor students' progress towards the development of core literacy skills (i.e., i-Ready, STEP) and math skills (i.e., in-house math assessments adapted from Uncommon Schools). • Additionally, teachers use diagnostic assessments in reading and math along with English as a New Language assessments (when applicable) to determine incoming students' academic needs. This battery of diagnostic assessments is particularly important for Enlace given that it's a new school and adding a new grade annually.	

Element	Evaluation
b) Does the school distribute assessment results to classroom teachers in a timely and useful manner to influence instructional decisions?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• 100% of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=12) or agreed (n=7) that they receive their students' formative assessment data in a timely manner. • 100% of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=13) or agreed (n=6) that the way they receive their students' formative assessment data makes it easy to determine how to modify instruction appropriately. • Additionally, Enlace's quarterly data days provide dedicated time and structure for analyzing student-level data and determining how best to modify instruction.	

Element	Evaluation
c) Does the school select assessments that have sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• Enlace's diagnostic, formative, and benchmark assessments are selected and designed with varied student learning abilities in mind. • For example, Enlace teachers are expected to incorporate varied checks for understanding into their daily lessons to assess content and/or skill mastery in various ways (e.g., observation, computer-based assessments, questioning). • Enlace's benchmark assessments also vary in style and type. For instance, i-Ready is a computer-based test, while STEP is administered verbally. Moreover, STEP's administration can be differentiated by providing less verbal guidance and instead asking students to instead show their reading comprehension skills.	

Element	Evaluation
d) Does the school use assessments with sufficient frequency to inform instructional decisions effectively?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• Enlace utilizes diagnostic assessments in reading and math during home visits to incoming students to determine their academic needs. • During the school year, Enlace delivers i-Ready assessments in a scaffolded manner daily, monthly, and quarterly. • Administering the STEP and locally-created math benchmark assessments are much more time intensive and thus delivered quarterly.	

Element	Evaluation
e) Does the school use assessment results to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• 100% of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=12) or agreed (n=7) that Enlace has provided them with the training and support necessary to modify their instruction based on students' formative assessment data. • Teachers have numerous and reoccurring opportunities to work with their peers to analyze data and determine the best course of action for instructional shifts (e.g., weekly grade level meetings, quarterly data days).	

Indicator 4.5: Talent	Approaching standard

Element	Evaluation
a) Are the school's hiring processes organized and used to support the success of new staff members?	Yes / **No**
Findings	
• The school leader has developed and utilizes a clear, detailed, and high-quality protocol for vetting and hiring staff. • Thus the concern with this element is not the organization or quality of the school's hiring processes, but rather how new staff members are inducted and mentored to support their individual growth and the school's overall success. • As evidence, the area cited on the staff survey as most in need of growth pertained to staff induction and mentoring processes (n=5 greatest area for growth, n=6 second greatest area for growth). • As a new and relatively small school, this finding is not particularly surprising. The principal noted that establishing a robust, formal peer mentoring program for staff is a priority, but that it has not yet come to fruition.	

Element	Evaluation
b) Does the school deploy sufficient number of faculty and staff to maximize instructional time and capacity?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• Each classroom in grades K-2 has both a lead teacher and an instructional aide. • These instructional aides are essentially completing a fellowship whereby if they demonstrate effectiveness and a lead teacher opportunity exists, they could matriculate into that open role. As such, Enlace has created its own residency program to identify, develop, and retain talent. • Over time, the school leader hopes to augment this residency program by expanding the number of grades with instructional aides, improving their pay, increasing pre-requisites, and ultimately, making the program more competitive.	

Element	Evaluation
c) Are faculty and staff certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• Faculty and staff are certified and trained in their assigned areas.	

Element	Evaluation
d) Is professional development related to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• 100% of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=15) or agreed (n=3) that the professional development provided by Enlace is targeted to address the school's demonstrated areas for growth. • 100% of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=13) or agreed (n=5) that the professional development provided by Enlace is targeted to address their individual areas for growth. • 100% of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=13) or agreed (n=5) that the professional development provided by Enlace allows them to improve their students' achievement and growth. • Enlace has a robust professional development schedule consisting of four main components – weekly grade level meetings, monthly staff meetings, monthly teacher professional development, and quarterly data days. • Instructional improvement is the primary focus of the grade level meetings, monthly teacher professional development, and data days. Staff meetings can cover instruction, but often focus on logistics and other whole-school topics. • The topics for these meetings are directly connected to the school's instructional priorities, but can and do shift based on demonstrated needs (e.g., evidence from student-level data).	

Element	Evaluation
e) Are professional development opportunities determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• 100% of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=10) or agreed (n=8) that the professional development offerings provided by Enlace are determined through analyses of student data. • Enlace uses weekly grade level meetings and quarterly data days to review, analyze, and discuss the implications of student-level data. Weekly grade level meetings cover instructional results from the previous week and data days examine formative assessment results. A key objective for both grade level meetings and data days is to determined, based on student-level data, what instructional strategies would be usual to practice and receive training on during professional development.	

