



SALINAS UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT SYSTEMIC INSTRUCTIONAL REVIEW

2019-2020

ccee

California Collaborative
for Educational Excellence

Table of Contents

What is the Systemic Instructional Review?	5
The California Collaborative for Education Excellence	5
Project Inception	5
Data Collection	6
Report Features and Layout	7
Summary of Findings	7
Instructional Components, Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats Analysis	11
Culture, Practice & Planning Process	11
Finding 1a.	11
Finding 1b.	11
Finding 1c.	11
Discussion	11
SWOT: Culture Practice and Planning Process	12
Actions: Culture Practice and the Planning Process	13
Curriculum Development and Support	14
Finding 2a.	14
Finding 2b.	14
Finding 2c.	14
Discussion	15
SWOT: Curriculum Development and Support	16
Actions: Curriculum Development and Support	16
Instructional Strategies and Practices	17
Finding 3a.	17
Finding 3b.	17
Finding 3c.	17
Discussion	17
SWOT: Instructional Strategies and Practices	18
Actions: Instructional Strategies and Practices	19
Social-Emotional Learning and Health Development	20
Finding 4a.	20
Finding 4b.	20
Finding 4c.	20
Discussion	20
SWOT: Social-Emotional Learning and Health Development	21
Actions: Social-Emotional Learning and Health Development	23
Assessment and Accountability	23
Finding 5a.	23
Finding 5b.	23
Discussion	23
SWOT: Assessment and Accountability	24
Actions: Assessment and Accountability	25

Family and Student Engagement	26
Finding 6a.	26
Finding 6b.	26
Finding 6c.	26
Discussion	26
SWOT: Family and Student Engagement	27
Actions: Family and Student Engagement	28
Instructional Leadership Teams (ILT)	28
Finding 7a.	29
Finding 7b.	29
Finding 7c.	29
Discussion	29
SWOT: Instructional Leadership Teams	30
Actions: Instructional Leadership Teams	31
Administrative Coaching and Leadership	31
Finding 8a.	31
Finding 8b.	31
Finding 8c.	31
Finding 8d.	31
Discussion	31
SWOT: Administrative Coaching and Leadership	32
Actions: Administrative Coaching and Leadership	33
Professional Learning and Coaching	33
Finding 9a.	34
Finding 9b.	34
Finding 9c.	34
Finding 9d.	34
Discussion	34
SWOT: Professional Learning and Coaching	35
Actions: Professional Learning and Coaching	36
Data Management and Student Information Systems	36
Finding 10a.	36
Finding 10b.	36
Finding 10c.	36
Discussion	37
SWOT: Data Management and Student Information Systems	37
Actions: Data Management and Student Information Systems	38
District and Leadership Capacity	38
Finding 11a.	38
Finding 11b.	39
Finding 11c.	39
Discussion	39

SWOT: District and Leadership Capacity	39
Actions: District and Leadership Capacity	40
Governance Support with Instruction	41
Finding 12a.	41
Finding 12b.	41
Discussion	41
SWOT: Governance and Support with Instruction	42
Actions: Governance and Support with Instruction	42
Recommendations	43
References	44
Appendix A CCEE SIR Instructional Components	45
Appendix B SIR Actions by Themes	49

I. What is the Systemic Instructional Review?

A systemic instructional review (SIR) is a diagnostic of an organization's instructional programs, practices, and implementation of initiatives (academic, behavior, and social-emotional) from Pre-K to 12th grade. SIR is designed to guide sustainable practice that is grounded in a continuous improvement model and the Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework. ESSA defines MTSS as "a comprehensive continuum of evidence-based systematic practices to support a rapid response to students' needs, with regular observation to facilitate data-based instructional decision making" (Title IX). Previously known as Rtl and PBIS, MTSS provides the umbrella under which both live. MTSS consists of six critical components: Leadership, Communication/Collaboration, Capacity/Infrastructure, Data-based Problem Solving, Three-Tiered Instruction/Intervention, and Data Evaluation. The foundational work of the SIR has MTSS at its core.

The purpose of a systemic instructional review is to help support a local educational agency (LEA) identify strengths, weaknesses, threats, and opportunities (SWOT) in the implementation of instructional initiatives and practices. Data is collected through focus group interviews, individual interviews, observations of all aspects of the instructional program, artifact reviews, and data analysis. Stakeholders at multiple levels (students, parents, teachers, school site staff and administration, governance members, and district office leadership) are involved throughout the data collection process. The review culminates in recommendations that are designed to assist districts in creating coherence throughout the system by supporting a strong focus on instruction, developing collaborative cultures, enhancing deeper learning, and establishing accountability throughout the system. These recommendations should serve the district, county office of education, CCEE, and other team members to engage in continuous cycles of improvement, and should include a plan with priorities, actions, and progress monitoring data indicators. CCEE will share progress on the implementation of recommendations with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and State Board of Education.

II. The California Collaborative for Education Excellence

The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) is a statewide agency that works to strengthen California's public-school system so LEAs can build their capacity to improve student outcomes. The CCEE partners with the CDE, county offices and other stakeholders to support LEAs under the System of Support, which is made up of a network of experts specializing in instructional practices targeting students with disabilities, English learners, low-income students, and foster youth.

III. Project Inception

In December 2019 the data set on CA Dashboard for the 2018-19 school year was released. This year marked the 3rd year for the CA Dashboard, which enacted Education Code subdivision (g) of Section 52064.5 (CA School Dashboard) for three or more pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052 or, if the school district has less than three pupil subgroups, all of the school

district's pupil subgroups, fails to meet priority outcomes, in three out of four consecutive school years, the district is eligible for support from CCEE. The following table demonstrates how SUHSD met the criteria for Education Code subdivision (g) of Section 52064.5.

Student Group	2017 Priority	2018 Priority	2019 Priority
English Learner	- Pupil Achievement - School Climate	- Pupil Achievement - Outcomes in a Board Course of Study	- Pupil Achievement - School Climate
Students Experiencing Homelessness	- Pupil Achievement - School Climate	- Pupil Achievement - Pupil Engagement	- Pupil Achievement - Pupil Engagement
Students with Disabilities	- Pupil Achievement - School Climate	- Pupil Achievement - Outcomes in a Board Course of Study	- Pupil Achievement - School Climate - Outcomes in a Board Course of Study

As a result of meeting the criteria, the CCEE SIR team met with SUHSD. Monterey County of Education (MCOE) and Tulare County of Education (TCOE as GEO Lead) began working together in early February 2020 at which time the CCEE presented information as to what a Systemic Instructional Review involves, the needs of the district, and the overall timeline of the Systemic Instructional Review. Additionally an overview of CCEE's work, and the SIR process was introduced to the governing board in late February 2020.

The support of this partnership will manifest in the following ways:

- I. The CCEE provides advice and assistance to the school district and COE.
- II. CCEE, along with the COE, will report on ongoing progress on the implementation of recommendations to the State Superintendent.
- III. The Systemic Instructional Review (SIR) and Differentiated Assistance Support will come together in service of the school district.
- IV. The SIR will help inform the district as it makes decisions on LCAP priorities, meeting with stakeholders, and determining investments.

IV. Data Collection

Data collection for this review began in mid-February 2020 and consisted of classroom observations, a comprehensive document review of instructional artifacts and policy documents, individual interviews, focus groups with multiple stakeholder groups, and site principal interviews. In this manner, CCEE staff were able to triangulate multiple data points in an effort to validate the collected data set and individual items. Over the course of five weeks, teams of CCEE staff members visited each of SUHSD's ten school sites as well as 130 classrooms, focusing on instruction in: 7th, 9th, and 11th grade ELA, ELD, math, co-taught classrooms (general education

teachers working with a special education teacher), and individual studies classrooms that provide additional support for students with disabilities. In addition, some alternative education programs were observed. Plans to revisit the remainder of the district's alternative education programs were interrupted by the mid-March school closures across the state due to the COVID-19 pandemic. School closures also forced some remaining focus groups and individual interviews to be conducted via online meetings.

Prior to site visits, CCEE staff reviewed all documents submitted by SUHSD to support instructional efforts. Additional documents were added and reviewed during the period of classroom visits. Site visits were conducted by CCEE teams working in pairs and visits typically began with a 20-30 minute interview of principals, during which they were provided an opportunity to give a general overview of their schools, and to present their site's areas of instructional focus. Focus groups were conducted with all stakeholder groups including middle school students, high school students, parents, teachers, and school administrators. As previously stated, the teacher and the administrator focus groups were conducted in a virtual setting. In addition to principal interviews conducted during site visits, individual interviews were conducted with the superintendent, board members, the associate superintendent, the assistant superintendent of human resources, the chief business officer, all directors, district instructional personnel, and union members.

V. Report Features and Layout

The report is organized around the 12 CCEE instructional components. Each section includes:

- a summary of the CCEE instructional component reviewed;
- the findings based on data collection and SWOT analysis;
- the discussion paragraph(s) detailing evidence based on the instructional component being reviewed; and
- the SWOT analysis of the component
- action steps

The report culminates in a table of recommendations for the school district, and in collaboration with the CCEE and Monterey COE, the district will create and implement an action plan. A recommendation when reviewing this report is to have the CCEE Systemic Instructional Review Components (Appendix A) in hand to see the full details of each component.

VI. Summary of Findings

Situated in Monterey County, in the heart of Central California's agricultural region, Salinas Union High School District consists of five comprehensive high schools, four middle schools, one independent study school, one alternative high school, ROP Center, and an adult school. The district's student enrollment is fed by seven area elementary school districts. The district enrollment is 15,818 students with 76% of the students qualifying for Free and Reduced Lunch, 10% SWD, 0.6% of students experiencing homelessness, and 21.5% English learners. It is led by

a superintendent who has led the district for three years and has a rich history of experience at multiple levels within the district as well as outside the district.

While the SIR process began prior to school closures in mid-March 2020, instructional challenges of distance learning for all students need to be considered when reading this report. There are added levels of consideration that did not exist in the pre-COVID-19 world including: meeting the needs for digital equity for all students in terms of devices, internet access, and bandwidth; instructional design considerations that must now be met by all teachers for engaging students; and ensuring equitable inclusive practices for the district's ELs, SWDs, and youth experiencing homelessness, which are the district's triggering factors for the SIR process.

The SIR team has identified the following findings, which are reported in the form of identifying the district's overall strengths, weaknesses, threats, and opportunities. These items will be discussed in detail in Section VII that addresses the 12 instructional components of the SIR.

Strengths

- The district has strong central and school site leadership committed to improving outcomes for students.
- The district has a strong central office which has laid out strong instructional structures for curriculum identification, common formative assessment development, and creation of curriculum maps.
- SUHSD has a strong collaborative culture and infrastructures, evidenced by Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs).
- SUHSD's core belief in collaboration is exemplified through the differentiated assistance work with the Monterey County Office of Education (MCOE), MTSS, and SEL using cycles of continuous improvement.
- The district has shown the ability to narrow its focus and develop an action plan through data analysis that led to improved outcomes in mathematics.
- There are on-going and consistent structures for building teacher capacity such as PLCs, Summer Institute, New Teacher Onboarding, EL/Newcomer Professional learning, etc.
- The district recognizes the need to differentiate supports for varied populations offering personnel, such as an EL Specialist at each school site, and structural supports, such as Wellness Centers, co-teaching, or Migrant Education supports, etc.

Weaknesses

- There is a discrepancy in the intended practices or curriculum called out by the district (such as co-teaching, use of Constructing Meaning, and gradual release of responsibility) and the implementation of such practices. These discrepancies exist from school to school and within schools.
- Though tools and structures have been set in place for accountability of practice implementation, or cycles of improvement, they are not adhered to on a consistent basis. Some schools have successfully implemented the structures and have seen positive

outcomes as a result, whereas others have not implemented them, which is reflected in student outcomes.

