



OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT SYSTEMIC INSTRUCTIONAL REVIEW

2020-2021

ccee

California Collaborative
for Educational Excellence

CCEE Systemic Instructional Review (SIR) Team:

[Tom Armelino](#), Executive Director

[Karla Estrada](#), Ed.D., Deputy Executive Director, Systems Improvement and Innovation

[Rocio Gonzalez-Frausto](#), Senior Manager, Instructional Systems and Innovation

[Susan Tandberg](#), Ed.D., CCEE Professional Expert

[Nati Rosza](#), CCEE Professional Expert

[Nick Mize](#), Ed.D. CCEE Profesional Expert

To learn more about the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence, please visit ccee-ca.org

THE CALIFORNIA COLLABORATIVE
FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE
Sacramento Headquarters
915 L Street, Suite 1430
Sacramento, Ca 95814
916.619.7494
ccee-ca.org

I. What is the Systemic Instructional Review?	1
Post SIR Steps	1
II. The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence	1
III. Project Inception	2
IV. Data Collection	2
V. Report Features and Layout	3
VI. Summary of Findings	3
VII. SIR Instructional Components, Strengths, Weaknesses, Threats, Opportunities, Analysis, and Actions	8
1. Culture, Coherence, and the Planning Process	8
Findings	8
Discussion	8
SWOT on Culture, Coherence, and the Planning Process	11
Actions: Culture, Coherence, and the Planning Process	12
2. Curriculum, Learning, and Support	13
Findings	13
Discussion	13
SWOT on Curriculum, Learning, and Support	15
Actions: Curriculum, Learning, and Support	17
3. Instructional Practice and Strategies	17
Findings	17
Discussion	18
SWOT on Instructional Practice and Strategies	20
Actions: Instructional Practice and Strategies	21
4. Social-Emotional and Behavioral Health and Development	22
Findings	22
Discussion	22
SWOT on Social-Emotional and Behavioral Health and Development	24
Actions: Social-Emotional and Behavioral Health and Development	25
5. Assessment and Accountability	25
Findings	26
Discussion	26
SWOT on Assessment and Accountability	27
Actions: Assessment and Accountability	28
6. Student and Family Engagement	28
Findings	29
Discussion	29
SWOT on Student and Family Engagement	30
Actions: Student and Family Engagement	31

7. School-based Instructional Leadership Teams	32
Findings	32
Discussion	32
SWOT on School-based Instructional Leadership Teams	33
Actions: School-based Instructional Leadership Teams	33
8. Administrative Coaching and Leadership	34
Findings	34
Discussion	34
SWOT on Administrative Coaching and Leadership	35
Actions: Administrative Coaching and Leadership	36
9. Professional Learning and Coaching	36
Findings	36
Discussion	36
SWOT on Professional Learning and Coaching	37
Actions: Professional Learning and Coaching	38
10. Data Management and Use and Student Information Systems	38
Findings	39
Discussion	39
SWOT on Data Management and Use and Student Information Systems	40
Actions: Data Management and Use and Student Information Systems	40
11. District and Leadership Capacity	41
Findings	41
Discussion	41
SWOT on District and Leadership Capacity	42
Actions: District and Leadership Capacity	44
12. Governance Support with Instruction	44
Findings	44
Discussion	45
SWOT on Governance Support with Instruction	45
Actions: Governance Support with Instruction	46
VIII. Conclusion	48
References	51
Appendix	
Appendix A: CCEE Instructional Components	54
Appendix B: OUSD SIR Actions by Themes	66

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, behavioral, and social-emotional) from pre-K to 12th grade. A SIR is designed to guide sustainable practice that is grounded in a continuous improvement model and the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework. The Every Student Succeeds Act (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 Response to Instruction and Intervention (RTI²) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (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, opportunities, and threats (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, families, teachers, school site staff and administration, governance members, and district office leadership) are involved throughout the data collection process.

The SIR culminates in recommended action steps 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 recommended actions are intended to serve the district as a roadmap to systemic instructional improvement.

Post SIR Steps

Once the SIR report is completed, the district's first step is to prioritize SIR action steps from the report and engage in cycles of continuous improvement with progress-monitoring data indicators and evidence to validate completion. CCEE can serve the district, if desired, in its role to advise and assist the district in this process and work with the district to identify supports needed to implement the SIR actions leading to student success. Activities driven by the SIR should ideally align with a district plan with priorities, actions, and progress-monitoring data indicators. As part of the CCEE's role, as defined in EDC 52072, the agency determines the capacity of the school district to implement the recommendations (identified as action steps within the SIR) and therefore will monitor and communicate the progress of the district on the implementation of SIR actions and recommendations to the district, COE, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and State Board of Education twice a year (fall and spring).

II. The California Collaborative for Educational 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 California Department of Education (CDE), county offices of education (COE), and other stakeholders comprising a statewide network of experts who support LEAs under the System of Support and specialize in instructional practices targeting students with disabilities (SWD), English learners (EL), 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 third 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, and 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 Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) met the criteria for Education Code subdivision (g) of Section 52064.5:

Student Groups	2017 Priority	2018 Priority	2019 Priority
African American Students	- Pupil Achievement - Pupil Engagement	- Pupil Achievement - Pupil Engagement	- Pupil Achievement - Pupil Engagement
Students Experiencing Homelessness	- Pupil Achievement - Pupil Engagement	- Pupil Achievement - Pupil Engagement	- Pupil Achievement - Pupil Engagement
English Learners	- Pupil Achievement - Pupil Engagement	- Pupil Achievement - Pupil Engagement	- Pupil Achievement - Pupil Engagement

IV. Data Collection

Data collection for this review began in February 2020 and consisted of a comprehensive document review of instructional artifacts and policy documents and individual interviews with leadership staff including governing board members. The collection process was then interrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic, resulting in the closure of schools and transition to virtual learning. Regular check-in meetings continued with the district and COE to determine support needed and agreement was made to continue with the SIR process to help inform the district's strategic instructional efforts. Data collection resumed in September 2020 with interviews of individual stakeholders, focus groups with multiple stakeholder groups both inside and outside the district, and virtual classroom visits. Through this comprehensive approach, CCEE staff were able to triangulate multiple data points in an effort to validate the collected data set and individual items.

During December 2020, teams of CCEE staff members conducted virtual classroom visits in 11 schools and 61 classrooms. Staff visited six elementary schools, four middle schools, and one high school. Teams had an opportunity to talk with the site leaders and visited various grade levels and content areas. Also observed were advisories, ELD sessions, and

special education programs. It is important to note that the school site and classroom visits are an activity in the SIR process that normally occurs in-person. CCEE acknowledges that OUSD, like many districts across the state and nation, is working through distance learning and planning for students returning to school. CCEE will visit school sites and classrooms after in-school instruction resumes. The data gathered, at that point, will be incorporated into the ongoing support and progress monitoring of the implementation of SIR actions.

Prior to site visits, CCEE staff reviewed all documents submitted by OUSD to support instructional efforts. Additional documents were added and reviewed during the period of virtual school and classroom visits and interviews. Virtual school 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 (13) were conducted with various stakeholder groups including students, families, teachers, support staff, school administrators, labor partners, and community committees/groups. It is important to note that attempts were made to gather the input of HY families through targeted focus groups, unfortunately, none were able to attend. Therefore this is an area to return to as part of the post SIR implementation to provide input on progress monitoring and recommended actions. Interviews (43) were conducted with individuals in various leadership roles across the district. All data collection was completed in a virtual format due to the pandemic.

V. Report Features and Layout

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

- a) a summary of the CCEE instructional component reviewed
- b) the findings based on data collection and SWOT analysis
- c) the discussion paragraph(s) detailing evidence based on the instructional component being reviewed
- d) the SWOT analysis of the component (strengths, weaknesses, threats, and opportunities); and
- e) action steps

The report culminates with a summary identifying themes impacting the work in OUSD. In collaboration with the CCEE and Alameda COE, the district will create and implement an action plan to prioritize and implement the action steps. Upon reviewing this report, it is recommended to have the CCEE Systemic Instructional Review Components (Appendix A) in hand to see the full details of each instructional component.