Element	Evaluation
f) Does the school explicitly and regularly implement its teacher evaluation plan with a clear process and criteria?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• All but one survey respondent strongly agreed (n=10) or agreed (n=8) that Enlace's teacher evaluation process is clear. • All but one survey respondent strongly agreed (n=10) or agreed (n=8) that Enlace's teacher evaluation process is fair and accurate. • All but one survey respondent strongly agreed (n=11) or agreed (n=7) that Enlace's teacher evaluation process is implemented consistently. • All but one survey respondent strongly agreed (n=12) or agreed (n=6) that Enlace's teacher evaluation process has a clear timeline for observations and feedback. • All but two survey respondents strongly agreed (n=8) or agreed (n=9) that Enlace's timeline for the teacher evaluation process (e.g., observations occur on time) is consistently followed.	

Indicator 4.6: Mission	Meets standard

Element	Evaluation
a) Does the school have a mission that is shared by all stakeholders?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• 100% of survey respondents strongly agree (n=16) or agreed (n=4) that they have a clear understanding of the school's mission statement. • The evaluation team did not unearth any evidence that suggests stakeholders are not bought in to the school's mission statement. Students, family members, and staff were enthused about the school and its direction during focus groups.	

Element	Evaluation
b) Do stakeholders possess widespread knowledge and commitment to the intentions of the school's mission?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• 100% of survey respondents strongly agree (n=18) or agreed (n=2) that they are committed to the school's mission statement. • When survey respondents were asked if they believe all key stakeholder groups (e.g., students, families, teachers, administrators) are deeply and equally committed to Enlace's mission, all but one individual strongly agreed (n=6) or agreed (n=13). • Similar to the previous element, the evaluation team did not find any evidence to suggest stakeholders are not committed to the intentions of the school's mission statement.	

Indicator 4.7: Climate	Meets standard

Element	Evaluation
a) Does the school have clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior?	**Yes** / No

Findings

- Enlace's approach to behavior management stems from the book Teaching with Love and Logic and its recommended system of logical consequences delivered with empathy. This "natural consequences" approach is designed to promote students' understanding of how their decisions and actions impact themselves and those around them.
- In both shared and classroom spaces, the evaluation team observed signage promoting this approach to behavior management by positively framing expectations while still clearly defining the rules.
- 100% of staff survey respondents strongly agreed (n=16) or agreed (n=3) that Enlace has clearly stated rules for students and that these rules reinforce positive behavior.
- Survey respondents ranked the school's culture and climate as its greatest strength (n=9 greatest strength, n=5 second greatest strength).

Element	Evaluation
b) Does the school's discipline approach possess high expectations for student behavior?	**Yes** / No

Findings

- Teachers all strongly agreed (n=17) or agreed (n=2) that the school's rules set high expectation for student behavior.
- A prominent theme from the student focus group was how appreciative students were of the safe, calm, and orderly learning environment at Enlace.
- All teachers also noted in the survey that they strongly agree (n=14) or agree (n=5) that the school consistently follow-through on student rules and consequences.

Element	Evaluation
c) Are interactions between faculty and students respectful and supportive? Are faculty and students clear about processes for conflict resolution?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• 100% of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=15) or agreed (n=4) that interactions between staff and students are respectful and supportive. • 100% of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=11) or agreed (n=8) that Enlace has a clear process for resolving conflicts between staff and students. • 100% of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=13) or agreed (n=6) that conflicts between staff and students are resolved in a complete and timely manner.	

Element	Evaluation
d) Are interactions between faculty and administration professional and constructive?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• 100% of survey respondents strongly agreed (n=17) or agreed (n=2) that interactions between staff and school administrators are productive and professional.	

Indicator 4.8: Communication	Meets standard

Element	Evaluation
a) Does the school have active and ongoing communication with parents?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• The school hosts a themed family night once a month (e.g., International Festival in September). Attendance, particularly at the September event, is strong (i.e., 200 to 250 attendees). • Every Friday, teachers send home a classroom-specific newsletter. • Every month, the principal sends home a newsletter for family members. • To share updates with family members, Enlace uses a phone blast system to leave messages, both voice and text.	

Element	Evaluation
b) Does the school utilize communications that are both timely and relevant to parental concerns?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• The school administered a family survey at the end of the 2013-2014 academic year. Because transportation was raised as family members' chief concern, Enlace began offering free transportation to students this year. This is evidence that Enlace not only collects input from family members about how to improve the school, but also acts upon their feedback. As the principal noted, the focus is on "follow-up and follow-through" with concerns raised by parents. • Additionally, in the family member focus group, participants noted that they find teachers and the school leader accessible and responsive to their questions and concerns.	

Element	Evaluation
c) Does the school communicate student academic progress and achievement in reports that are understood by parents?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• Every school day, students leave the building with a homework folder. This folder contains the student's own assessment of how they did that day in terms of key character traits along with a clear, detailed description of their homework. At the end of each week, teachers also send home an assessment each student's academic and behavioral performance. • Quarterly parent-teacher conferences are student-led to promote students' agency over their own learning and to help overcome language barriers. The principal described successful efforts to engage parents, students, and teachers in such conferences after the official date through numerous engagement strategies.	