- Data sets are consistently provided to site leaders. However, their usage to inform practice is not implemented district wide. Some schools utilize data systematically, after each learning block to guide differentiation and next steps; whereas others' use is perfunctory and does not inform differentiated instruction or interventions.
- When quantitative and qualitative data (such as school visits) reveal a need for improvement and alignment in practices, there is a lack of clarity regarding recommendations made by visiting district experts. This clarity pertains to the perception of the recommendations made by directors being optional.
- While the PLC structure offers on-going and consistent opportunities for teacher collaboration, additional time within the workday is needed for in-depth collaboration within schools and across schools.
- While there are clear learning opportunities for paraprofessionals, additional opportunities within the bell structure would benefit capacity building and coherence throughout the system.

Opportunities

- There is an opportunity to build on district-wide practices existing during "CST times", of establishing learning goals for each instructional period, reviewing data based on such goals, and determining next steps based on results of data analysis. In other words, establishing cycles of improvement with clear accountabilities.
- Build on Peter DeWitt's leadership coaching by providing district coaches that will expand on the work and provide on-going opportunities for reflection and revision of strategies.
- The research on inclusive practices in schools has demonstrated positive outcomes for students with disabilities. The district's commitment to implementing inclusive practices should be celebrated. However, it needs to deepen local school sites' common understanding of inclusive practices, co-teaching and support for students with disabilities, with clarity of strategy and goal setting.
- Re-clarify the role of teacher voice in decision-making for district-wide decisions such as: processes for selecting supplemental and core materials to recognize and utilize the expertise from practitioners in selecting and implementing curriculum that meets students diverse needs. It should be understood by all parties that there are times when the teachers' role is advisory and times when they participate in a consensus-making process. Teacher representatives, e.g. department chairs, involved in such work have a responsibility to communicate their role in decision-making with their school sites.
- Expand work with MCOE to continue the implementation of LEA Self-Assessment and other initiatives to have continuity of the work and take advantage of the resources the partnership with the county provides.
- Expand work with MCOE to build articulation pathways with SUHSD's elementary feeder districts, especially in supporting transition to middle and high school for ELs, SWDs, and

students experiencing homelessness. Examples would be common criteria for reclassification of ELs by feeder districts and for the identification of students experiencing homelessness.

- Utilize data to differentiate support to schools to ensure equity based on student numbers by demographic.
- Expand the capacity of school leaders to lead the analysis of data, lead the work of continuous cycles of improvement with internal and external accountability markers to ensure coherence and accountability, with data-based decision-making for intervention.
- Utilizing the resources of MCOE, collaborate in professional learning with districts serving similar student populations who are achieving positive student outcomes.
- There is an opportunity to build the governing board's knowledge and understanding of district instructional initiatives and goals, and progress towards such goals on a regular basis.

Threats

- Due to COVID-19, there is limited data about student achievement. One possible way to address this might be to consider administering the Smarter Balanced Interim Comprehensive Assessments (ICAs) to serve as a diagnostic.
- The district is affected by the turnover rate in personnel, particularly special education teachers and paraprofessionals. This inconsistency requires on-going capacity building and development of common understanding.
- There is a need for a clearer focus on the instructional strategy for attaining student outcomes and for a common understanding of district practices that are tight and loose that will get SUHSD there. The what, why, and how the district overall, as well as individual schools, will be held accountable needs to be clearly articulated.
- Though there has been improvement in acquiring data from feeder districts, solid, consistent structures for such data collection would benefit student articulation and placement.
- There is a need to improve homeless identification in order to best service students, whether it be academically or with social and emotional support.

This June 2020 SIR report has been updated with smaller and granular actions totaling 43 recommendations/actions. CCEE determined that this would ensure SUHSD progress on implementing the SIR recommendations/actions could be more accurately measured, including the gathering of evidence. CCEE engaged in the process of examining the original recommendations and determining the smaller steps needed to accomplish the original recommendations. Consideration of the current work at SUHSD related to instruction was taken in the development of the updated SIR recommendations/action. CCEE reviewed the recommendations with SUHSD leadership as a part of the process to ensure accuracy and clarity. [May, 2021]. **For the SUHSD SIR Executive Summary**, please [click here](#).

VII. SIR Instructional Components, Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats Analysis

1. Culture, Practice & Planning Process

(CCEE Instructional Component 1) The LEA creates culture and climate for all stakeholders, through the implementation of district-wide professional learning opportunities that teach, promote, and practice inclusivity and diversity. LEA members implement culturally reflective practices and policies designed around an inclusive instructional mission and vision achieved through continuous improvement practices and processes.

Finding 1a.

In our direct engagement with the superintendent, cabinet, district and site leaders, and teachers, we could hear a deep commitment to a culture of collaboration, inclusiveness, and support for historically marginalized student populations.

Finding 1b.

Although the leadership is committed to a vision and mission of a culture of learning and equity, work remains for SUHSD to uniformly manifest those values at all levels of the system through cycles of continuous improvement.

Finding 1c.

A primary challenge faced by the SUHSD in the area of culture is in the achievement of system coherence in which implementation of all actions at all levels is tightly aligned with its espoused values.

Discussion

The SUHSD has demonstrated that its leadership at all levels is values-driven and student-centered. The values that drive district actions include: the fostering of a culture of learning for both adults and students; collaboration; inclusiveness and support for historically marginalized student populations, e.g., LGBTQ and undocumented students. In addition, SUHSD focuses on all students accessing post-secondary educational opportunities, especially first-generation college-going students. These values are evident in the way district leaders focus their efforts, and target the district's financial resources. The core values held by the district and its leaders were mentioned in stakeholder interviews, including being a driving force for individuals wanting to serve in the district as educators. In other words, educators viewed what they perceived as district values to be a positive factor that would cause them to want to seek employment in the district.

The development of a culture in which values are embedded across all levels of the system, in every action taken by all stakeholders, is what ultimately results in a coherent system. In describing a coherent system, Fullan and Quinn (2016) posited that coherence lies not so much in alignment of plans, but rather as, "the shared depth of understanding about the nature of the

work” (p. 30) across four areas: establishing focus, creating a collaborative culture, deepening learning, and securing accountability.

The respectful relationship that exists between SUHSD and its labor partners will be very beneficial in continuing to foster innovative solutions to the uncertain world of post-pandemic K-12 education, including translating its deeply held values to the new, post-COVID 19 paradigm and to changes in practices. Shifts in culture and changes in teacher practice occur most successfully when there is a common understanding regarding goals and the action needed to support those goals.

SWOT: Culture Practice and Planning Process

A. Strengths:

- A culture of learning is embedded within SUHSD and is evidenced by longstanding and focused financial commitments to professional learning opportunities, dedication to a Professional Learning Community (PLC) model, and leadership collaboration and guidance.
- The SUHSD demonstrates a commitment to inclusiveness and support for historically marginalized student populations, e.g., LGBTQ and undocumented students.
- The SUHSD is actively working to refine direction, guidance, and support for stakeholders tasked with supporting students’ health and wellness.
- There is evidence of a strong focus on all students attaining educational success in SUHSD and in accessing post-secondary educational opportunities, especially for first-generation college-going students.

B. Weaknesses:

- The implementation of the PLC model needs to be re-invigorated at some school sites to realize the full benefits of professional learning and collaboration in support of all students succeeding.
- There needs to be increased accountability at the district and school site leadership levels to ensure common continuous improvement practices, e.g., data review procedures focused on inquiry in support of the district’s mission and vision.
- While there is a disparity between middle and high schools in terms of available professional learning time, some PLCs lack focus on improving student outcomes.

C. Threats:

- The difficulty in recruiting and retaining teachers, credentialed support specialists, and classified personnel creates gaps in the human capital pipeline that result in inconsistencies in programming, planning, and implementation of instructional services and supports.
- The SUHSD’s commitment to inclusion needs to be fully articulated in its vision in order for initiatives in support of SWDs to be fully realized.

D. Opportunities:

- The variety of school-site needs provides an opportunity for SUHSD to focus human and financial capital in support of differentiation at the site level.
- The Covid-19 crisis and future projections on its impact provide a unique opportunity for the district and its teachers to collaboratively explore innovative instructional practices, including digital platforms and distance learning.
- There is an opportunity for SUHSD to leverage and implement the learning derived from its participation in the MCOE's Professional Learning Network (PLN) in support of a fully realized MTSS.
- The longstanding structures of site-level PLCs, and examples of robust implementation at select sites, provide a rich opportunity for reestablishing or refocusing the purpose of PLCs and best practices.
- The respectful relationship between SUHSD and its collective bargaining units and their shared goals provide a strong structure for the work needed to address any misalignment between vision, goals, and the implementation of initiatives.
- Examples of articulation between select schools and feeder districts can provide models to scale up ongoing SUHSD articulation efforts.

Actions: Culture Practice and Planning Process

1A. Re-clarify the district's overall achievement goals by developing and implementing a concise instructional framework and plan that create coherence, clarity, and focus for district and school sites. The framework and plan:

- 1) Establish outcomes for students to attain (e.g., Literacy, Graduation).
- 2) Align to the district's vision, mission, and goals.
- 3) Integrate and connect to other district plans (e.g., Master Plan for English Learners) and initiatives (MTSS and SEL).
- 4) Set expectations for implementation of evidenced based instructional processes, e.g., SUHSD's currently selected strategies such as co-teaching, Constructing Meaning (CM), and Gradual Release of Responsibility.
- 5) Are grounded in using cycles of inquiry, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA).
- 6) Specify district and school site processes (MTSS) and structures to monitor framework/plan implementation, and goal attainment.
- 7) Clarify role and responsibilities of cabinet members towards the implementation and support of the plan.
- 8) Focus on the diversity of students and their needs (e.g. English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness).

- 1B. Clarify and share structures of support for the policies, instructional program options, practices, assessments, and services included in the 2021 adopted Master Plan for English Learners and how these align with the California Department of Education English Learner Road Map principles.
- 1C. Set expectations that existing working groups (Instruction Council [IC], school site Instruction Leadership Teams [ILTs], Professional Learning Communities [PLCs]) use data to engage in continuous improvement practices and processes using a minimum of four short inquiry cycles, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) per year.
- 1D. Ensure that all central office and school sites use a multi tiered approach to support schools, students, and resources (e.g., tiering schools for need) in a manner that supports inclusive practices in the classroom and for students.
- 1E. Expand the 2020-2021 middle to high school articulation practices to include feeder districts in order to ensure placement, program, and services to incoming English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness (HY).
- 1F. Engage with feeder district leadership teams (DLTs) to ensure common local practices and procedures (e.g., once a semester check in on transfers) that provide direction, guidance, and oversight in the identification and support of students experiencing homelessness.

2. Curriculum Development and Support

(CCEE Instructional Component 2) All instructional materials and curriculum (general education, supplemental, special education, ELD, etc.) are standard aligned, available and implemented for all students and documented in the LEA's MTSS framework; including an aligned professional learning plan targeting the needs of all teaching staff and their students.

Finding 2a.

The SUHSD has used its collaborative approach to set policy which engages teachers in the selection of a standards-based curriculum, providing opportunities for training district wide, as with the Summer Professional Learning offerings and onboarding for new teachers.

Finding 2b.

The LEA has instituted the structure of weekly PLCs, which allow for schools to dig deeper into the curriculum and provide opportunity for practitioners to plan at their own school sites for assessments and teaching and differentiating support for students. Weekly PLCs also help practitioners reflect on student learning based on results of planned curriculum and assessments.

Finding 2c.

Observations of PLCs in action reveal that these structures vary in function, with inconsistent use of data-driven cycles of improvement being implemented district-wide and within sites.

Discussion

The spirit of collaboration exhibited at the SUHSD leadership level is an expectation at school sites. Training with Peter DeWitt, as well as the long tradition of PLCs in the district, support the implementation of such collaboration and planning at the local schools. DeWitt supports school instructional leadership teams by building on researched collaborative practices that impact student learning. The implementation of SUHSD site level PLCs and of the district's intended curriculum ranges in its spectrum. The PLC work being done by SUHSD has been in practice for many years and it is based on DuFour's research and training. DuFour is highly respected for his work with professional educators learning in community, known as PLCS. The purpose of PLCs is to ensure that all students learn at high levels. Thus, DuFour advocates that PLCs work around four guiding questions:

- What do we expect our students to learn?
- How will we know they are learning?
- How will we respond when they don't learn?
- How will we respond if they already know it?