VI. Summary of Findings

Situated in the Bay Area, Oakland Unified School District consists of 48 elementary schools, five K-8, 12 middle schools, three 6-12, one 6-12 alternative, seven high schools, six high school alternatives, and one independent study school, for a total of 76 sites housing 83 district-run schools. The district enrollment in 2019/2020 was approximately 35,000 students in district-run schools. In addition, there are 33 district-authorized charter

schools that are not represented in this report. The data for the 2019/2020 school year provided the following data: 71.2% of the students qualifying for Free and Reduced Lunch, 13.5% SWD, 0.25% of students experiencing homelessness, and 32.9% English learners. The district 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.

2019-2020 OUSD School Breakdown	
School Type	# of schools
Elementary School	48
Grade K-8 School	5
Middle School	12
Grade 6-12 Schools	3
Grade 6-12 Alternative School	1
High School	7
Alternative High Schools	6
Independent Study	1
Total	83 schools, located on 76 sites

The SIR report serves to focus accountability on improved student outcomes. In OUSD the specific focus is on African American students (AAs), English learners (ELs), and students experiencing homelessness (HY). Although the primary focus is on these three student populations, there is a recognition that these groups function in the context of the whole. With this in mind, the report addresses equity through systemness. Systemness is defined as an “overall mindset . . . a commitment to contributing to, and benefitting from, the larger system.” (Fullan, 2015, p.5).

In addition, the district has been working on stabilizing its financial status considering the impact of declining enrollment and the priorities stated in the LCAP. These LCAP priorities and financial decisions are designed to support the increased number of unduplicated student populations, as recommended in the November 2019 California State Auditor’s Report. The actions outlined in the SIR are in support of the district’s continued pathway to financial health and achievement of LCAP goals, which includes engagement with ACOE on the Intensive Support and Technical Assistance (ISTA) and Differentiated Assistance support they have been providing.

Overall, OUSD has multiple plans that are aligned with the district vision and include goals, metrics processes, and outcomes that serve to focus the instruction for all students and various student populations. However, coherence on what the instructional goals are and what is expected at the classroom level still remains a significant barrier. The Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) outlines the district’s focus in many areas. The Instructional Focus Plan, 2019-2022, developed in collaboration with ACOE, outlines the expected instructional focus for all schools. Building out from those plans are other plans that support the implementation of the LCAP and Instructional Focus Plan, for example, English

Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement (ELLMA) Roadmap Plan, Annual Plan, and the Literacy Plan. The challenge the district faces is integrating these plans into a cohesive and coherent message with a shared focus that creates connections for district departments, networks, and schools for their implementation.

Although addressing instructional coherence is critical, the understanding of what are practices and procedures that will remain tight and loose at all levels of the district also must be addressed to ensure a commonly understood degree of quality of instruction in every classroom, support to attain quality is provided, and to attain OUSD's equity-driven agenda. Autonomy and accountability was found to be misunderstood by many in the system, which in regard to instruction can perpetuate inequities and can make it difficult to set and meet goals. There is a path forward for OUSD to recalibrate school autonomy by clarifying, especially in the area of instruction, how attaining student achievement outcomes is what connects the district, networks, and schools. This must also come with a clear understanding of accountability measures that communicate reciprocal accountability, at all levels, and enacts focus, celebration, and problem solving.

While the SIR process began prior to school closures in mid-March 2020, the 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, AAs, and HY, 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, which addresses the 12 instructional components of the SIR.

Strengths

- Stakeholders feel that engagement opportunities are improving.
- The district has a robust data system that is responsive to flexible needs and is known for its mapping systems.
- The district is recognized by districts within and outside of California for programs such as the African American Male Achievement (AAMA) initiative, English Learner programs, Linked Learning, Community Schools, etc.
- The Office of Equity is a voice for the underrepresented communities within the district and highly regarded by some stakeholders. The system can learn from these communities, and they can help integrate equity throughout instructional priorities and targets.
- The district has taken steps to seek and leverage funding from outside organizations and community partners focused on instructional initiatives. The support enriches the system's ability to serve its students (Outside funding is also a threat, see below).

Weaknesses

- There is a misalignment, acknowledged by multiple stakeholders, between district

plans and the ways in which they are implemented at school sites.

- There are limited structures for accountability at the central office, network, and site levels regarding district instructional priorities.
- Perceived site autonomies impact the implementation of district plans in the areas of curriculum, centralized professional development, and measurement of student progress.
- Numerous stakeholders acknowledged that continuous external crises, e.g., the budget and the pandemic, have negatively impacted OUSD's ability to implement initiatives strategically.
- There is a lack of structures to learn from successful schools or initiatives within OUSD.
- There is a perception, not borne out by data, that the OUSD leadership pipeline and support system is challenged by the rate of principal changes.¹
- There is a perception that OUSD is challenged in hiring and retaining teachers of color. In this case, data indicate² that the largest task in aligning demographic balance is between Latinx teachers and the Latinx student population.
- There needs to be an increased effort for OUSD to move beyond engaging its stakeholders to one in which a common understanding of a few key priorities regarding instructional outcomes and pupil achievement is clear.
- There also needs to be an effort to focus collective energy with stakeholders in supporting OUSD's instructional vision for all students with an eye on meeting these outcomes.
- The branding and marketing of OUSD, while improving, needs greater refinement and attention to multiple ways of delivering its communications to families, most especially families who may have language or technology barriers.

Threats

- The continuity and maintenance of some supports and programs are threatened by expiring grants and funding, which creates built-in instability.
- Decisions on funding of supports (e.g., staffing, materials, professional learning) for programs at the district and school level must be aligned with the district's strategic agenda, the Instructional Focus Plan (IFP), and the School Plans for Student Achievement (SPSAs) and include a plan for sustainability when funding expires.
- Diverse advocacies with opposing views and differing agendas impact the district's ability to remain focused on the instructional priorities. Further, the emphasis of these community groups and organizations is largely on social services without a clear connection to how these services will support student academic outcomes.
- Stakeholders perceived that transitions or changes in the teacher and principal corps threaten the quality and stability of services at school sites. This perception is not always supported by data.
- The lack of clear guidelines on site level autonomy prevents system-wide implementation of the instructional vision.

¹ The most recent national data (2016-17) indicate the principal attrition rate across the nation was 18% compared with OUSD's 2016-17 rate of 14.7%. In 2018-19, OUSD's principal attrition rate dropped to 10.4%.

² OUSD's teachers are 15.6% Latinx while the student population is 47.8% Latinx.

- School sites that are declining in enrollment and have the potential for less resources are at risk of sustaining efforts to assure that key programs and student supports remain in place.
- Oakland does not lack basic systems; rather, the district lacks consistent and systemic implementation of foundational agreements of what is expected of all schools, e.g., instructional programs, PBIS, MTSS, etc., and how the central office and the networks support them and hold them, and themselves, accountable for attaining these.

Opportunities

- Historically OUSD has gone through multiple leadership changes. The current senior district leadership is perceived as stable and credible by most stakeholders. Many senior leadership positions are filled by long-time OUSD educators. Consistency in leadership that leverages experience and credibility is a strength; whether leadership is developed from within or not, there is also an opportunity to leverage new thinking.
- The district has the opportunity to use learning from various previously implemented programs, such as the Early Literacy work or Restorative Justice work, to bring the best outcomes and most effective practices to scale and limit the number of initiatives that are not focused on the instructional priorities and strategies.
- The district has an opportunity to standardize expectations on the strategic use of data to drive aligned cycles of inquiry throughout the system and hold itself accountable to improved student outcomes, particularly for ELs, AAs, and HY.
- The Instructional Focus Plan, crafted in cooperation with the Alameda County Office of Education, provides the foundation and coherence for instruction for schools districtwide and clarifies the expectations and resources for the central office, networks, and schools to attain pupil achievement outcomes.
- The district has an opportunity to develop a program-effectiveness rubric grounded in the learning from programs and pilots, e.g., some of the practices of Restorative Justice, Community Schools, etc. Again, it must be emphasized that the focus should be on best practices vs. specific programs. The goal would be to ensure maximum return on investment for student outcomes, especially academic achievement. This would support decision-making about budgets and resourcing to improve student achievement and academic outcomes, particularly for ELs, AAs, and HY.
- There is an opportunity to clarify the role of committees, both internal and external, with a focus on purpose: to inform, advise, or decide. The Defined Autonomy draft begins that process for school-based committees.
- OUSD has an opportunity to leverage outside funding that is aligned to the district's strategic agenda, the Instructional Focus Plan (IFP), and SPSAs. Consideration should be given to the potential for funding to be sustainable. Clear grant guidelines for seeking new funding should focus on outside funding being aligned to district plans and on promoting funding sustainability.