Element	Evaluation
d) Are the school's communication methods designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• All communication from the school to family members in delivered in both English and Spanish. • As mentioned before, student-led conferences also help surmount language barriers between family members and teachers. • The principal also noted that meeting times are intentionally varied to allow family members to attend, regardless of their personal and/or professional schedules.	

Indicator 4.9: Special Education	Approaching standard

Element	Evaluation
a) Do services outlined within Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) adequately match the exceptional needs of the student?	Yes / **No**
Findings	
• The evaluation team found three primary growth areas with this element. • First, general education teachers need additional training on the services outlined within IEPs as well as on strategies they should be utilizing to meet students' exceptional needs in the classroom. • Second and on a related note, the school's Response to Intervention plan should continue to be augmented and used as an intervention model to engage the staff regularly to better understand and meet students' exceptional needs. • Third, additional detail and clarity are needed in IEPs on what supports and programming will be provided to students who are two or more years behind in reading and/or math.	

Element	Evaluation
b) Do each of the needs identified within the IEPs have a corresponding goal and plan for assessment?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• IEPs clearly and explicitly identify students' needs and provide a corresponding goal and plan for assessment. • To be sure everyone is on the same page, we recommend clarifying the acronyms used to describe the assessments from which goals are set and defined. Such clarity will help ensure all individuals on a student's Case Conference Committee are speaking the same language and have a shared understanding of what her or his goals actually mean in practice.	

Element	Evaluation
c) Are the goals outlined in IEPs rigorous and based on state and national learning standards?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• Goals are clearly written in terms of levels and measurable through high-quality assessments that are aligned to state and national learning standards.	

Element	Evaluation
d) Does explicit evidence exist to demonstrate that goals have evolved each year as the student develops?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• There is clear evidence that students' IEP goals have evolved based on students' assessment results. Students' IEP goals are being adjusted to reflect their learning needs identified through assessments.	

Element	Evaluation
e) Is a specifically designed curriculum outlined in each IEP?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• IEPs outline curriculum and resources to meet goals and address students' needs.	

Indicator 4.10: English as a New Language	Approaching standard

Element	Evaluation
a) Do the appropriate staff have a clear understanding of current legislation, research and effective practices relating to the provision of ENL services?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• The teacher responsible for Enlace's ENL program has the necessary knowledge regarding ENL services, legislation, and best practices.	

Element	Evaluation
b) Are relationships with students, parents, and external providers well-managed and comply with law and regulation?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• The ENL services coordinator and the teacher of record meet annual with family members of ENL students. • When students are not progressing at the expected rate, the ENL services coordinator and the teacher of record also meet with family members to create an action plan.	

Element	Evaluation
c) Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations regarding ENL students?	**Yes** / No
Findings	
• ENL students are being provided appropriate services and Enlace staff, including but not limited to the ENL services coordinator, are annually communicating with family members about students' progress. • That said, the evaluation team did identify a few important ways to strengthen students' Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) (described in the next section).	

Element	Evaluation
d) Do Individual Learning Plans ("ILPs") contain all required information and incorporate best practices, such as measurable learning goals?	Yes / **No**
Findings	
• Students' ILPs contain some, but not all of the required information. For example, while ILPs often had accommodations listed, measurable learning goals were not provided. • Additionally, the accommodations listed for students did not seem to vary. For example, all fourth-grade ENL students' ILPs listed the same three accommodations. Thus tailoring these accommodations to students' unique needs is a growth area.	

Part V: Recommendations

Aligned to OEI's Core Question Four indicators, the review team's recommendations are described below.

Indicator 4.2: Pedagogy	Approaching standard
• Leverage professional development time to train teachers on how best to maximize student engagement and learning across all three components of the school's instructional design – online, teacher-led, collaborative activities and stations. Additionally, provide training on best practices for leveraging instructional aides to promote engagement and learning when students are not working directly with the lead teacher.	

Indicator 4.5: Talent	Approaching standard
• Based on staff input and best practices, develop and introduce a formal peer mentoring program to support the induction and growth of new teachers and new teachers to the building.	

Indicator 4.9: Special Education	Approaching standard
• Provide training and supports to general education teachers to improve their understanding of and ability to deliver the services outlined within students' IEPs in the general education setting. • Grow and improve the school's Response to Intervention plan as an intervention, as opposed to a resource, model that routinely engages staff to discuss ways to better meet students' exceptional needs. • For those students who are two or more years behind in reading and/or math, clearly define in their IEPs the supports and interventions that will be provided. • Given that students' IEP goals are often defined by assessments, clarify for all members of a student's Case Conference Committee what the acronyms mean that are used to describe these assessments and what these tests actually measure.	

Indicator 4.10: English as a New Language	Approaching standard
• Ensure all students' ILPs are appropriately filed and contained all required information, especially measurable learning goals. • Review students' accommodations described in their ILPs and be sure these accommodations are tailored to students' unique needs.	