The curriculum or instructional blocks developed by district committees, as well as the common formative assessments aligned to such blocks, should answer the first two questions. Interviews with stakeholders, as well as observations of PLCs in action, reveal that data is not always leveraged or analyzed to assist in answering the four guiding questions. The implementation of the intended curriculums would be more systemic if each PLC were to establish clear achievement goals for their students, for each instructional period. These goals would be based on the end year outcomes for each school site. These summative learning outcomes would be established after careful analysis of SBAC, ELPAC, or other standardized data and would serve to guide the school's single plan for student achievement (SPSA). Each learning block, with its common formative assessments (CFAs), would provide an opportunity to analyze CFA results to gauge progress toward end-of-year achievement, as well as to reflect on the four action-oriented, guiding questions, and the implemented curriculum. With these recurring cycles of improvement, each school, and thus the district, would achieve academic improvements.

At SUHSD the engagement of lead teachers, administrators, and district curricular experts in selecting curriculum sets a foundation for trust, buy-in, and practitioner expertise throughout the district. This strong foundation, coupled with the PLC and ILT structures that exist at every school, can be leveraged to reduce the gap between the intended curriculum and the implemented curriculum.

SWOT: Curriculum Development and Support

A. Strengths:

- The LEA has engaged in the collaborative construction of district-wide curriculum maps, lessons and assessments utilizing expert lead teachers/practitioners, coaches, and district leadership for content: ELA, math, history, social studies, and science.
- The district has selected Constructing Meaning as a curriculum and has trained staff on its use in order to support English Learners in language courses, as well as content courses, with ELD assessments to gauge student progress.

B. Weaknesses:

- The implementation of the intended/adopted curriculum is not systemic.
- Although curriculum maps exist, there's inconsistency in their implementation.

C. Threats:

- The LEA supports autonomy and self-directedness for each school, in order to improve collective efficacy. This school autonomy also creates incoherence throughout the system. A balance of school independence and school-district interdependence needs to be defined and clearly communicated and understood in order to maintain coherence in learning across the district.

D. Opportunities:

- In SUHSD's presentation to the MCOE in February 2018, the following next steps were identified by the district: 1) To establish a vision for data usage, 2) Increase consistent implementation of curriculum/assessments and 3) For each school to take accountability actions resulting from data analysis. In order to support consistent implementation of curriculum, there's an opportunity for on-going training/coaching for school leadership teams (between the DeWitt sessions) on:
 - how to facilitate PLCs,
 - how to conduct data analysis utilizing the district's curriculum maps and CFAs
 - how to intervene or modify curriculum in order to support diverse student populations such as ELs, SWDs, and HYs.

Actions: Curriculum Development and Support

- 2A. Clarify the curriculum to implement a Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) approach to align and allocate resources for instructional decision-making and support based on students' and school's needs, which will result in improved outcomes for specified populations: English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness. This should be included in the instructional framework and plan.
- 2B. Align decision making on curriculum and supplemental materials or resources to data analysis resulting from using cycles of inquiry, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) with a

special focus on English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness.

3. Instructional Strategies and Practices

(CCEE Instructional Component 3) The LEA establishes and defines its instructional practice and strategies to be culturally inclusive, differentiated, rigorous, coherent, and standards-aligned, including the use of instructional technology and other experiences beyond the textbook. Decisions and pivots will be done through the analysis of data and use of the continuous improvement model.

Finding 3a.

There is strong evidence of defined and expected use of instructional practices at the district level, e.g., a longstanding focus on Constructing Meaning (CM), the Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR), and the co-teaching model to support SWDs, yet based on observations, full implementation lags across some sites.

Finding 3b.

When the SUHSD is successful in achieving coherence between its expectations of instructional practices and their implementation at school sites, there is evidence that it positively impacts student learning and achievement. For example, the district's 2018-19 focus on math instruction realized discernible gains in the SBAC Summative Math Assessment.

Finding 3c.

There is an ongoing need for the district to provide more differentiated support for school leaders and school sites to: 1) help educators more consistently implement and use expected instructional practices at some sites, and 2) leverage the benefits of autonomy, i.e., local decision making, for leaders and sites demonstrating successful implementation.

Discussion

The SUHSD has demonstrated a continuing focus on selecting and training its educators on research-based instructional strategies and processes, including Constructing Meaning, the Gradual Release of Responsibility framework, and the co-teaching model. There is evidence of those strategies and processes being embedded into the instructional design at the district level in History and Social Science Scope and Sequence guides, the Functional Academics Classes Framework, and the alignment of the ERWC curriculum.

The district's commitment to a co-teaching model was not observable in classroom visits. The district's focus on co-teaching needs continued support for its implementation in all classrooms. In addition, the Individual Studies course for SWDs might be more impactful if there was a focus on teachers shifting from a tutoring emphasis to also include intervention by reinforcing or re-teaching the specific district-adopted CM strategies and other learning strategies. As in the area of culture, SUHSD's challenges are not in the district's selection and commitment to research-based instructional strategies and processes, but rather in the achievement of

coherence through consistent implementation of those strategies and policies at all school sites. This includes the district's ability to use its own pockets of excellence as models. This variety of implementation was also noted in the implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL).

With the longstanding efforts that have been in place in SUHSD to support CM, GRR, co-teaching, and other instructional strategies and processes, the district is beyond the level of recognition. A shift in focus to the application level, and to achieving instructional coherence, would balance deepening learning with accountability.

SWOT on Instructional Strategies and Practices

A. Strengths:

- The SUHSD's efforts to address achievement gaps using commonly agreed-upon instructional practices has demonstrated results, e.g., in mathematics.
- There is evidence at the district level (interviews, scope and sequence guides, etc.) of a sharp focus on attaining instructional coherence.
- There is evidence at a number of school sites of common agreements on instructional practices being teacher-driven.
- The SUHSD has demonstrated a commitment for all students access to technology as a tool for learning.
- There is evidence of research-based instructional strategies and practices being embedded in the design of SUHSD's curriculum and scope and sequence guides, e.g., History and Social Science Scope and Sequence guides, the Functional Academics Classes Framework, and the alignment of the ERWC curriculum to the district's focus on the Constructing Meaning (CM) initiative.
- The SUHSD has a strong design and infrastructure for supporting students needing intervention and attendance recovery.
- The SUHSD has an articulated focus on fully implementing a co-teaching model to support SWDs and full inclusion.
- The SUHSD has demonstrated improvement in EL reclassifications.

B. Weaknesses:

- There is a wide variety of implementation of the co-teaching model across school sites.
- While there is an abundance of technology, classroom observations showed discrepancy in its application as an active teaching tool, which requires use of technology as more than a device only to be used for drilling skills.
- Evidence of implementation of UDL is limited to individual classrooms.
- While there is a long-standing district commitment to CM and the Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR), there was limited evidence of its consistent use during classroom observations.

- The mathematics instruction observed during classroom visits was largely teacher-led direct instruction with limited opportunities for students to work together to make meaning of concepts and apply skills.

C. Threats:

- The low level of implementation of the co-teaching model negatively impacts service delivery to SWDs.
- The lack of differentiated support for school sites and school site leaders fails to provide additional assistance for an increase in services. Differentiated support needs to span the spectrum to include school site leaders who are positioned for greater autonomy and a gradual release experience.

D. Opportunities:

- The positive work being done in defining and memorializing the variety of instructional models (instructional handbooks, etc.) that the SUHSD has to meet the needs of SWDs will strongly support continuing implementation of expected practices.

Actions: Instructional Strategies and Practices

- 3A. Narrow down the focus of existing classroom walkthrough tools utilizing a common instrument, such as the district's existing Gradual Release of Responsibility/Constructing Meaning (GRR/CM) rubric. (For example: identify one element from the GRR/CM rubric that correlates with "teacher clarity" to observe while walking classrooms and leads to improved academic outcomes for English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness). Utilize data resulting from walkthroughs to inform scheduled inquiry cycles (e.g., PDSA) four times a year. Reach common agreement on which walkthroughs or data collection require feedback to teachers. Additional data that may be analyzed regarding the common understanding and implementation of district wide instructional practices may be: 1) lesson plans, 2) minutes from Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings, and 3) focus of teacher evaluation cycles.
- 3B. Include in the instructional framework and plan the clear instructional practices that should be reflected in each and every SUHSD classroom (e.g., select co-teaching strategies, Constructing Meaning, and Gradual Release of Responsibility) including expanding student goal setting and reflection as a common practice for students to support student agency and ownership.
- 3C. Support implementation of MTSS and inclusive practices, utilize instructional support and intensive support staff to provide in class interventions and supports resulting from decisions made during cycles of inquiry (e.g., PDSA) or data analysis.
- 3D. Set the expectations and outcomes for existing Professional Learning Communities and school site Instructional Leadership teams, so that participating administrators and

teachers of all student groups, e.g., English learners, students with disabilities, students experiencing homelessness, and foster youth engage in collaborative planning for instruction.

- 3E. Implement specific and differentiated academic interventions for students with disabilities, students experiencing homelessness, and English learners by typologies (Long Term English Learners [LTELs], Newcomers, etc.) during Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III instruction.
- 3F. Expand Individual Studies Course utilized in middle school addressing: math, English, and Executive Functioning to the high school, as part of implementing specific and differentiated interventions for students with disabilities, including English learners with disabilities.

4. Social-Emotional Learning and Health Development

(CCEE Instructional Component 4) The social-emotional and behavioral well-being of the whole child is a critical component in the LEA's mission and vision. Identified social-emotional learning (SEL) skills are integrated into the curriculum, instructional practices, and resources identified for student support and school capacity building. SEL is embedded in the policy and practice and is modeled by adults LEA-wide.

Finding 4a.

As a system, the SUHSD demonstrates a strong commitment to the social and behavioral development and well-being of the students it serves as evidenced in its vision and mission, targeted practices (e.g, Wellness Centers, availability of mental health professionals, digital literacy initiative), and support of adults' professional learning.

Finding 4b.

There are exemplary efforts at select school sites in implementation of PBIS practices, utilization of an MTSS approach, and targeted support for students in greatest need, but implementation consistency across the district is less coherent.

Finding 4c.

While the district has offered multiple job-specific training opportunities focused on supporting students' social and emotional well-being, there is an opportunity to strengthen these efforts by strengthening expectations and structures for all adults to engage in long-term refinement of these practices at individual school sites.

Discussion

The SUHSD offered comprehensive artifact evidence of its commitment to the social and emotional learning, support, and well-being of its students. The evidence ranged from inclusion of values in its vision and mission that supported this work, to memorialization of a broad cross-section of guidance and professional learning opportunities for its classified and credentialed employees.

Students interviewed in focus groups generally reported they felt supported by teachers and adults on their campuses. However, student data collected in focus groups for the SIR represents potential improvement in students' connectedness to adults as compared with data reported in the 2018-19 Main Report for SUHSD's California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS).

In the district's 2019 Locally Reported Data on the CA Dashboard, the district noted that its PPS Department had created a focused initiative, Building Healthy Relationships, between adults and students. Site leaders interviewed during the SIR also reported a commitment to the social and emotional learning and health of their students and were frequently observed engaging students in interactions that demonstrated a high level of care and a deep understanding of the students in their care. What is less clear is how the connections exist between the district's strong commitment to its programs and the ways in which they are grown and leveraged through continual cycles of improvement for all adults at all sites. Growth could be more fully manifested by leveraging and replicating the work already being done at the district level, in partnership with MCOE and other agencies, and at individual select school sites. All sites fully embracing a district-wide MTSS model would also support this work.

There is an opportunity for the district to sharpen its focus and efforts on addressing the needs of its homeless youth. The SUHSD has many unique needs within its community, for example, supporting student mobility and serving the needs of migrant students and families.

Finally, the COVID-19 pandemic has required California school districts to drastically reimagine how they will provide students and families with ongoing social and emotional support. There is a great likelihood that students, families, and adults working within the system will have increased social and emotional needs that have not yet been identified.