For the OUSD SIR Executive Summary, please [click here](#).

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

1. Culture, Coherence, and the Planning Process

(CCEE Instructional Component 1) The local educational agency (LEA) places a strong value on 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 to create coherence around an inclusive instructional mission and vision achieved through continuous improvement practices and processes. The LEA has a robust culture of accountability in regard to the academic, social, and emotional developmental of each child. Achievement outcomes guide coherent and collaborative work while fostering knowledge of expectations around teaching, learning, and accountability.

Finding 1a. There is widespread belief among stakeholders that OUSD must intensify its actions to address adult beliefs about systemic racism, historical marginalization, explicit and implicit bias, and racial injustice across the system.

Finding 1b. While OUSD has articulated its dedication to culturally reflective policies and practices, there is variance in how this work is viewed by all departments centrally and how it is accomplished at the network and site levels.

Finding 1c. Greater coherence in the areas of culture and planning would be enhanced by more consistent implementation of short cycles of improvement focused on available data at all school sites.

Finding 1d. OUSD's focus on development of the whole child would be more impactful with consistent implementation of policies and practices related to MTSS at all school sites.

Finding 1e. There is a need to re-envision the culture of site autonomy.

Finding 1f. Opportunities exist to refine and improve communication within the system and with stakeholders through an established strategic agenda (Strategic Plan) and instructional agenda (Instructional Focus Plan).

Discussion

As noted in Section IV. Data Collection, the SIR process was affected by the shift to distance learning caused by the pandemic. Data collection for the culture, coherence, and planning component was one of the most impacted because of the requirement to visit and observe schools virtually. There is no substitution for the SIR team's ability to be on the ground observing elements of culture and climate, such as a school's welcoming environment and in-person interactions. In this case, our triangulation of data is more heavily weighted to synthesize our findings from empathy interviews, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, and artifact review.

In addition, the SIR was conducted at a time when systemic racism, historical marginalization, and racial justice have moved to the center of national discussions. While recognizing that OUSD has been engaged in these discussions internally and with stakeholders, OUSD stakeholders seek meaningful dialogue and more importantly, action

that includes policy and cultural shifts toward eradicating systemic bias and racist and anti-Black thinking across the system.

The culture of OUSD is driven by multiple factors including its dedication to equity, its history of innovative practices, and a long-standing record of site autonomy that developed from the small schools initiative, which began in 2000 (Vasudeva et al., 2009). At the policy level, there is a clear articulation of the value of culture and climate. This is evidenced by existing central office communications, the many initiatives of the Office of Equity, the identification of best practices used in OUSD's Restorative Justice and the Community Schools initiative, and efforts to bring issues of culture, climate, diversity, equity, and inclusion into professional learning. The key is not the replication of specific program models; it is the scaling up of best practices. There is a district focus on the development of the whole child as evidenced by work ranging from OUSD efforts to address food insecurity during the pandemic to increasing attention to social and emotional learning needs.

The greater Oakland community celebrates and embraces the diversity of its members and views that diversity as a strength. This also filters through the beliefs of OUSD leadership and policies. One example is the way in which OUSD has worked to integrate a shift from a deficit-based to an asset-based approach into academic content discussions. OUSD has a history of targeted initiatives to support diverse student groups. Among the most notable are African American Female Excellence, African American Male Achievement, Asian Pacific Islander Achievement, and Latino/a Student Achievement.

Most recently, with its reaction to the technology needs of pandemic-forced distance learning, and with the aid of outside partners such as those supporting the #OaklandUndivided campaign, the district implemented multiple ways for students, families, and staff to access technology that has been vital for the community. The district provided opportunities for teachers to engage in professional development to support instruction and increase engagement in the new online delivery model. This included dashboards for monitoring progress, e.g., Thursday Family Support Meetings sponsored by the Office of Equity and the site-based opportunities for students and their families to learn how to use district technology platforms.

Yet while these beliefs are articulated and brought to action in many areas within OUSD, a number of stakeholders reported a lack of system-wide coherence that manifests in variance in implementation across some school sites. Fullan and Quinn (2016) described a coherent system as one in which participants have a "shared depth of understanding about the nature of the work" (p. 30), specifically in the areas of establishing focus, creating a collaborative culture, deepening learning, and securing accountability.

A commonly agreed-upon culture of accountability for development of the whole child is not consistent across OUSD. Implementation of short cycles of improvement focused on available data varies by school site. OUSD policies and practices related to MTSS and its support for diverse students vary in implementation. In some areas, there is a lack of common agreement around the roles and responsibilities of the central office, networks, and schools as they relate to school culture.

The culture of site autonomy sometimes negatively impacts a notion of shared accountability across the levels of the district. Stakeholders at multiple levels reported varying understanding of how site autonomy is to be interpreted, which naturally impacts the understanding of shared accountability. OUSD Board policy 6005 has called for an autonomy framework, which is still under revision. In this revision, called for in this report in action steps, OUSD should consider addressing the definition of autonomy as well as beliefs about why autonomy exists in a system. Fullan and Gallegher (2020) called for districts to work toward a state of connected autonomy by rethinking “the system in terms of its three levels—local, middle, and top—so that each level could make a contribution individually and in combination with the other levels in order to transform the system dramatically for the better” (p. vii). This work has already begun as demonstrated by OUSD’s Annual Plans, which specifically call out and define indicators for actions to be taken by teachers, leaders, and the central office to manifest the Instructional Focus Plan’s Building Blocks.

There remains a perception among some stakeholders that not all central departments are in consistent dialogue, although other stakeholders reported that the issue of “siloeing” has diminished under Dr. Johnson-Trammell’s tenure. Lack of consistent dialogue manifests in terms of communication not reaching all who need the information, which could impact stakeholders’ trust in central office. There is also a perception among several stakeholder groups that navigation of the system and access to support is sometimes more contingent upon a system of relationships than policies.

Short-term funding from grants supports initiatives, programs, and staff that serve the development of a positive culture and climate, but the nature of the funding creates longer-term issues of fiscal sustainability, an added stress on a system already fiscally burdened. For example, many Community School Managers sometimes seek outside funding for their schools. While this effort deserves accolades for the way in which it brings added resources, it also raises issues of sustainability of funding for a school.

OUSD’s need to refine its work in the areas of culture and coherence lies in continuing to cultivate a shared understanding of how this work is to be done at all levels of the system, centrally, in networks, and at school sites. To that end, there is a need to continue to increase engagement with all stakeholders, especially parents and community advocacy groups. There is also a need to consider ways in which it might be possible to reset the definition and understanding of site autonomy by examining what system functions are best held centrally and which are more impactful when held at the site level. For example, there is an opportunity to continue, again at all levels of the system, to enhance a culture of learning evidenced by common agreement on assessment practices. At central and network leadership levels, there is opportunity to refine and communicate direction, guidance, differentiated support, and oversight. Specifically, OUSD is encouraged to increase and continue to polish communication to all stakeholders, especially hard-to-reach families, on its efforts to address issues of equity and diversity and on the avenues of support the district has in place.

SWOT on Culture, Coherence, and the Planning Process

A. Strengths:

- OUSD values an equity-focused culture and climate at the central, network, and site levels.
- The district focuses on development of the whole child and views diversity as a strength.
- There are targeted initiatives to support diverse student groups.
- Professional development offerings integrate a celebration of diversity and culturally and linguistically relevant practices.
- OUSD has demonstrated support for the development and use of technology to promote equitable access, effective pedagogy, and student engagement.
- Students interviewed revealed that they felt practices implemented by some teachers at AAMA schools supported them, as they felt respected and comfortable engaging in learning.