SWOT: Social-Emotional Learning and Health Development

A. Strengths:

- The SUHSD demonstrates a commitment to the social and emotional health of its students through targeted support, including an expanding system of school-site Wellness Centers staffed by mental health professionals.
- The SUHSD demonstrates a commitment to creating welcoming learning spaces for all students, including those who might be historically marginalized, e.g., undocumented students, LGBTQ students, etc.
- There is evidence at school sites of implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS).
- Site leaders clearly articulated the specific student needs at their sites as well as efforts underway to support them.
- Full-time therapists are assigned to every high school.
- There is evidence of SEL training that was specifically targeted to both certificated and classified staff, e.g, PPS campus supervisors, parents, counselors, etc.

- The SUHSD provides specific written guidance to schools for addressing the well-being of the whole child, e.g., the Digital Citizenship Implementation Plan.

B. Weaknesses:

- While there is evidence of targeted SEL training having been designed and delivered to multiple stakeholder groups from the district level, there is less clarity on how educators, specifically classroom teachers and paraprofessionals, engage in this learning in an ongoing manner.
- There is a lack of clarity regarding how the initiative of training staff at school sites on students' SEL needs is transitioning from an initial awareness level to the level of continuous application.
- There is a lack of clarity from site to site regarding expectations for implementing PBIS.
- There is a lack of clarity as to the implementation of a robust MTSS in terms of how it manifests across specific school sites.
- While the district has specific school sites using data to support student groups and students who have greater need, it is less clear how this practice manifests across the district.

C. Threats:

- While there is evidence of implementation of PBIS at all sites, there is variance in the level of fidelity across sites.
- The SUHSD faces unique challenges in the high rate of student mobility and of being able to effectively meet the social and emotional needs of those students.
- There is a need to continue to increase efforts to support and monitor school sites in their identification of homeless youth and families in transition in order to better meet their social and emotional needs.

D. Opportunities:

- There is an opportunity to advance the implementation of the SUHSD's vision of the type of social-emotional skills that students are expected to demonstrate, possibly using as a model the district's initiative on digital citizenship.
- Implementation of the PBIS model in an aligned approach across sites could lead to a more coherent, consistent, and unified effort.
- In the improvements the SUHSD has experienced with targeted effort to meet specific student needs (e.g., in mathematics, reclassification of ELs, etc.) it could find replicable elements to apply to the needs of homeless youth.
- There is an opportunity to leverage and strengthen the work that the district has done to develop a robust MTSS.
- There are examples of school leaders developing site-level systems to determine what students and families need in terms of support, which could serve as models to scale up to the district level under an MTSS umbrella.

- The DA work done with MCOE focused on the needs of homeless students could be leveraged to take the district from an awareness level to an application level.

Actions: Social-Emotional Learning and Health Development

- 4A. Expand professional learning opportunities for educators to build their capacity to support students experiencing homelessness academically, socially, and emotionally, including using interventions and enrichment.
- 4B. Ensure that social, emotional, and behavioral instruction and assessment strategies and processes are used that promote resilience in foster youth and students experiencing homelessness and assess students' skills such as motivation, social adaptability, and interpretive abilities.

5. Assessment and Accountability

(CCEE. Instructional Component 5) There is an LEA-wide systemic process to measure and analyze the data on student academic and behavioral learning (i.e. diagnostic, summative, formative) with a paired accountability system for all stakeholders, from home to boardroom, that details the means of school improvements based on data.

Finding 5a.

The LEA has established systems, assessments and routines that would support on-going ownership and accountability for improving outcomes for all students. The curriculum maps and CFAs developed by district committees composed of instructional directors, coaches, and school site lead teachers serve to guide pacing of the curriculum, while establishing means of assessing for learning.

Finding 5b.

Although curricular maps and CFAS as well as identified IABs and testing windows exist, clear outcome goals for achievement are not consistently implemented at every school site. Likewise, not all PLCs utilize the data resulting from such CFAs to inform next steps for instruction, differentiation, and support of student subgroups.

Discussion

The SUHSD has an established assessment system that includes both standardized and district-developed formative assessments that align with standards-based curricular maps. The SUHSD in conjunction with the MCOE has engaged in various processes to analyze summative and some formative data, such as the fish-bone protocol, to identify causal factors that affect student academic performance and social-emotional measures.

Artifacts collected from MCOE, and SUHSD, including interviews with county officers, cabinet members and school personnel, speak to the district's willingness to: face hard facts, own the data, and own the possible solution plans to the challenges being faced. The establishment of Instructional Leadership Teams (ILT) at every school site and the structure and time dedicated to

PLCs are tools in establishing internal accountabilities to gauge whether established solution plans are delivering the intended results.

As in the areas of culture and curriculum, SUHSD's challenges are not in the district's intents or available systems/structures, but rather in the achievement of coherence through consistent implementation of cycles of improvement. While some sites are engaged in looking at formative data that determines next steps, these practices are not systemic district-wide. Those sites with established means of data analysis, have found ways to make the data comprehensible, and the means to look at such data through a "Here's What, So What, and Now What" process. Models of data analysis, within cycles of improvement, exist within the district that could serve as a resource for other schools. Partnered with on-going ILT coaching, the district can develop coherence in this area.

SWOT: Assessment and Accountability

A. Strengths:

- The SUHSD has a district-wide multiple assessment system, which includes: Common Formative Assessments (CFAs) aligned with curriculum maps, ELD common assessments, inclusion and balance of state assessments including IABs, SBA, ELPAC, etc.
- Some SUHSD schools are focused on CFAs and use the data resulting from these to engage in cycles of improvement and provide differentiated support for students.
- English learners have opportunities to engage in reading/writing tasks in their ELD classes that are aligned to ELPAC, and include differentiated support and opportunity for productive struggle.
- The SUHSD has engaged in long-term work with the Monterey County Office of Education to analyze assessment outcomes, determine causal factors, and identify problems of practice.
- Reclassification criteria is posted in classrooms district wide; when asked, both teachers and students could speak to it.

B. Weaknesses:

- Results of CFAs are not systemically utilized by classroom teachers/PLCs to plan for next steps and differentiated instruction.
- The implementation of curriculum maps may supersede learning and differentiation, particularly in math courses, with limited accountability for students' concept mastery.
- Some teachers lack understanding in math courses about the intent of informal assessments, which also affects students' understanding of how informal assessments can inform their next steps in learning.
- ELD assessments focus on comprehension; listening and speaking are not included in these monitoring opportunities. Reclassification criteria and ELD standards require that students demonstrate mastery of English through speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

C. Threats:

- Observations of students' tasks, work displayed, student conversations, and other artifacts indicated that some of the ELA and math assessments given in classrooms lacked the depth and rigor found in the content standards. For example, a math task asked students to solve algorithms without having them explain in mathematical terms/concepts why this made sense.
- Data targets for each school and district are not overtly clear, nor the systems for on-going monitoring in progress towards meeting district targets.

D. Opportunities:

- Reflect on/revise existing literacy and math assessments for rigor, depth of knowledge, and alignment to the common core standards.
- Reflect on/revise existing ELD assessments to include listening and speaking.
- Train all PLCs on protocols to analyze CFA results and determine next steps for support and intervention.
- Monitor PLC time to ensure protocols for data analysis on student performance takes place and that resulting agreed upon changes/supports are implemented in classrooms.
- Share, for example at principals' meetings, results of CFAs, school-level analysis, and resulting next steps in order to learn from practitioners while monitoring progress toward school/district achievement targets.

Actions: Assessment and Accountability

- 5A. Establish a schedule to implement district wide, standards-aligned common assessments that will be used for Cycles of Inquiry to measure impact on student learning, particularly for impacted groups: English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness.
- 5B. Determine academic assessment tools and data points that will be utilized to monitor the growth for English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness, to ensure students are receiving differentiated, coordinated, and coherent support to improve in learning.
- 5C. Lead existing working groups (e.g., Instructional Council, Instructional Leadership Teams, Professional Learning Communities) through the use of cycles of inquiry that include both short-term and long-term data (e.g., process improvements, student outcomes, multiple years) from a student information system and assessment data to measure growth for all students, with particular focus on English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness. Utilize such data to make instructional decisions at the student, classroom, school and district level (e.g., strategies to continue implementing based on data, district initiatives to undertake or dismiss, asking the group, "How does

this xxxx align with/and support our focus? How will we know that a change is actually an improvement?”).

- 5D. Implement intentional time for the superintendent, associate superintendent, and directors to engage with teachers and principals to utilize cycles of inquiry, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) with a focus on English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness to learn, digest, analyze, problem-solve, and plan for instruction that results in improved outcomes for academics, behavior, and social and emotional (e.g., Professional Learning Communities, Monterey County Office of Education's Professional Learning Network, etc.).
- 5E. Utilize the district Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) decision rules during cycles of inquiry, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) utilized by Professional Learning Communities and Instructional Leadership Teams to determine entrance and exit criteria for students needing intensified instruction and intervention.

6. Family and Student Engagement

(CCEE Instructional Component 6) The LEA engages in two-way communication that reflects the cultural and linguistic needs of the community, with resources and engagement activities that give students agency, promotes student leadership, and provides a space for active community engagement.

Finding 6a.

The SUHSD has demonstrably worked to increase student and family engagement in the past few years, e.g., improved parent and guardian communication, assignment of community liaisons at each site, greater access to meeting times and translation, and increased student voice in the form of higher responses to its LCAP survey and to the CHKS.

Finding 6b.

Stakeholders reported experiencing interactions with the district that are highly driven by personal relationships and felt this dynamic serves some parents, guardians, and families better than others.

Finding 6c.

While stakeholders reported general satisfaction with district efforts at outreach, they are less satisfied with the modes and efficiency of its communication with them.

Discussion

Stakeholders interviewed during the SIR are generally satisfied with efforts that SUHSD has made to increase parent, guardian, and family outreach and engagement. They were also able to articulate areas in which they felt improvements could be made. They described a system that traditionally was characterized by a reliance on individual relationships with knowledge and trusted individuals who serve the system, e.g., parent liaisons.

Some families of SWDs reported they remain unclear on how to navigate the system to receive the support they need, especially for students needing additional services. Through its ongoing work with MCOE and its own efforts at self-review, SUHSD has identified areas in which it targeted efforts in the past two years to increase family and student engagement and to address its challenges.

Parents identified a recent focus on safety at high schools as an example of the district responding to parent concerns. Another area of positive action is the outreach to families needing internet access for their students via hotspot devices. With the spring 2020 closure of district schools due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and an uncertain future for the timing of school reopenings, the demand for creative and varied outreach in such areas will likely grow. One area of concern for stakeholders has to do with the general area of communication, and the specific area of two-way communication as some stakeholders reported feeling their feedback is sought but often not acted upon. Stakeholders also reported less satisfaction with current modes of communication. They expressed dislike for automated phone calls and reported they often go unanswered. Parents, guardians, and families reported they understand the potential value of the ParentVue system for viewing grades and communicating with individual teachers but also felt its use is not being fully realized.

While stakeholders viewed the efforts and intent of SUHSD in its outreach as generally positive, they found a number of areas to address: 1) community liaison turnover, and 2) the topics selected for parent meetings, 3) a need for greater empathy from staff towards SWDs, and 4) the timing of parent meetings and workshops. It should be noted that the district has been expanding its times for parent meetings and workshops in response to parent, guardian, and family concerns.

SWOT: Family and Student Engagement

A. Strengths:

- The SUHSD has worked, and continues to work, to improve its parent and guardian communication, i.e., providing a community liaison per school, evening meeting times for families, and an increase in translators for outreach events.
- The SUHSD demonstrated an improvement in eliciting stakeholder input as evidenced by an increase in LCAP stakeholder responses from 1,556 to 2,101, a growth of 35%.
- The SUHSD's parent advisory committee is representative in its membership of the population and community it serves.
- The district strategically attempts to leverage outreach opportunities to serve multiple purposes, e.g., scheduling open house activities to include orientations for incoming students from elementary feeder districts.
- The use of simultaneous translation at some of the meetings was perceived by parents as an asset.

B. Weaknesses:

- The 2018-19 student survey results indicate that SUHSD students feel connected to their schools but less connected to the adults who serve them within their schools.
- When interviewed in focus groups, some parents expressed that they questioned the value of attending parent meetings because they found the information presented not to be useful.
- Parents expressed lack of understanding of the IEP process, reclassification, as well as the process and supports utilized to transition students to mainstream classes.
- Some parents expressed lack of authenticity or follow through, so that even though their concerns were heard and written down, there appeared to be no action to resolve the noted issues.

C. Threats:

- Communication, or lack of clear understanding by the community.
- Inconsistency in simultaneous translation at meetings, which impacts parents' understanding and sense of belonging.

D. Opportunities:

- There are strong models of community partnerships at select sites, which can be emulated across the district to target students in need across sites.

Actions: Family and Student Engagement

- 6A. Create a common definition of: 1) two-way communication, 2) meaningful two-way communication, and 3) success in two-way communication, that result in deeper understanding and support by all stakeholders of academic, social-emotional and behavioral goals and outcomes for students.
- 6B. Continue to foster student voice and agency utilizing existing structures (Leadership, Student Council, AVID, student led conferences, student goal setting) to promote two-way communication.
- 6C. Utilize structures at the district and school site level that provide regular two-way communication and engagement opportunities for staff (Instructional Leadership Teams, Professional Learning Communities, surveys) and parents and community (DELAC, parent conferences, surveys, texts) to support student learning and achievement.

7. Instructional Leadership Teams (ILT)

(CCEE Instructional Component 7) ILTs exist in every school and reflect across grades and disciplines with members who make culturally responsive, data-driven decisions to design instruction for all students and their needs. ILTs will facilitate professional learning and coaching to implement and support initiatives LEA-wide.

Finding 7a.

SUHSD has clear expectations for the establishment of ILTs at each site. Each site has enacted ILTs composed of teacher leads across grades and disciplines, as well as out of classroom/coaching personnel and administrators.

Finding 7b.

On-going professional development/coaching has been provided for existing ILTs at the majority of schools by author Peter DeWitt. A system of on-boarding new sites needs to be developed to ensure that all schools benefit from new/continued learning and coherence is maintained throughout the system. ILTs would grow from continued professional development for ILT members on the: 1) What of ILTs, to develop common understandings and agreements, 2) Why of ILTs, to understand their purpose and alignment to LCAP and district goals, and 3) How of ILTs, to refine facilitation skills.

Finding 7c.

School ILTs would benefit from consistently implementing cycles of improvement in order to guide the respective PLCs they facilitate in utilizing quantitative and qualitative data to gauge progress towards LCAP, district, and school academic/SEL goals.

Discussion

The SUHSD's culture of collaboration and trust is evidenced at school sites via Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs). The SUHSD has demonstrated its belief in, and the value of, school-driven leadership by expecting each school site to establish an ILT composed of administrators and teacher leaders. Furthermore, the district has invested in the development of those teams by engaging with Peter DeWitt, author of *Collaborative Leadership: Six Influences that Matter Most*, to train and provide coaching to school teams.

The value of site-driven leadership is a key in Fullan and Quinn's Coherence Framework. It has the potential to address the framework's components of: Cultivating Collaborative Cultures, Deepening Learning, Focusing Direction and Securing Accountability. Currently, there's inconsistency in being able to implement all of these components. There are different understandings in that the schools, as diverse as they may be, exist within the larger scope of the district.

The SUHSD has tried to develop some coherence by outlining expectations in the Instructional Leadership Team Site Visit form. The purposes or outcomes for this mid-year visit are: 1) to reflect upon the school site's accomplishments and challenges from the first semester in order to modify the implementation plan, 2) to discuss mid-year site GRR/CM data, and 3) to share questions, concerns, and/or the need for support the site has in the implementation of GRR/CM/Educational Technology. All of these outcomes and reflections tie to teacher practice, which ultimately is what affects instruction. The mid-year reflection outcomes are not overtly tied to student learning or achievement. This connection would support clarity and coherence throughout the district.

At SUHSD, there is great potential for developing the coherence via district and school site ILTs. The district and school leaders value collaboration, are passionate about learning, and are dedicated to their students. The current policies and practices related to ILTs and PLCs are a sound foundation for achieving coherence and improved outcomes for students. Continued development of facilitation practices and cross-school partnerships and visits would also support coherence across the system and student outcomes.

SWOT: Instructional Leadership Teams

A. Strengths:

- SHUSD expects each school to establish Instructional Leadership Teams (ILT).
- The LEA has clear expectations for the following roles within the ILT: coach, principal, district leadership.
- SHUSD has consistently and continually worked with Peter DeWitt in training, coaching, and supporting ILTs.
- Individual sites are self-directed in developing facilitation skills for ILT members.
- ILT members consistently facilitate PLCs.

B. Weaknesses:

- There is a discrepancy in the implementation and efficacy of ILTs at school sites.
- The 2019-2020 goals for ILTs are process-related and disconnected from student achievement.
- The facilitation skills for ILT leads are varied and in need of support and training.
- Coaching and support for ILTs is needed more frequently than DeWitt's seven yearly sessions.

C. Threats:

- Given interviews and conversations, there might be a misconception that there's a common understanding of the role of ILT, where diverse definitions exist within the field, which leads to miscommunication and understanding of roles and responsibilities, which affects the coherence in implementation.
- There is resistance to change, particularly where established staff exists and new administrators are assigned to lead the schools. This resistance threatens the implementation of initiatives.
- The school closures due to COVID-19 interrupted the continued ILT work.

D. Opportunities:

- There is an opportunity to systematize the implementation of ILTs and utilize existing district schools where ILTs are high-functioning as models and learning labs for other schools.
- An opportunity arises to provide on-going, day-to-day coaching to ILTs by a consistent district coach.

- This process offers a favorable time for focusing the work of ILTs to increase SUHSD's fundamentals in teaching and learning such as: depth of knowledge, co-teaching, Constructing Meaning, etc.

Actions: Instructional Leadership Teams

- 7A. Create written expectations for the Instructional Leadership Teams' roles, responsibilities, and team membership.
- 7B. Empower Instructional Leadership Teams to facilitate the use of data resulting from formative assessments, district common assessments, and summative assessments to design Tier I, Tier I, and Tier III instruction, differentiation, and intervention based on diverse students group's needs: English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness.

8. Administrative Coaching and Leadership

(CCEE Instructional Component 8) Infrastructure across the LEA supports and enhances administrator effectiveness in management and instructional leadership with consistent data (academic and behavioral/SEL) monitoring that informs instruction and is used for stakeholder engagement.

Finding 8a.

District and school-site administrators engage in reflective practices, such as end of year reports, which allow time to rate academic, behavior, and social-emotional growth for the district.

Finding 8b.

The SUHSD is vested in building the leadership of site principals, assistant principals, and teacher leaders. They have secured leadership coaching by contracting with The New Teacher Center for three years, and with Peter DeWitt for several years, securing time to have site-by-site coaching.

Finding 8c.

The SUHSD understands that differentiated coaching and support is needed for new administrators. The practices instituted in the district guarantee a mentor for each new principal, who is able to coach the rookies in instructional and managerial matters.

Finding 8d.

Site leaders value the coaching and mentoring provided by DeWitt seven times a year, but also express that additional coaching would be beneficial. Regular coaching from experienced leaders who know the inner workings of the district, and who understand the demands placed upon the site administrators from varied departments.

Discussion

The SUHSD has invested in the development of its school site and district leaders. District leadership recognizes that there's value in having cabinet leaders who have been a part of the

LEA, with historical understanding of the journey the SUHSD has been engaged in. These successful leaders have learned from prior experiences, understanding what has and hasn't worked in the past, thus being cognizant not to implement past strategies that delivered minimal or negative results. Likewise, SUHSD has been thoughtful in bringing in outside leaders with core values that match the district's collaborative learning spirit. These leaders have expertise that helps propel the district into new territories and welcomed research-proven approaches.

Aside from a cabinet of expert leaders, the district is thoughtful in hiring such leaders. The district's leadership understands that leaders need to be supported and coached. Thus, the SUHSD has invested in coaching for school site leaders through its work with Peter DeWitt. Additional coaching takes place for new principals. District leadership also engages in reflection and coaching with the support of the MCOE. These practices are systemic and appreciated by the field due to their impacts on student outcomes. Additional coaching and leadership development/support is also being requested by site leaders. A system of extending DeWitt's work to new schools or reconfigured schools, as well as one that differentiates based on experience and school needs, were also areas where coaching might be extended.

Leadership development and coaching is not a "one and done" type of activity, but rather one that grows and builds, as experience and needs change. Continued leadership development and learning, which are highly valued by the SUHSD, is an area to build upon for all district leaders, whether at the school sites, cabinet, or the board room.

SWOT: Administrative Coaching and Leadership

A. Strengths:

- The LEA has strong district leadership, with experience and understanding of the district
- The experience of district leadership in many roles, within and outside of the district, serve in understanding district needs and historical perspective, while considering diverse approaches from members with experiences in other districts.
- The multi-year work accomplished by the LEA with Peter DeWitt in leadership development, coaching, and refinement that allows for continuity and depth.
- The LEA has a system of support for new principals, with assigned coaches during their first year in the role of leading a school.

B. Weaknesses:

- School site leaders would benefit from day-to-day coaching via a director who could support them in connecting the various department demands and prioritizing said demands.
- Although supports exist for new principals, site leaders would benefit from differentiated supports based on leadership skills, experience, and the school site's history.

C. Threats:

- There is a system of reaching out for support by school site administrators that is voluntary. This might pose a threat for SUHSD schools whose administrators are in need of support and guidance but are not reaching out.
- Reliance on Peter DeWitt to coach and support school site leaders and their leadership teams seven times a year might not allow for the day-to-day differentiated coaching that may be needed. Although DeWitt is also available on an on-call basis, additional opportunities for in-house coaching could better differentiate.

D. Opportunities:

- Expand SUHSD's work with Peter DeWitt to include all schools and to partner with local coach leaders/directors.
- Develop and implement a differentiated model of school leadership development, coaching, and supervision.
- Utilize model/process for SUHSD's Year-End Analysis on a quarterly basis as a way to have district and school site leaders reflect on leadership commitments and accomplishments.

Actions: Administrative Coaching and Leadership

- 8A. Employ targeted coaching practices, e.g., the ongoing work with Peter DeWitt, at the site level to support implementation of effective differentiated/targeted strategies agreed upon during cycles of inquiry, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA).
- 8B. Clarify roles of directors, coaches, English learner specialists, department chairs, teachers involved in district committees, etc. and how they are expected to support the district's outcomes, priorities, and accountabilities. Directors' roles include spending extensive amounts of time in schools observing instruction in both general and special education settings and providing strength-based and actionable feedback to site leaders, after agreeing which types of classroom walkthroughs require data collection and feedback to teachers.
- 8C. Use consistent leadership coaching and mentoring, e.g., the ongoing work with Peter DeWitt, to provide principals the opportunity to reflect on, monitor, adjust, and increase effectiveness of their roles in strengthening instructional practices to address the needs of diverse learners.

9. Professional Learning and Coaching

(CCEE Instructional Component 9) The LEA has a multi-level (teacher, school and district leadership) professional learning plan that includes a focus on raising student academic and behavioral learning and accompanying practices as a collective effort. Instructional coaches are in place to support the reflection and improvement of the accompanying practices.

Finding 9a.

The SUHSD has built a structure in which school site professional learning is focused on collaborative cultures, both through PLCs and ILTs.

Finding 9b.

The SUHSD has aligned resources to build teacher capacity through PLCs. All schools have ensured that teachers have the opportunity to meet weekly in their PLCs.

Finding 9c.

Training provided to EL specialists and other resource personnel include protocols for engaging in reflection of student learning and strategy implementation.

Finding 9d.

There are systems to provide feedback for professional learning at the district level. Artifacts collected did not reflect how feedback is utilized to support continuous improvement.

Discussion

In their book *Learning by Doing*, DuFour and DuFour argue that a Professional Learning Community (PLC) is an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve. “PLCs operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous job-embedded learning for educators.” The SUHSD has taken this premise to heart and has set aside monetary, time, and human resources to ensure that professional learning takes place at school sites through PLCs on a weekly basis.