B. Weaknesses:

- Although it is the intention of the district to focus on equity and to offer professional development focused on culturally reflective practices, stakeholders reported a lack of coherence across schools regarding implementation.
- Stakeholders also reported they perceived there have been limited actions to address systemic racism across the system.
- A commonly agreed-upon culture of accountability for the development of the whole child is not consistent across the system.
- Implementation of short cycles of improvement focused on available data varies by school site.
- There is variance across sites in the implementation of policies and practices related to MTSS.
- In some instructional areas, there is a lack of common agreement on roles and responsibilities of the central office, networks, and school sites.
- While perceived as beneficial in many ways, the culture of site autonomy sometimes negatively impacts a notion of shared accountability across all levels of the system.
- There is a perception that not all components of the system are in regular dialogue; although there is a belief that this is improving at the central office level.
- There is also a perception that consistent communication across the system is not reaching all who need it, including hard-to-reach families.
- Several stakeholder groups reported that navigation of the OUSD system and access to support is sometimes contingent more upon a system of relationships than policies.

C. Threats:

- Initiatives, programs, and staff that support development of a positive culture and climate, and that are paid for through grant funding, face issues of fiscal sustainability. As noted, this is also a strength in the SWOT in section VI.

D. Opportunities:

- Continue to support all stakeholders, especially parents and community advocacy groups, in understanding the instructional vision outlined in the Instructional Focus Plan, and how it exists coherently in all subsequent plans.
- Continue, at all levels, to refine a culture of learning evidenced by common agreement on instructional practices and cycles of continuous improvement, e.g., assessment practices.
- There is an opportunity for the central office and network leadership teams to continue to refine and communicate direction, guidance, differentiated support, and oversight.
- Building off the district's communication structures, continue to refine OUSD's efforts to demonstrate accountability to outcomes and reinforce how the district is addressing issues of equity and diversity.

Actions: Culture, Coherence, and the Planning Process

- 1A. Analyze the effects of existing school autonomies on student outcomes, perhaps with support from an outside partner, to inform the district's policy on autonomy.
- 1B. After analyzing the effects of existing school autonomies on student outcomes, finalize and implement OUSD's draft of its *Defined Autonomy Framework*, which operationalizes the directions contained in Board Policy 6006. Part of this process should be to reach common agreement and shared understanding of how school autonomies in OUSD support better outcomes for students.
- 1C. Identify an Instructional Equity Framework³ that 1) extends from the instructional plan and, when finalized, the strategic plan 2) defines what equity and anti-racist practices look like at the central office, network, school site, and classroom levels, and 3) includes an equity matrix for leaders to use in decision-making.
- 1D. In an effort to make OUSD's vast data resources more accessible, build an Equity Dashboard that standardizes a data set from the indicators on p. 5 of the Instructional Plan. This dashboard would make public the network and school actions to address disproportionality, systemic racism, and explicit and implicit bias.
- 1E. Set expectations for a culture of continuous improvement at school sites based on regular implementation of short cycles of inquiry grounded in data.
- 1F. Set the expectation that full implementation of MTSS practices at all school sites will support OUSD's focus on serving the needs of the whole child.

³ For an example see:

<https://www.austinisd.org/sites/default/files/dept/equity-office/docs/Equity-Framework-%26-Key-Questions.pdf> and the decision-making tool that accompanies it:
<https://www.austinisd.org/sites/default/files/dept/equity-office/docs/Equity-Focused-Decision-Making.pdf>

- 1G. Set the expectation that, as a system, all organizational decisions and data monitoring mechanisms will utilize the tenets of the Strategic Plan being finalized as well as the Instructional Focus Plan.
- 1H. Ensure that all communications within the system and with stakeholders are grounded in the tenets of the finalized Strategic Plan and the Instructional Focus Plan.
- 1I. Require school leaders to engage in training on facilitating dialogue on race, racism, white supremacy, and anti-Blackness.
- 1J. Develop an expectation that schools will begin to initiate inclusive strategies such as Equity Walks to evaluate their culture and climate (for an example see <https://west.edtrust.org/data-equity-walk-toolkit/>).

2. Curriculum, Learning, and Support

(CCEE Instructional Component 2) The LEA has an MTSS framework that documents and assesses the implementation of all standards-aligned materials, curricula, learning, and social-emotional and behavioral supports (e.g., differentiation options, tiered support options, integrated aligned ELD supports). The LEA uses a coherent, standards-aligned curriculum, instruction, and assessment system that is culturally and linguistically responsive and meets the needs of all learners (e.g., gifted, English learners, students with disabilities, and homeless and foster youth). Evidence-based programs and instructional materials reflect the diverse needs of the student population and provide equitable access for all learners.

Finding 2a. While OUSD has been making a concerted effort to ensure all students are taught using coherent standards-aligned materials and curricula, perceived levels of autonomy provided to schools has raised concerns about the consistent implementation of curriculum and support across schools. Lack of a consistent and coherent expectation on instructional programs impacts the provision of a solid instructional foundation, especially for AAs, ELs, and HY.

Finding 2b. Greater involvement of stakeholder voice in the vertical and horizontal planning of curriculum and instruction expectations aligned to the district's overall strategic and instructional plan will lead to a more coherent implementation of the instructional program.

Finding 2c. While the district has had a focus on literacy, there is still a lack of clarity as to what the teaching of reading and language entails at each level of the system. Some guidance is provided in the Annual Plans, 2019/2020, yet teachers continue to need professional learning on the process of teaching reading, academic language, and English language development particularly to AA, ELs, and HY. (connected to finding 3F)

Discussion

Research shows an equity-focused system ensures all students have access to a challenging, standards-based curriculum. Larry Ainsworth & Kyra Donovan, (2019) state, *"The need for a cohesive and comprehensive curriculum that intentionally connects standards, instruction, and assessment has never been greater than it is today. A rigorous—and relevant—curriculum must provide educators with an organized framework*

that enables them to continually monitor student progress toward mastery of the standards” (pg. 1).

Framing the work in curriculum, instruction, and assessment around a Multi-tiered System of Support helps to ground all teaching and learning in rigorous, culturally relevant standards-based instruction. The selection and implementation of evidenced based curriculum, instructional practices, and assessment are at the foundation of the MTSS Framework. OUSD has recognized the need for MTSS as evidenced by the Council of Great City School Report (2016), subsequent OUSD Academic Social Emotional Learning Guidance Document (2016/17), and the most recent Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS) plan, yet implementation of the framework was less evident.

OUSD has developed a three-year plan to ensure all students access high quality standards-based curriculum (textbooks) that is culturally relevant and rigorous by the end of the 2021/2022 school year (Board of Education presentation, 2020). The district teams have reviewed the four main content area textbooks and are currently in various stages of adoption/implementation based on grade level and content area. Science and social studies curriculums have been adopted. Math programs are on hold due to the disruption this year. OUSD is currently in the process of reviewing and testing various literacy programs at the elementary level with the goal of making a recommendation to the Board of Education at the end of the 2020/2021 school year (State of Curriculum and Instructional Materials, 9/20).

OUSD has a culture of school autonomy that includes the selection of curriculum. As a result of this, a variety of reading/language arts programs are used within the district. The Units of Study, in conjunction with the Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS), are considered the base programs in elementary schools. In addition, additional resources such as EL Education, Bookworms, Wit and Wisdom, are available to teach literacy based on waiver requests. This creates inconsistencies in reading instruction particularly for students who might be experiencing homelessness and move from school to school or those learning English. According to the CCEIS plan, this also impacts AAs, possibly resulting in increased rates of referral to special education and discipline. A common foundational literacy program or clearly defined scope and sequence of learning aligned with common assessments is critically important at the early grades when foundational reading skills are taught.

The current ELA programs used in the district are not considered Program 2 (basic grade-level programs that provide the comprehensive curriculum in English language arts for kindergarten through grade eight with the integration of the CA ELD Standards). As a result, the ELLMA program has outlined the English Learner Acceleration Program (ELAP) as the foundation for all schools serving English learners. In addition, various programs are available based on student need and school choice, e.g., dual language, newcomer, LTEL, etc.