Time for professional learning through PLCs is not the only investment the district has made. Understanding that the LEA serves a significant number of English learners, including newcomers and LTELs, the district has allotted the services of an EL specialist at each school site; the EL specialist supports teachers by coaching. These specialists receive district training in coaching and facilitation, both essential skills when engaged in the work of PLCs.

The intent of PLCs, as vehicles for engagement in cycles of improvement/inquiry, do not always match what occurs while teachers meet. This venue intended to cultivate collaborative cultures and adult learning is an area of concern at school sites, where principals would benefit from additional training on the why, how, and what of the PLCs.

Another threat to the PLC structure is staff turnover. More than 90 teachers are hired annually, with an average of 64% remaining for two years, and 54% remaining in the district after four years. Thus, the district has to continually find ways to onboard novice instructors to the district and to the workings of the school site PLCs. However, this threat is definitely surmountable, Wellman and Garmston, co-authors of *The Adaptive School*, reassure us that “groups that emphasize developing group-member capabilities and norms of collaboration informally provide induction experiences for new members.”

Other types of professional development opportunities offered by the district to whichever certificated staff wishes to attend, include summer institutes, where district initiatives, strategies and resources are used to systemically build the capacity of staff. Specific sessions for newcomers, ELs and SWDs are offered by the district. Opportunities for learning, outside of the workday, are also opened to paraprofessionals who assist students with disabilities, English learners, and other learners.

SWOT: Professional Learning and Coaching

A. Strengths:

- SUHSD has placed emphasis, time, and maintained focus on developing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) at each school site as a model of developing instructional capacity.
- There is a thoughtful and purposeful way of aligning LCAP funds for the coaches/specialists who are assigned to the school sites.
- SUHSD invests time and resources in systemically developing coaching and content skills for their coaches through the district's office.
- SUHSD has addressed differentiated needs of student population through newcomer and ELD professional learning.

B. Weaknesses:

- The learning taking place during professional development opportunities is not always being transferred to systemic classroom practices.
- The PLC model ranges in implementation and efficacy, from school to school, within schools and departments.
- District-wide professional learning does not always match the individualized needs of schools.
- Opt-in professional development, including classified special education or English learner support personnel, affects coherence and implementation in the system.

C. Threats:

- The turn-over on teaching staff, hiring 90 or more educators a year, poses a threat to coherence and stability in the district. This leads to a need for training, or retraining throughout the year, when the academic calendar is already in full implementation.
- Turnover rate for professional coaches and teachers limits the opportunity for targeted support needed at school sites.

D. Opportunities:

- Utilize the curriculum, instruction, and assessment calendars and tools to implement cycles of improvement, utilizing data to differentiate supports for English learners, students with disabilities, foster youth, etc.

- SUHSD has schools implementing model PLCs; utilize the knowledge and expertise from these schools to scale the work to not only provide coherence throughout the district but to learn from colleagues/practitioners from the district with similar demographics.
- Redefine the role of the EL specialist to emphasize instruction so that teacher practice and support for English learners may be maximized.

Actions: Professional Learning and Coaching

- 9A. Create a one-year written comprehensive professional learning plan (PL) and coaching plan based on best practices for improving effective instruction for veteran and new principals, teachers, and staff (classified and certificated) and ensure there are clear expectations for implementation and monitoring. The goal would be to expand these into multi-year plans.
- 9B. Ensure that the vision, principles, and components (e.g., Assessment and Program Placement, Program Options, Access to Core, English Language Development, etc.) of the newly adopted 2021 Master Plan for English learners are part of the district's comprehensive professional learning plan (PL).
- 9C. Provide continued professional learning on: 1) assessment literacy, 2) data analysis, 3) facilitation of Professional Learning Communities, 4) high-leverage instructional strategies for teaching English learners, 5) co-teaching best practices, 6) inclusive practices, and 7) using cycles of inquiry, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) with a particular focus on English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness.
- 9D. Ensure that each school site has a data-driven professional development plan that is intentional and differentiated for the needs of the teaching staff and its student population.

10. Data Management and Student Information Systems

(CCEE Instructional Component 10) There is LEA-wide appropriate user access to the student information system (SIS) that meets federal/state/local reporting requirements and allows for a cross-departmental, classroom-to-school-data analysis to inform continuous improvement instructional decisions.

Finding 10a.

The SUHSD has skillful leaders at the district level, responsible for the management of data and facilitating the use of data analysis with school site leaders.

Finding 10b.

The district has an appropriate and accessible data management system in place.

Finding 10c.

Areas of possible growth for the district include: 1) continuing efforts to improve articulation with feeder districts and data transfer district-to-district, and 2) creating common messages and

understanding of expectations for integrating data inquiry cycles in a continuous improvement model across school sites.

Discussion

The SUHSD's Research and Assessment Action Plan demonstrates the district's intention to utilize its existing infrastructures and assessments, e.g., PLCs at school sites, CFAs, and other benchmark and summative assessments to support the data analysis process throughout the system. These efforts will likely increase data literacy at school sites for school leaders and all educators. The 2019-20 plan specifically calls for the building of PLCs' capacity, and analysis at the school site of 2019 CCI and CA Dashboard graduation data. District directors responsible for this work are knowledgeable and many have institutional knowledge of the district's data over time. There are also examples of select site leaders who have integrated this work in the form of data inquiry cycles.

There was less observable evidence of consistent implementation of data inquiry cycles at all school sites. Nor were clear expectations delineated regarding such work. While the 2019-20 Research and Assessment Action Plan stipulated that directors were tasked with leading school administrators through specific data inquiry cycles, it was unclear as to what the district was demanding in terms of school leaders facilitating their teachers in the same experiences.

The SUHSD's efforts in utilizing multiple measures of data for evaluating students' learning needs is made challenging due to the district's struggles to obtain timely access to information on incoming students from its feeder districts. This data gap is especially impactful on ELs, whose secondary programming is dependent in many cases on their ELPAC scores and information on their language acquisition progress. The individual efforts of select site leaders to engage in articulation with feeder districts, and to accelerate the transfer of student data from district to district, are scalable internal models.

SWOT: Data Management and Student Information Systems

A. Strengths:

- The SUHSD has a data infrastructure in place.
- There is strong leadership from dedicated personnel in the area of data and research at the district level with long-standing knowledge and understanding of the district.
- Efforts are underway to engage feeder districts in an effort to streamline data transfers for incoming students and there are examples of individual school leaders seeking to engage in articulation with feeder districts to obtain timely data on incoming students.
- There are examples at some school sites of using data cycles to inform classroom practice.

B. Weaknesses:

- The district struggles to obtain timely access to information on incoming students from its feeder districts.

- The lack of explicit expectations in regard to schools using data inquiry cycles, accompanied by accountability measures, impedes a system-wide effort to standardize its use of data at the school and classroom levels.

C. Threats:

- Feeder districts vary widely in their effectiveness and timeliness for providing student data to SUHSD, which is particularly impactful in supporting appropriate placement of incoming ELs.
- The number of feeder districts, their variety of data practices, and uncertainty in their leadership (e.g., leadership changes and vacancies) make it extremely challenging to engage in effective articulation and alignment of data for students transitioning to SUHSD.

D. Opportunities:

- There are models at some school sites of the effective use of data inquiry cycles that could be used to build upon district-wide.
- Efforts at articulation with feeder districts by individual schools could be used to leverage a unified, district-led effort to standardize and accelerate the transfer of data for incoming students.

Actions: Data Management and Student Information Systems

- 10A. Continue to provide data through the district's SIS that supports and aligns with the district's assessments, timelines, and accountabilities. Some data that might be included are: reports from common assessments by student groups and standards/clusters, and Renaissance performance reports by student groups, grades, etc.
- 10B. Utilize Student Information System and observational data at calendared cycles of inquiry to monitor improved academic outcomes for targeted populations.
- 10C. Partner with schools within and outside the district to learn, identify practices, or receive feedback on implemented practices that support targeted populations and have proven to increase student outcomes.

11. District and Leadership Capacity

(CCEE Instructional Component 11) The LEA contains a strong multi-level (school and LEA leadership) organizational capacity and processes to make coherent, coordinated decisions and ensure that goals and metrics are mission and vision aligned across sites and departments. Established processes ensure each member, regardless of position, can fulfill their role and responsibilities.

Finding 11a.

District office leaders demonstrate strong capacity, mutual respect for co-leaders, and a collaborative approach to the district's vision, mission, and goals.

Finding 11b.

The collaborative dynamic within the district leadership has attracted talented educators from outside SUHSD to seek employment within the district and has fostered a strong and beneficial relationship with MCOE.

Finding 11c.

There is a lack of clarity within the system regarding how the district's nonnegotiable expectations are to be fully manifested at all school sites.

Discussion

The SUHSD has consistency in its leadership at the district level, with a balance of senior leaders who have served in multiple leadership capacities in the district and educators who have sought to join the district from outside the district. The system has performance metrics aligned with district goals, and leaders model collaborative effort. There is a focus on being an organization dedicated to both adult and student learning.

District leaders maintain a robust relationship with counterparts in the MCOE and have availed themselves of opportunities to engage in shared learning. Those opportunities also included select educators from school sites, which demonstrates a desire to build leadership capacity at multiple levels. Among SUHSD central office leaders, there is a strong perception they are tasked with engaging in work that builds coherence at all levels of the system and facilitating that work for educators assigned to school sites.

In reaching system-wide coherence, a remaining challenge for SUHSD is the perception among some stakeholders regarding which district initiatives on instructional practices may be optional. For example, the district has evidence of a focus on CM, GRR, and a co-teaching model. It has invested in professional learning for these initiatives. Yet, classroom observations across multiple sites found limited evidence of these practices in action. It is unclear whether those variances in implementation are based more on educators' understanding of them or on clear messaging of accountability and expectations. In either case, the facilitation of deepening coherence through common understanding requires leaders to build individual and collective capacity through leadership at all levels.

SWOT: District and Leadership Capacity**A. Strengths:**

- There is evidence of strong capacity, mutual respect, and collaborative effort at all levels of the district office.
- There is strong consistency in district leadership, with the superintendent and much of the senior leadership having served in a variety of leadership positions.
- The culture of respect and collaboration within SUHSD has attracted strong educators to join the SUHSD leadership team.

- The relationship between SUHSD and MCOE is very strong, which has made the Direct Assistance program work effectively.
- B. Weaknesses:
- While principals greatly valued the coaching received from Peter DeWitt, they have limited access to in-house coaching to build leadership skills.
 - There is a lack of clarity within the system as to how principals are to be held accountable by SUHSD central office directors to the district's nonnegotiable expectations.
- C. Threats:
- Site leaders' efforts to implement district goals regarding teaching and learning and commitment to equity are impacted by limited time available to engage in this work with full staff attendance within the workday.
- D. Opportunities:
- The expertise within district office leadership could support an effort to better differentiate support for site leaders and create opportunities for leaders to collaborate with peers.

Actions: District and Leadership Capacity

- 11A. Establish and implement how student learning will be monitored by different levels and by leadership, to determine support for schools and student groups and to coach and support staff responsible for student learning at a minimum of four-calendared times a year. Utilize existing HR protocols, such as the evaluation process, in the monitoring (e.g., superintendent - principals; associate superintendent - directors; directors - coaches/specialists; principals-teachers).
- 11B. Establish clear and coherent calendars, structures, reflective/monitoring processes and academic targets that align with the district's commitment to the advancement of all students.
- 11C. Develop a Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) structure to support and monitor the implementation of the instructional framework and plan. At the central office, ensure that differentiated support is provided for all schools and departments, that the support connects to other district plans and initiatives, and that is grounded in continuous improvement practices (e.g., PDSA) and processes.
- 11D. Regularly meet as a District Leadership Team to provide direction, guidance, differentiated support, and oversight to clarify roles of directors, coaches, English learner specialists, department chairs, teachers involved in district committees, etc. and how they are expected to support the district's outcomes, priorities, and accountabilities.
- 11E. Provide professional learning and coaching opportunities to school leaders on inclusive practices, including co-teaching.