OUSD has adopted an evidenced-based program for students with disabilities supported in special day classes. S.P.I.R.E. provides intensive reading intervention for students with

disabilities. Evidence-based programs to support Tier 2 interventions such as iReady, Imagine Learning, and ST Math are also available.

OUSD is known for its implementation of Linked Learning and has a long history of implementation. In 2014, Measure N was passed by Oakland voters that designated approximately 12 million dollars per year (for 10 years), which goes directly to school sites to support customized high-performing career pathways. The district has 13 Linked Learning pathways offered at various schools. High schools offer between one (small schools) and five pathways. The large comprehensive high schools also are structured with 9th-grade academies to support the transition to high school. Pathways are designed to personalize learning and ensure relevance for students. These pathways are supported by a team of teachers who work together to integrate curriculum, career courses, and real-world experiences. All pathways are linked to A-G requirements ensuring all graduating students are college prepared. OUSD has been engaged in this work for over ten years with success in implementation that can be replicated and supported in earlier grades.

While successful implementation includes the link to A-G, teams working together to integrate curriculum, the result of this work is not as evident in student outcomes. ELs, and HY continue to have the lowest graduation rates at 56% and 41.3% respectively. AA students were graduating at a higher rate, 75.2% in the last year data was available. This is in comparison to the overall graduation rate of 75% (2019). Over the last three years of data collection, the general population and the AAs population have increased in graduation rate. While the graduation rate of African American students has been consistently the same as or above the district rate for the past three years, many fewer African American students graduate having met A-G requirements. The graduation rates for ELs and HY have declined over the last three years.

Culturally relevant instruction is embedded through various targeted literacy programs such as the Ta'alam Literacy Program, Middle Eastern & Pacific Islander Literacy Pilot Projects, and the Fananga Literacy Program, etc. At the secondary level, one curriculum in use at some schools is the Khepera Curriculum to support AA youth in the exploration of their cultural identity.

SWOT on Curriculum, Learning, and Support

A. Strengths:

- The district has a three-year plan for ensuring all content and grades have quality standards-aligned curriculum. The district plan indicates that the district should meet this goal by the end of the 2021-2022 school year, yet with the delays caused by the pandemic, this may be extended. The ELA adoption should be complete and ready to implement in fall 2021.
- The focus on literacy is a common theme with stakeholders within and outside of the district.
- The district has adopted an evidenced-based literacy program, SPIRE, for special education programs.
- ELLMA office has developed supplemental designated ELD lessons to be used in conjunction with the reading programs.

- Evidence-based programs, Benchmark and Adelante, are consistently used in Dual Language programs.
- The district's EL program has developed guidance on supplemental programs to support the core elementary curriculum.
- The district has several evidence-based supplemental programs such as Imagine Learning, iReady, and ST Math to support prevention, acceleration, and remediation in reading, language, and math.
- The district has embraced the structure of Linked Learning and personalization at the high school level.

B. Weaknesses:

- The current curriculum used in elementary ELA/ELD, Units of Study, is not sequenced or fully aligned with the CCSS. As a result, the district has supplemented the curriculum with Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS) for foundational reading.
- Units of Instruction used for elementary literacy instruction lack authentic cultural relevance.
- Although there are committees to review the new curriculum, stakeholders want clarity on the role of the committee, i.e., to inform, advise, or decide.
- The current elementary reading program, Units of Study, has loosely defined designated ELD, contributing to a lack of coherence in instruction for English learners, especially when the English learner guidance is not implemented in tandem with the Units of Study.
- Professional development on ELD is opt-in, creating inconsistencies in instruction.

C. Threats:

- The perception of autonomy over the selection of curriculum inhibits the implementation of comprehensive, sequenced, standards-based curricular programs districtwide.
- The lack of clear guardrails or standards across all schools as to the non-negotiable elements of a comprehensive literacy program hinder growth for all students, but especially for AAs, ELs, and HY.

D. Opportunities:

- The ELA programs under review for adoption offer an opportunity to implement a core program for all schools that is culturally relevant, sequenced, and aligned to standards and best practices.
- The district has an opportunity to build common language and common understanding around a shared focus on increasing literacy outcomes for all students using MTSS by identifying a common foundational elementary reading program and defining how it meets the needs of the various student groups.
- There is an opportunity to leverage the newly adopted textbooks to outline a literacy plan from preschool-12th grade that focuses on foundational reading standards, core standards, and ELA/ELD standards for content subjects.

- The success of pathways structures of teaching through the lens of the pathway and focus on aligning to A-G requirements at the high school level provide opportunities for the district to move the college and career work down to the elementary level. Current College/Career data indicate that the percent of students prepared for college/career has increased over the last three years (currently at 38.5%).

Actions: Curriculum, Learning, and Support

- 2A. The central office is to outline the non-negotiables in the selection of curricular materials to ensure all students receive instruction using curricular tools that are standards-aligned, rigorous, and culturally relevant.
- 2B. Revisit and revise the draft "Defined Autonomy" policy to define and implement a coherent approach to autonomy in curriculum selection as well as accountabilities for at the site level (teachers), network level (principals), and district level (network superintendents). As recommended in action 1A, potentially partner with an outside organization well versed in earned school autonomy to define the concept of autonomy and establish agreed-upon guardrails, monitoring, and support structures.
- 2C. The central office should provide required professional development in all curricular areas and integrate the explicit teaching of reading, ELD, and academic language strategies.
- 2D. The network structure should examine how it will be used to provide differentiated support and monitoring of the implementation of a systemwide literacy focus and implement a consistent model across the different networks.
- 2E. Use the CCEIS plan and the Early Literacy plans as opportunities to build a systemwide literacy focus, grounded in a Multitiered System of Support, that identifies specific measurable literacy goals at each level.

3. Instructional Practice and Strategies

(CCEE Instructional Component 3) The LEA has established and defined instructional practices and strategies that are culturally inclusive, differentiated, rigorous, coherent, and standards aligned. Instructional technology, project-based learning, and other experiences beyond the textbook are regularly utilized. Instructional practices and strategies positively support students in developing self-agency and building metacognitive skills. The LEA maintains a districtwide intentional focus on providing a rigorous teaching and learning experience that uses Universal Design for Learning principles for improving and extending differentiated instructional practices that increase student engagement.

Finding 3a. The OUSD has dedicated time and resources to develop a comprehensive instructional plan for all students with clear recognition of the components required for a coherent instructional system: foundational teacher PD, curriculum-based professional learning, on-site coaching and support, quality, standards-based curriculum, and standards-based assessment.

Finding 3b. OUSD's purposeful alignment of its instructional plan with LCAP goals connects actions to outcomes and state accountabilities.

Finding 3c. The OUSD recognizes the varied needs of its diverse communities. The district has had a tradition, emerging from the small schools initiative, of having schools develop and own their instructional plans and curriculum. As a result, schools have been able to pilot programs or resources that are not always aligned with the district's priorities, creating incoherence throughout the system.

Finding 3d. Whereas in some schools there is clear evidence of common instructional strategies being implemented across grade levels/departments, it is not evident in others.

Finding 3e. OUSD has written a three-year instructional plan with support from the Alameda County Office of Education (ACOE). Schools have to address the building blocks included in the Instructional Focus Plan when writing the SPSA. The district has also produced The English Language Learner Road Map, Master Plan, and Annual Plan, which are comprehensive, including priorities, goals, metrics, practices, etc. There is variance in how these plans are implemented and integrated at the school and classroom level.

Finding 3f. While literacy has been a focus for the district and an early literacy plan exists, teachers continue to need professional learning on the process of teaching reading, academic language, utilization of culturally and linguistically responsive practices, and English language development, particularly to support AAs, ELs, and HY. (connected to finding 2C)

Discussion

As reflected in section IV, data collection for Instructional Practices and Strategies was highly affected by the pandemic and distance learning. School visits were conducted virtually, after more than one semester of distance learning for students and staff. Thus, evidence gathering was dependent on artifacts, interviews, and truncated observations due to modified distance learning schedules.

The LEA has created an instructional plan intended to establish priorities and professional practices for the system. The pillars, or building blocks, for these professional practices are utilized by school sites when developing their School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA). This plan includes goals for students, with summative measures, intended to ensure that all students graduate college and/or that they are career and community ready. The next step is to engage the system (district, network, and school level) in identifying common formative, standards aligned measures to implement with a minimum number of cycles of inquiry to gauge student learning/progress towards instructional outcomes. Systemic implementation of such plans would also include district, network, and school-level clarity and accountability around priority practices that would be included in planning and lesson delivery.

Evidence from district plans, artifacts, and interviews indicate that literacy has been a focus for the district. Stakeholders shared that the most rigorous mathematical tasks require literacy and understanding, thus highlighting the role literacy plays in student outcomes across content areas. The comprehensive literacy approach called out by OUSD involves rigorous tasks that require analytical thinking and provide differentiated practices to support all learners. Differentiated practices include foundational literacy skills, integration and designation of ELD, and independent reading of culturally relevant, appropriate

leveled texts. Classroom observations demonstrate incoherence in the system with discrepancies in the implementation of the literacy plan.

The Roadmap for ELLs is another one of OUSD's comprehensive plans. As with the literacy focus, the same can be said for implementation of GLAD strategies to support English learners included in the Roadmap. Although the summer institute offers GLAD strategies as part of the foundational training for teachers, not all teachers of ELs have been trained. For those teachers who have been trained, evidence of implementation varied. The district has processes, such as student shadowing, to note implementation and effect on student learning. Usage of such processes is limited.

In some schools, the importance of Tier 1 instruction and small group instruction was highlighted. Differentiated practices and supports for struggling students in a Tier 2 or Tier 3 setting varied, based on funds, personnel available and decisions made by the school sites. Partnerships with local agencies that provide academic tutors and volunteers who provide support in the classrooms, as well as case managers, are some of the resources various schools use. OUSD's partnerships with the community and local agencies are noted as assets by teachers and administrators alike. There is also a recognition that these partnerships are limited based on availability and relationships, which does not always support the implementation of systemic practices.

Most high schools in OUSD implement Linked Learning pathways for students. The Linked Learning approach integrates rigorous academics that meet college-ready standards with sequenced, high-quality career-technical education, work-based learning, and supports to help students stay on track. For Linked Learning students, education is organized around industry-sector themes. Their chosen industry theme is woven into lessons taught by teachers who collaborate across subject areas with input from working professionals and reinforced by work-based learning with real employers. Some of the Linked Learning Goals for OUSD in 2020 were to:

- 1) enroll 80% of high school students in Linked Learning pathways,
- 2) attain 85% cohort graduation rate across the city,
- 3) have 75% of students meet UC/CSU A-G criteria, and
- 4) have 60% of AA, EL, Latino, special education, and foster youth meet A-G requirements

Given current College/Career data, the percent of students prepared for college/career has increased over the last three years (currently at 38.5%), so significant work needs to be done to achieve 2020 goals.

Professional practices in OUSD's instructional plan call out for data-driven instruction, in which "teachers collaboratively analyze formative assessments in relation to grade-level standards and use data to inform instructional practices." Data collected revealed that at some schools there are short cycles of inquiry, utilizing data such as IAB results or school formative assessments. These cycles of inquiry engage teachers in data analysis and problem-solving. Improvement-monitoring methods, whether by site administrators or

network superintendents, were varied. A common language or process for the monitoring of, and accountability for, improved student outcomes was lacking.

Systemic implementation of this strategy, or cycles of inquiry, would benefit all schools in addressing student learning and improving outcomes for African American students (AA), English learners (EL), and youth experiencing homelessness (HY).

SWOT on Instructional Practice and Strategies

A. Strengths:

- The OUSD has a three-year instructional plan that will result in standards-based aligned curriculum for ELA, mathematics, and science K-12.
- The OUSD's instructional plan is aligned with LCAP goals.
- A thoughtful Learning and Continuity Plan has been developed to address student needs and learning during the pandemic.
- The district is recognized for its consistent implementation of the pillars of Linked Learning at its secondary schools.
- The English Learner Road Map and English Learner Master Plan are comprehensive, offering goals, outcomes, pedagogy, and varied programs, together with monitoring tools and guidelines.
- The early literacy plan calls out foundational skills, integrated and designated ELD, and accountable independent reading.
- Essential, researched-proven practices have been identified for English learners, such as *Stronger and Clearer Each Time*, *Three Reads*, GLAD, etc.
- During interviews, students revealed that they felt practices implemented by some teachers at AAMA schools supported them, as they felt respected and comfortable engaging in learning.

B. Weaknesses:

- The existing curriculum in elementary ELA, as well as high school ELA, math, and history, are neither standards-based nor aligned within the district, other than at Dual Language schools.
- The misalignment of implementation of curriculum, instruction and assessment directly affects teaching and learning for AAs, ELs, and HYs.
- Teachers need professional learning on the system practices that have been identified for teaching reading, academic language, and English language development to increase systemic implementation of practices that support increased outcomes for AAs, ELs, and HY.
- The district engages in grant writing and community outreach for financial support to implement instructional practices aligned with its core values and instructional plans when district funds are limited; however, there is not a clear system for evaluating whether these grants and financial supports attain the intended outcomes for student populations. Furthermore, when those practices are producing the desired student outcomes, there isn't a clear continuity plan for when the grants sunset.
- There is lack of clarity about the intent of pilot programs, whether it is to learn from or to scale up, and how they contribute to attaining the district's

- instructional plan and student outcomes. Diverse interpretations exist about the criteria for entering or exiting a program, as it relates to student outcomes.
- Implementation of diverse curriculum as approved by waivers affect coherence and continuity for students transferring within the system.
 - Priorities identified in the OUSD's three-year Instructional Focus Plan, as well as strategies identified by the district, are not consistently implemented districtwide.
 - There does not appear to be clear or consistent understanding/communication/implementation of accountability to the district's priorities and meeting student outcomes at the central office, network, and school level.
 - There are diverse interpretations of autonomy at the district and school site level.

C. Threats:

- Lack of clarity and/or understanding of autonomies, expectations, and accountabilities in the field, threaten the coherence of foundational program implementation.

D. Opportunities:

- The OUSD has an opportunity to develop a common language and common understanding around its priorities with coherent and aligned accountability that supports common language, common understanding, and coherence in the system.
- The LEA has an opportunity to clarify and provide targeted support that builds on its foundational instructional plan and focuses on leveraging cycles of inquiry, culturally and linguistically responsive practices, rigor, and creating schools that support the social-emotional well-being of all students, with a focus on meeting the needs of AAs, ELs, and HY.
- The district has an opportunity to unify key district plans and implement strategies with specificity so schools know how to implement future improvement actions found in a unified improvement plan.
- The district has an opportunity to systematically implement, at all secondary schools, the pillars of Linked Learning: rigorous academics, technical skills, work-based learning, personalized support in order to improve outcomes for AAs, ELs, and HY to achieve greater than 60% A-G completion.
- The district has an opportunity to expand practices utilized by teachers in the AAMA classrooms to all classes with AA students so that they feel safe and respected to engage in learning and improve academic outcomes.

Actions: Instructional Practice and Strategies

- 3A. Build on the district's instructional focus plan working with the central office, networks, and schools to clarify instructional non-negotiables related to priorities for the district. These non-negotiables would focus on systemwide instructional and engagement practices to ensure all students experience meaningful and relevant instructional tasks that support student mastery of content standards.

Non-negotiables should include common expectations of instructional practice (across networks and schools), minimum cycles of inquiry school teams engage in, the central office having a set minimum of improvement goals from one cycle of inquiry to another, and a set number of common strategies to support students.

3B. As recommended in 1A, define the concept of autonomy, possibly with the support of an outside organization, and establish agreed upon guardrails, monitoring, and support structures. Given this definition, revisit and revise the draft “Defined Autonomy” policy to define and implement a coherent approach to autonomy as well as accountabilities for instructional practices at the site level (teachers), network level (principals), and district level (network superintendents).