12. Governance Support with Instruction

(CCEE Instructional Component 12) The governance team (board) members understand their roles and responsibilities and reflect the local community's values, voice, and interest. The board has clearly established processes and protocols to assist in the implementation of strong instructional practices and supports for all students.

Finding 12a.

The governing board developed Strategic Goals for 2017-20 that demonstrate a strong commitment to serving SUHSD's students and developing the capacity of its teachers and staff.

Finding 12b.

The governing board has developed a clear set of policies that are regularly updated on the district website and easily accessible for stakeholders.

Discussion

The governing board of SUHSD has developed Strategic Goals for 2017-20 that focus on two of the three elements identified by City, Elmore, Teitel et. al. (2009) as being central to the instructional core. Specifically, Strategic Goal #1 addresses the preparation of students for post-secondary opportunities, and Strategic Goal #2 calls out the need to, "Recruit, hire, retain and develop faculty, staff, and leaders that are qualified, high performing, diverse, and culturally competent." The remaining strategic goals address "safe, caring, and healthy" learning environments (Strategic Goal #3), and fiscally prudent and equitable use of the district's resources (Strategic Goal #4). While the third component of the instructional core model espoused by City, Elmore, Teitel et. al. (2009), strong instructional content, is implicit in Strategic Goal #1, it is not specifically called out in the district's Strategic Goals.

The governing board of SUHSD elaborates its positions on curriculum and standards in board policies. Those policies are accessible through the SUHSD website and are organized in an easily-searched database. An examination of key instructional policies revealed that they are regularly reviewed and updated.

The recognition of the instructional core being composed of three parts, i.e., students, teachers, and content, is echoed by Harvard University Graduate School of Education's Public Education Leadership Project (PELP, 2020) in its Coherence Framework. While the PELP framework envelops its instructional core with a Theory of Change, written as an "if...then..." statement, City, Elmore, Teitel et. al. (2009) posited that the key to effective instruction was based in the relationship of students and teachers to each other and the content rather than on the components themselves.

The governing board's policies clearly support the excellent work of SUHSD's instructional leaders. While SUHSD's Strategic Goals are understandably designed to focus on students and

teachers, there might be a future opportunity to fold in content and curriculum at the strategic goal level as well.

SWOT on Governance and Support with Instruction

A. Strengths:

- Board policy documents are updated, accessible, and are used to support district instructional decisions.

B. Weaknesses:

- The district's Strategic Goals for 2017-20 specifically call out two of the three components of what is widely considered to be the instructional core, i.e., students and teachers, but not the third, content.

Threats:

- The lack of a clearly stated commitment to instructional content stated in the district's strategic goals could signal that instructional core component being less of a district priority, and hinder its efforts to message the need for strong curriculum and implementation of district-selected instructional strategies.

C. Opportunities:

- There is an opportunity for the governing board to more publicly signal its support of the efforts of SUHSD's instructional efforts by calling out the third element of the instructional core, content and curriculum in its revision of strategic goals.
- There is an opportunity to be more public about student achievement with the board, including highlighting examples of students and schools tightly aligned to the districts' larger instructional vision and expectations for teaching and learning.

Actions: Governance Support with Instruction

- 12A. Share with the Governing Board at a minimum of four times a year on the progress of the instructional plan and student achievement including the SIR actions, how they are informing the district's priorities, and how student outcomes are being impacted (e.g., presentations and communications).
- 12B. Ensure policies that are adopted are in alignment with addressing school improvement and attaining student outcomes in particular the needs of English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness.

VIII. Recommendations

As a result of data analysis, interviews and school visits certain themes have emerged for the SUSHD. These themes, **Clarity and Coherence**, **Accountability**, and **Communication** cut across SIR components and refer to the work being done by the district around Fullan and Quinn’s (2016) Coherence Framework. **Clarity** speaks to a common understanding, and **Coherence** refers to “what is in the minds and actions of people individually and especially collectively” (p. 14). **Accountability** is both internal and external. “If you want effective accountability, you need to develop conditions that maximize internal accountability—conditions that increase the likelihood that people will be accountable to themselves and to the group. Second, you need to frame and reinforce internal accountability with external accountability—standards, expectations, transparent data, and selective interventions” (p. 111). For the purpose of this report, **Communication** is a two-way process. Clear communication occurs in a multi-modal manner, from the district to the stakeholders. There is an opportunity for stakeholders to demonstrate their understanding through their actions and their communication to the district. There are structures in place for the district to check for understanding.

The following table represents the themes with specific recommendations. Action steps and implementation timelines to meet these recommendations will be developed collaboratively with the SUHSD.

References

- City, E. A., Elmore, R. F., Fiarman, S. E., Teitel, L., & Lachman, A. (2018). *Instructional rounds in education : a network approach to improving teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard Education Press.
- DeWitt, P. (2017) Collaborative LeadershipL Six Influences that Matter Most. Thousand Oaks, CA. Corwin Press.
- DuFour R., DuFour R., Eaker R., Many T, Mattos M. (2016) Learning by Doing: A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work. Bloomington, IN. Solution Tree Press.
- Fullan, M. (2015). Leadership from the middle: A system strategy. Education Canada. Canadian Education Association. Retrieved from <https://docs.google.com/document/d/10dqUhsrGjYXtKMxFMZcNGRu0HC44fwmR/edit#>
- Garmston, Robert & Wellman, Bruce (2016). The Adaptive School. Lanman, MA. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Harvard University Graduate School of Education. (2020). *Coherence Framework*. Retrieved from <https://pelp.fas.harvard.edu/coherence-framework>

Appendix A: CCEE Systemic Instructional Review Components

"Working together to strengthen the System of Support for every student."

Instructional Components	Characteristics
1. Culture, Practice and Planning Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture in the local educational agency (LEA) is one that fosters a deep commitment to ensuring all students attain educational success. • The LEA practices and planning processes integrate an inclusive instructional vision and mission that is embedded within a tiered system of support. • Continuous improvement practices and processes are utilized to determine whether the instructional mission and vision is being attained. • A supportive culture and climate for stakeholders (e.g., teachers, leaders, staff, parents) is cultivated and evident across all LEA efforts. • Professional learning opportunities are provided, from the boardroom to the classroom, that creates and sustain a LEA-wide culture of inclusivity, celebration of diversity, and culturally reflective practices and policies. • A LEA Leadership Team provides direction, guidance, support and oversight for ensuring the health and wellness of the LEA.
2. Curriculum Development and Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A coherent, standards-aligned curriculum, instruction and assessment system is in place that is culturally and linguistically responsive. • Supplemental and enrichment curricular and instructional materials are provided and reflect the diverse needs of the student population and provide equitable access for all. • The LEA utilizes a continuous problem-solving process that helps identify and provide supports needed to systemically implement the LEA's instructional efforts that align with the vision and mission of the LEA. • Decision rules are developed and socialized with teaching and learning personnel that provide entrance and exit criteria for robust and coherent tiered support for all students, including gifted, at-risk, and students with disabilities. • Data are used regularly to progress monitor and ensure the curriculum and instruction efforts are resulting in positive outcomes, both academic and behavior/SEL, for students. • There is a comprehensive data driven professional development plan that is intentional and differentiated for the needs of teaching and learning staff.
3. Instructional Practice and Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a LEA-wide intentional focus on universal design for learning for improving and extending differentiated instructional practices that increase student engagement. • Instructional practices provide students access to and experience with rigorous, relevant, and coherent standards-aligned instruction that is responsive to the needs of all learners, including gifted students, cultural and linguistically diverse students and student with disabilities. • Instructional practices and strategies ensure that all student groups (gifted, EL, students with disabilities) and their respective teachers are included and participate in collaborative integrated planning for instruction.

Appendix A: CCEE Systemic Instructional Review Components

"Working together to strengthen the System of Support for every student."

Instructional Components	Characteristics
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology and experiences beyond the textbook (e.g., project-based learning) and the classroom are used to actively engage students and emphasize critical thinking skills. • LEA-wide instructional practices and strategies are actively cultivated through teacher leadership and provide the opportunity to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ serve as a peer resource for teaching and learning ○ regularly meet to review student work ○ focus on the delivery of standard-aligned instruction • utilize school data to plan, design and deliver culturally responsive instruction that results increased rate of student growth for academic and behavior/s
4. Social Emotional Learning and Development Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The social emotional and behavioral well-being of the whole child is evidenced within the instructional vision and in policy and practice. • Social emotional learning skills are identified and integrated into the curriculum and instruction practices and is assessed. • When student behavior and well -being is of concern, there are a continuum of resources identified to provide support to students and build the capacity of the school to meet student needs. • Social emotional learning and health development is practiced and modeled by adults throughout the LEA.
5. Assessment and Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing, aligned, systemic processes are in place for measuring how, what, and how well a student is learning (e.g., early warning system, universal screening, diagnostic, formative, summative). • There is a systematic process (e.g., protocols) for using assessment data to make instructional decisions at the student, classroom, school, and LEA levels. • There is an accountability system that provides a holistic approach (e.g., academic, social, developmental) to educating students, parents, teachers, administrators, and LEA leaders for the purpose of improving school performance. • LEA-wide practices include intentional time for teachers and leaders to learn, digest, analyze, problem-solve and plan for instruction that results in improved student outcomes for academics, behavior, and SEL. • Decision rules are established that articulate entrance and exit criteria for students needing intensified instruction and intervention and are embedded within a multi-tiered system of support. • There is an established practice to ensure system wide fidelity to using/delivering effective instructional practices that results in improved student outcomes.
6. Family and Student Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student agency and voice is fostered to promote critical thinking and leadership that contributes to decisions being made. • There is an expectation in the Local Education Agency and support is provided to schools to ensure family/guardians, and other caregivers, and students are active members and decision makers within the LEA system of support and school community. • The LEA and school communities cultural and linguistic needs are reflected in the resources, engagement activities and

Appendix A: CCEE Systemic Instructional Review Components

"Working together to strengthen the System of Support for every student."

Instructional Components	Characteristics
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • curriculum. • The local educational agency actively seeks and acts upon two-way communication with students and families/guardians. Written protocols that delineate practices are developed that promote and engage students and families.
7. Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILTs exist in every school and meet regularly with organized agendas, minutes and a clear purpose for the team. • ILTs reflect cross grade and disciplinary representation of student groups including EL, gifted and students with disabilities. Participants are capable and empowered to use data to design instruction based on the needs for each and every student. • ILTs are actively involved in facilitating culturally responsive data driven decision making and creating the instructional supports necessary to deliver best first instruction that result in improved school-wide student outcomes. • ILTs facilitate professional development and coaching on instruction, assessment and data driven decision making.
8. Administrative Coaching and Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructures exist that support and enhance the administrator effectiveness and instructional leadership. • Administrators clearly demonstrate a balance between building management and instructional leadership. • Administrative practices include targeted instructional coaching to support and facilitate effective teaching strategies and practices. • Administrators spend an extensive amount of time in classrooms observing instruction and providing strengths-based and actionable feedback to teachers. • Administrators demonstrate a consistent use of qualitative and quantitative data to assess the rate of growth for academic, behavior and social emotional learning. • There is a consistent use of data to monitor progress in academic, behavior and social emotional learning. • Administration actively cultivates a growth mind set and a safe environment for personnel to take risks, speak their truth and contribute to decision making. • Administrators actively facilitate and engage parents/guardians as welcomed partners in the school community/family.
9. Professional Learning and Coaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a comprehensive multi-year written plan, based on best practice, for improving teachers- both veteran and new, principals' and staff (classified and certificated) effectiveness in raising student achievement and supporting social emotional learning. • Data based professional learning opportunities foster collective responsibility for improved student performance facilitated by highly effective school and LEA leaders and grounded in student performance data. • Instructional coaches are in place to support teachers' reflections and efforts to improve classroom practices for academics, behavior and social emotional learning. • Leadership coaching and mentoring provides principals' opportunity to reflect on, monitor, adjust, and increase effectiveness of their roles in strengthening instructional practices in order to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Appendix A: CCEE Systemic Instructional Review Components

"Working together to strengthen the System of Support for every student."