3C. Connect the Instructional Focus Plan to existing professional practices within the district that have resulted in improved outcomes for targeted populations. Use successful models within the district to scale the work at the central office and increase schools accessing them.

3D. Expand policies, professional learning, and implementation of culturally relevant practices utilized by AAMA teachers that allow students to feel safe and respected and to engage in learning intended to improve AA students' academic outcomes.

4. Social-Emotional and Behavioral Health and 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 and instruction 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. OUSD has invested deeply in the social-emotional well-being of students and family practices. For example, Community Schools programs and Restorative Justice practices and personalization are found in Linked Learning and the Small Schools practices, yet the practices are not systemic across the district. While the programs are highlighted, it is the practices that should be the focus.

Finding 4b. OUSD has embedded the importance of social-emotional well-being in all guiding documents. It is clear that throughout the system, there is a focus on connecting with students and families on a personal level.

Discussion

“SEL can be a powerful lever for creating caring, just, inclusive, and healthy communities that support all individuals in reaching their fullest potential. Systemic implementation of SEL both fosters and depends upon an equitable learning environment, where all students and adults feel respected, valued, and affirmed in their individual interests, talents, social identities, cultural values, and backgrounds,” according to Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning website, <https://casel.org/>. Furthermore, according to Smith, Frey, Pumpian, and Fisher (2017), “. . . it is essential for the school to intentionally create systems that support the social-emotional engagement of its members and help them to feel understood and valued.” (pg. 33).

One of the core values of OUSD is a long-standing commitment to the vision of service to the whole child. This includes the family as the primary unit of support and nurturing for each child. This is evidenced in the development of the Full Service Community Schools Initiative many years ago. While a focus on equity is at the heart of this work, it has become all the more urgent in recent years, and specifically this year of COVID-19 interruptions. Various programs have been established and implemented that are recognized beyond the borders of the district. Full Service Community Schools and Restorative Justice are two examples of this innovation. Both of these programs have been implemented and studied for over 10 years. In addition, in 2016 the district created the Office of Equity to strengthen the process of creating a culture of equity.

In 2010, OUSD implemented the Full Service Community Schools (FSCS) initiative in 27 schools. Since that time the service has expanded to 64 schools. FSCS provides a “. . . *focus on high academic achievement while serving the whole child, eliminating inequity, and providing each child with excellent teachers every day.*” (Community of Schools Citywide Plan, 2018). This initiative was further supported by Board Policy 6006, Community of Schools. In a 3-year research study conducted in collaboration between John W. Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities at Stanford University and Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) conducted in 2019, the “*data suggest that full-service community schools are keeping track with or improving at a faster rate than schools district wide, despite working with demonstrably more disadvantaged students.*” (Oakland Unified School District *Full-Service Community Schools Outcomes: A Retrospective, 2019*). Stakeholders continue to report the positive outcomes on school and family structures, especially in light of the impact of COVID-19. Implementation of this initiative has been grounded in a gradual release process. Schools were provided full district funding for one full-time employee (FTE) in the first year, one-half funding for the 2nd year, and full school funding in the 3rd year. While this program has had indicators of success in influencing culture and climate, it has not been embraced systemwide. It is perceived to be based on relationships (i.e., relationships determine which schools get a program), and is in jeopardy due to ongoing funding issues at both the district and school levels.

Another process focused on social justice and equity is Restorative Justice (RJ). The use of RJ practices have been in the district since inception at one school in 2005 and had expanded to 24 by 2014. The practices embedded in RJ, when implemented with fidelity, have a track record of reducing racially disproportionate discipline and suspensions and improving academic outcomes (Restorative Justice in Oakland Schools, Implementation and Impacts, 2014). According to this report, conducted by OUSD personnel, RJ practices reduced referrals and suspensions for all students in the schools but particularly for African American students. It should be noted that this report was completed in 2014 and was primarily looking at implementation practices. Student outcomes were not measured. Recent data (2019) indicates that AA students are suspended at a higher rate (8.7%). The report also reported improvement in climate and an increase in caring relationships and attendance. Again, current data shows that AAs, ELs, and HY have the highest rates of chronic absenteeism. Stakeholders referred to the use of RJ practices on school sites to support a climate of caring and personalization. While this initiative has demonstrated levels of success in initial implementation, this was accomplished with resources including central office support and RJ counselors. As resources become scarce, it is important to

question how the practices become part of the school structure rather than dependence on a program and additional resources. Some schools have embedded the work under the care of the Community Services Manager.

In 2016, the Office of Equity was established to fold several initiatives under one umbrella. The African American Male Achievement, African American Female Excellence, Latino/a Student Achievement, and Asian Pacific Islander Student Achievement initiatives combined creating the newly formed Office of Equity. The Office of Equity was created to provide guidance system-wide on targeted support for identified groups of students and aimed at supporting alignment between instructional and social-emotional strategies. Evidence of implementation of these programs was evident in electives at the secondary schools, clubs, use of advisory programs, and mentorships.

Even with a hyperfocus on wellness, the district was found disproportionate in 2018-2019 for the over-identification of AAs as Emotionally Disturbed/Other Health Impairment and further, for the over-suspensions of AAs with IEPs as compared to other students with IEPs. OUSD is in the process of developing a CCEIS plan to address disproportionality and aims to focus on the impact. One focus of that plan is a deeper look at the success of underperforming students, especially in systems reading.

SWOT on Social-Emotional and Behavioral Health and Development

A. Strengths:

- The district focuses on meeting the needs of the whole child. (Sanctuary District, Full Service Community Schools, Restorative Justice) etc.
- Overall suspension rates are declining.
- A focus on Restorative Justice and culturally relevant PBIS is evident.
- The Community Schools Managers help support homeless youth and attendance rates.
- The district's Learning and Continuity Plan, as well as the OUSD Instructional plan, address measures to promote resilience and social-emotional learning for students.
- SEL activities are embedded into examples reviewed.

B. Weaknesses:

- Social-emotional and behavioral health programs are site specific and dependent on site and outside funding.
- AA youth have the highest suspension rates, specifically in middle schools.
- AA, Pacific Islanders, and homeless youth have the lowest attendance rates in the current year, 2020-21.
- Clear indicators for successful implementation of the work of any personnel supporting social-emotional and behavioral health programs are unclear.

C. Threats:

- There is lack of clarity about the intent of social-emotional and behavioral health pilot programs, whether it is to learn from or to scale up, and how they contribute to attaining the district's instructional plan and student outcomes.

Diverse interpretations exist about the criteria for students entering or exiting a program, as it relates to student achievement and academic outcomes.

D. Opportunities:

- Many of the tenets of various SEL programs are integrated into school structures, e.g., PBIS, RJ, Community of Schools, particularly at the secondary level. The district has an opportunity to redefine various job descriptions to support SEL implementation into possibly one integrated position or more as an ongoing part of the school culture.
- Build off the current resources to integrate the promising practices from the various social-emotional and behavioral health programs into appropriate and existing job descriptions.

Actions: Social-Emotional and Behavioral Health and Development

- 4A. Identify the criteria for measuring the success of social-emotional programs, i.e., student outcomes, attendance, reduction in discipline referrals, etc. to determine what programs should be either transitioned to a close, remain as pilots, or recognized for greater scale.
- 4B. Identify social-emotional practices, based on established criteria and evidence of effectiveness, that will be reflected in the instructional focus plan and to make decisions on what practices should be scaled or expanded as schools consider their specific SEL needs.
- 4C. Develop tools for schools to use to analyze the data in the area of social-emotional learning and identify what SEL practices and supports should be implemented to meet the identified needs of the student population as identified in the school's SPSA.
- 4D. Examine the data to clearly identify homeless youth to allow for intentionality in the connecting of academic, social-emotional, and physical well being supports, and then put structures in place so case management can occur. This could also include community and city service providers. Consider connecting with ACOE to support the development of this approach.

5. Assessment and Accountability

(CCEE Instructional Component 5) The LEA has a systemic process to measure and analyze student data—academic, behavior, and social-emotional learning—that drives the accountability system for all stakeholders (classroom to boardroom and home) and informs a continuous improvement process. The LEA's system of assessment ensures that all students are provided with, know, and understand clear learning targets in all courses and at all grade levels with the goal that each student comprehends precisely what and how to attain mastery of key skills and concepts. The system includes targeted and on-going assessment of ELs to ensure they are moving toward advanced levels of English, reclassification, and closing the academic language gap.