Instructional Components	Characteristics
10. Data Management and Student Information Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a student information system (SIS) that actively stores and tracks all individual student data [e.g., grades, attendance, discipline], with appropriate access to teachers, administrators and parents. • The SIS provides for the following user-friendly information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ cross-departmental continuous improvement of systems ○ information that helps meet federal/state/local reporting requirements ○ data on tracking and reporting longitudinal student progress ○ data to support classroom/school instructional decision-making ○ information that helps understand/address patterns in student performance ○ data that supports the assessment and accountability system(s)
11. District and Leadership Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a process to ensure the capacity of each cabinet member's ability to lead the work under their purview. • Performance metrics that are aligned with LEA goals are established across all dept/offices and are regularly reviewed for growth and sustainability. • Leaders are provided professional learning and coaching opportunities to enhance their skills to fulfill their roles and responsibilities. • Each dept/office's strategic workflow, metrics and benchmarks are verified with data, aligned with LEA goals and vision and reviewed regularly • There is evidence of strong organizational capacity, dynamics, and processes to make coherent, coordinated decisions that improve the overall health and well-being of the LEA on behalf of students, families/guardians and staff • LEA and school leadership develop and facilitate collaborative and transparent processes to implement shared goals regarding teaching and learning, effective leadership, accountability and commitment to equity and excellence across the LEA.
12. Governance Support with Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA governance team has clearly established written processes and protocols for the purpose of implementing strong instructional practices and educational supports for each and every student. • The LEA governance team has a delineated function and clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities in improving school and educational outcomes. • The work of the LEA governance team reflects the local community's values, voice and interests. • The LEA governance team demonstrates interpersonal respect, trust, communication, and conflict resolution for each other, LEA leadership/staff, and the community they serve.

Appendix B: Action Steps by Themes

Theme 1: Clarity and Coherence	
1A	<p>Re-clarify the district's overall achievement goals by developing and implementing a concise instructional framework and plan that create coherence, clarity, and focus for district and school sites. The framework and plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Establish outcomes for students to attain (e.g., Literacy, Graduation). 2) Align to the district's vision, mission, and goals. 3) Integrate and connect to other district plans (e.g., Master Plan for English Learners) and initiatives (MTSS and SEL). 4) Set expectations for implementation of evidenced based instructional processes, e.g., SUHSD's currently selected strategies such as co-teaching, Constructing Meaning (CM), and Gradual Release of Responsibility. 5) Are grounded in using cycles of inquiry, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA). 6) Specify district and school site processes (MTSS) and structures to monitor framework/plan implementation, and goal attainment. 7) Clarify role and responsibilities of cabinet members towards the implementation and support of the plan. 8) Focus on the diversity of students and their needs (e.g. English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness).
1B	<p>Clarify and share structures of support for the policies, instructional program options, practices, assessments, and services included in the 2021 adopted Master Plan for English Learners and how these align with the California Department of Education English Learner Road Map principles.</p>
1C	<p>Set expectations that existing working groups (Instruction Council [IC], school site Instruction Leadership Teams [ILTs], Professional Learning Communities [PLCs]) use data to engage in continuous improvement practices and processes using a minimum of four short inquiry cycles, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) per year.</p>
1D	<p>Ensure that all central office and school sites use a multi tiered approach to support schools, students, and resources (e.g., tiering schools for need) in a manner that supports inclusive practices in the classroom and for students.</p>
1E	<p>Expand the 2020-2021 middle to high school articulation practices to include feeder districts in order to ensure placement, program, and services to incoming English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness (HY).</p>

4A	Expand professional learning opportunities for educators to build their capacity to support students experiencing homelessness academically, socially, and emotionally, including using interventions and enrichment.
4B	Ensure that social, emotional, and behavioral instruction and assessment strategies and processes are used that promote resilience in foster youth and students experiencing homelessness and assess students' skills such as motivation, social adaptability, and interpretive abilities.
5C	Lead existing working groups (e.g., Instructional Council, Instructional Leadership Teams, Professional Learning Communities) through the use of cycles of inquiry that include both short-term and long-term data (e.g., process improvements, student outcomes, multiple years) from a student information system and assessment data to measure growth for all students, with particular focus on English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness. Utilize such data to make instructional decisions at the student, classroom, school and district level (e.g., strategies to continue implementing based on data, district initiatives to undertake or dismiss, asking the group, "How does this xxxx align with/and support our focus? How will we know that a change is actually an improvement?").
5D	Implement intentional time for the superintendent, associate superintendent, and directors to engage with teachers and principals to utilize cycles of inquiry, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) with a focus on English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness to learn, digest, analyze, problem-solve, and plan for instruction that results in improved outcomes for academics, behavior, and social and emotional (e.g., Professional Learning Communities, Monterey County Office of Education's Professional Learning Network, etc.).
7A	Create written expectations for the Instructional Leadership Teams' roles, responsibilities, and team membership.
8B	Clarify roles of directors, coaches, English learner specialists, department chairs, teachers involved in district committees, etc. and how they are expected to support the district's outcomes, priorities, and accountabilities. Directors' roles include spending extensive amounts of time in schools observing instruction in both general and special education settings and providing strength-based and actionable feedback to site leaders, after agreeing which types of classroom walkthroughs require data collection and feedback to teachers.
8C	Use consistent leadership coaching and mentoring, e.g., the ongoing work with Peter DeWitt, to provide principals the opportunity to reflect on, monitor, adjust, and increase effectiveness of their roles in strengthening instructional practices to address the needs of diverse learners.
9A	Create a one-year written comprehensive professional learning plan (PL) and coaching plan based on best practices for improving effective instruction for

	veteran and new principals, teachers, and staff (classified and certificated) and ensure there are clear expectations for implementation and monitoring. The goal would be to expand these into multi-year plans.
9B	Ensure that the vision, principles, and components (e.g., Assessment and Program Placement, Program Options, Access to Core, English Language Development, etc.) of the newly adopted 2021 Master Plan for English learners are part of the district's comprehensive professional learning plan (PL).
9D	Ensure that each school site has a data-driven professional development plan that is intentional and differentiated for the needs of the teaching staff and its student population.
11B	Establish clear and coherent calendars, structures, reflective/monitoring processes and academic targets that align with the district's commitment to the advancement of all students.
11C	Develop a Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) structure to support and monitor the implementation of the instructional framework and plan. At the central office, ensure that differentiated support is provided for all schools and departments, that the support connects to other district plans and initiatives, and that is grounded in continuous improvement practices (e.g., PDSA) and processes.
11D	Regularly meet as a District Leadership Team to provide direction, guidance, differentiated support, and oversight to clarify roles of directors, coaches, English learner specialists, department chairs, teachers involved in district committees, etc. and how they are expected to support the district's outcomes, priorities, and accountabilities.
11E	Provide professional learning and coaching opportunities to school leaders on inclusive practices, including co-teaching.
12B	Ensure policies that are adopted are in alignment with addressing school improvement and attaining student outcomes in particular the needs of English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness.
Theme 2: Communication	
1F	Engage with feeder district leadership teams (DLTs) to ensure common local practices and procedures (e.g., once a semester check in on transfers) that provide direction, guidance, and oversight in the identification and support of students experiencing homelessness.
3B	Include in the instructional framework and plan the clear instructional practices that should be reflected in each and every SUHSD classroom (e.g., select co-teaching strategies, Constructing Meaning, and Gradual Release of

	Responsibility) including expanding student goal setting and reflection as a common practice for students to support student agency and ownership.
3D	Set the expectations and outcomes for existing Professional Learning Communities and school site Instructional Leadership teams, so that participating administrators and teachers of all student groups, e.g., English learners, students with disabilities, students experiencing homelessness, and foster youth engage in collaborative planning for instruction.
6A	Create a common definition of: 1) two-way communication, 2) meaningful two-way communication, and 3) success in two-way communication, that result in deeper understanding and support by all stakeholders of academic, social-emotional and behavioral goals and outcomes for students.
6B	Continue to foster student voice and agency utilizing existing structures (Leadership, Student Council, AVID, student led conferences, student goal setting) to promote two-way communication.
6C	Utilize structures at the district and school site level that provide regular two-way communication and engagement opportunities for staff (Instructional Leadership Teams, Professional Learning Communities, surveys) and parents and community (DELAC, parent conferences, surveys, texts) to support student learning and achievement.
12A	Share with the Governing Board at a minimum of four times a year on the progress of the instructional plan and student achievement including the SIR actions, how they are informing the district's priorities, and how student outcomes are being impacted (e.g., presentations and communications).
Theme 3: Accountability	
2A	Clarify the curriculum to implement a Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) approach to align and allocate resources for instructional decision-making and support based on students' and school's needs, which will result in improved outcomes for specified populations: English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness. This should be included in the instructional framework and plan.
2B	Align decision making on curriculum and supplemental materials or resources to data analysis resulting from using cycles of inquiry, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) with a special focus on English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness.
3A	Narrow down the focus of existing classroom walkthrough tools utilizing a common instrument, such as the district's existing Gradual Release of Responsibility/Constructing Meaning (GRR/CM) rubric. (For example: identify one element from the GRR/CM rubric that correlates with "teacher clarity" to observe while walking classrooms and leads to improved academic outcomes for English

	learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness). Utilize data resulting from walkthroughs to inform scheduled inquiry cycles (e.g., PDSA) four times a year. Reach common agreement on which walkthroughs or data collection require feedback to teachers. Additional data that may be analyzed regarding the common understanding and implementation of district wide instructional practices may be: 1) lesson plans, 2) minutes from Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings, and 3) focus of teacher evaluation cycles.
3C	Support implementation of MTSS and inclusive practices, utilize instructional support and intensive support staff to provide in class interventions and supports resulting from decisions made during cycles of inquiry (e.g., PDSA) or data analysis.
3E	Implement specific and differentiated academic interventions for students with disabilities, students experiencing homelessness, and English learners by typologies (Long Term English Learners [LTELs], Newcomers, etc.) during Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III instruction.
3F	Expand Individual Studies Course utilized in middle school addressing: math, English, and Executive Functioning to the high school, as part of implementing specific and differentiated interventions for students with disabilities, including English learners with disabilities.
5A	Establish a schedule to implement district wide, standards-aligned common assessments that will be used for Cycles of Inquiry to measure impact on student learning, particularly for impacted groups: English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness.
5B	Determine academic assessment tools and data points that will be utilized to monitor the growth for English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness, to ensure students are receiving differentiated, coordinated, and coherent support to improve in learning.
5E	Utilize the district Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) decision rules during cycles of inquiry, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) utilized by Professional Learning Communities and Instructional Leadership Teams to determine entrance and exit criteria for students needing intensified instruction and intervention.
7B	Empower Instructional Leadership Teams to facilitate the use of data resulting from formative assessments, district common assessments, and summative assessments to design Tier I, Tier I, and Tier III instruction, differentiation, and intervention based on diverse students group's needs: English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness.
8A	Employ targeted coaching practices, e.g., the ongoing work with Peter DeWitt, at the site level to support implementation of effective differentiated/targeted strategies agreed upon during cycles of inquiry, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA).

9C	Provide continued professional learning on: 1) assessment literacy, 2) data analysis, 3) facilitation of Professional Learning Communities, 4) high-leverage instructional strategies for teaching English learners, 5) co-teaching best practices, 6) inclusive practices, and 7) using cycles of inquiry, e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) with a particular focus on English learners, students with disabilities, and students experiencing homelessness.
10A	Continue to provide data through the district's SIS that supports and aligns with the district's assessments, timelines, and accountabilities. Some data that might be included are: reports from common assessments by student groups and standards/clusters, and Renaissance performance reports by student groups, grades, etc.
10B	Utilize Student Information System and observational data at calendared cycles of inquiry to monitor improved academic outcomes for targeted populations.
10C	Partner with schools within and outside the district to learn, identify practices, or receive feedback on implemented practices that support targeted populations and have proven to increase student outcomes.
11A	Establish and implement how student learning will be monitored by different levels and by leadership, to determine support for schools and student groups and to coach and support staff responsible for student learning at a minimum of four-calendared times a year. Utilize existing HR protocols, such as the evaluation process, in the monitoring (e.g., superintendent - principals; associate superintendent - directors; directors - coaches/specialists; principals-teachers).