Finding 5a. OUSD has an academic, behavioral, and social-emotional data system that can drill down to groups and individual students, lending itself to analysis, monitoring, and accountability toward district/school goals. The system does not yet drill down to specific content standards.

Finding 5b. The district has assessment calendars for elementary, middle, and high schools. Its data system/vital signs dashboard serves to connect assessment and results.

Finding 5c. The Department of Research, Assessment and Data is responsive to users' needs, refining and streamlining its data system in order to provide real-time information that supports data-driven decisions. However, this real-time data is not always employed at the district/network/site/classroom level in decision-making that leads to improved student outcomes.

Finding 5d. Available data, resulting from Interim Assessment Blocks (IABs) or formative assessments, is not systemically utilized in decision-making.

Finding 5e. There are varied understandings/inconsistencies in how formative assessment and data-based inquiry cycles are monitored by the district.

Discussion

The OUSD has an established assessment calendar that is aligned to state standards and includes IABs. The district has engaged in data analysis to create outcome goals and has identified measures or vital signs to monitor progress towards such goals.

Artifacts collected from the district, including individual and stakeholder group interviews, speak to the district's awareness of its data, and OUSD's willingness to plan for and implement strategies that will result in improved outcomes for its AA, EL, and HY populations. Data resulting from IABs for the fall semesters of 2018 and 2019, indicate that some of the plans and strategies being attempted are resulting in increased achievement for students.

However, the forward trajectory for the district suggested by the IAB results is not present at every school. The autonomy and variance in curriculum, Tier I standards-based instruction, formative assessments, and accountabilities are perceived by the stakeholders interviewed as contributing factors to these disparate results. OUSD's challenges are not in the district's intents, plans, or available systems/structures, but rather in the achievement of coherence through consistent implementation of cycles of improvement with a common set of accountability metrics and processes.

Fullan and Kirtman (2019) in *Coherent School Leadership: Forging Clarity from Complexity*, indicate that in securing accountability to improved student outcomes, we need an intrinsic drive in all stakeholders for continuous improvement. Clarity about what this looks like throughout the system—district, network, school, and classroom—is essential. The authors emphasize that “clarity on the results one is trying to achieve is paramount to a continuous improvement culture” (p. 77).

Aside from a commitment to improvement, research shows tiered differentiated supports based on student outcomes are necessary for coherence. The approach to these supports

should provide guardrails and a set of options for schools to choose from. Differentiated interventions are needed in order to improve outcomes for students, by network, district, or site ILT/leadership. As Beers and Probst (2017) state in *Disrupting Thinking: Why How we Read Matters*, differentiation “must be grounded in equity, in access, in agency” (p. 112).

SWOT on Assessment and Accountability

A. Strengths:

- The district has a robust data system that is responsive to flexible needs and is known for its mapping systems.
- Preliminary IAB results from fall 2019, showed improved overall achievement for literacy and mathematics, as compared to results from fall 2018 IABs.
- Learning targets in student-friendly language were evident in some schools.
- The district's Learning Continuity and Attendance Plan, as well as the OUSD Instructional plan, address measures to promote and monitor resilience and social-emotional learning for students.
- There was evidence of professional learning communities engaging in the cycle of inquiry.
- Some schools include teacher walk-thrus to gather qualitative data based on cycles of inquiry and agreed upon next steps.

B. Weaknesses:

- There are limited/inconsistent structures for accountability at the site and network levels. Accountabilities in the form of metrics and processes for measurement—with roles and responsibilities from the classroom teacher, the site leader, the network leader, the district departments, and the district leadership—were neither explicit nor clearly understood throughout the district.
- Although the ELLMA Office has created tools designed for on-going assessment of ELs, such as the ELL Snapshot, they are not always employed.
- Systems of monitoring and accountability for ELs, such as the “Shadowing Template,” are not systematically implemented.
- Systems for monitoring improved outcomes for AAs or HY are not clear nor implemented districtwide.
- Although an assessment calendar is provided for all schools, this calendar does not include formative assessment dates, other than IABs, nor does it include an expected minimum number of cycles of inquiry.

C. Threats:

- The lack of understanding of guidelines for school autonomies and accountability threaten the forward progress of students and impacted groups such as: AAs, ELs, and HY.
- The autonomy of school-developed formative assessments to measure student improvement allows for variance across schools in rigor, alignment to standards, threatens how the district can support schools, and does not provide a true measure of progress for students.

D. Opportunities:

- There is an opportunity to connect coherent, school-level, effective assessment practices in the district with the implementation of the Instructional Plan.
- There is an opportunity for the district to learn from schools implementing effective assessment practices that have resulted in increased student outcomes for AAs, ELs, and HY, for a minimum of three consecutive years, so as to scale the work in the system. Such practices might include: systemic implementation of cycles of inquiry, short PDSA cycles with clear goals and differentiated strategies, Tier I interventions, regular data chats between teachers and administrators, etc.

Actions: Assessment and Accountability

- 5A. Clarify the non-negotiables for school sites related to assessment and accountabilities that are aligned to the district's priorities. Non-negotiables might include a common set of assessment metrics, minimum cycles of inquiry, minimum improvement goals from one cycle of inquiry to another, set number of common strategies to support AAs, ELs, and HY, and the role of the network superintendent, executive directors, site leaders, and Instructional Leadership Teams in these short cycles of inquiry.
- 5B. Continue to build clarity, coherence, and capacity across the district, central office, and schools in cycles of inquiry so that local ILTs may develop agency and ownership in improving outcomes for the most impacted groups: AAs, ELs, and HY.
- 5C. As recommended in 1A, define the concept of autonomy, possibly with the support of an outside organization, and establish agreed upon guardrails, monitoring, and support structures. Given this definition, revisit and revise the draft "Defined Autonomy" policy to define and implement a coherent approach to autonomy as well as districtwide common formative assessments (formative/summative), goal setting, accountabilities, and monitoring at the site, network, and district levels.
- 5D. Implement districtwide, rigorous, standards-aligned common formative assessments to be used in cycles of inquiry to measure impact on student learning, particularly for impacted groups: AAs, ELs, and HY.
- 5E. Set guidelines and expectations for system-wide data dashboard usage in conjunction with formative, interim, and summative assessments.

6. Student and Family Engagement

(CCEE Instructional Component 6) The LEA practices two-way communication that reflects the cultural and linguistic needs of families in the community and provides resources and activities that give students agency, promotes student leadership, and provides a space for active family and community engagement. The district has both systems and supports in place to successfully engage families and students in an adaptive learning environment (e.g., distance learning, blended learning, flipped classroom), internet connectivity, devices, orientation, and guidance on hybrid learning environments. Clear two-way communication is used

with families and cultivates a clear understanding of steps and progress required for students to show mastery of skills, concepts, and grade-level and graduation requirements.

Finding 6a. There is widespread belief among stakeholders that communication and outreach efforts have improved since the pandemic began.

Finding 6b. OUSD, in cooperation with community partners, continues to address issues of technology access and support for students.

Finding 6c. In spite of acknowledged improvements in communication and engagement, there is a perception among some stakeholders that issues impacting their children will only be remedied with persistent effort by OUSD to address community-based inequities and systemic processes and beliefs, i.e., persistent issues of explicit and implicit bias and racism.

Discussion

Many stakeholders reported satisfaction with the level and quality of the OUSD's family communication and outreach efforts, especially since the beginning of the pandemic. They pointed to how the shift to distance learning resulted in more direct communications to families about technology support in the form of the technology survey to determine students' hardware and internet needs. The survey also sought specific guidance on the process for shifting instructional models from full distance to hybrid to face-to-face when public health conditions warrant. OUSD actively sought feedback on steps to return to full face-to-face instruction and on parents' and caregivers' satisfaction with distance learning to date. In regard to the technology survey, it should be noted that some stakeholders faced challenges in answering the survey online when digital access was sparse or non-existent.

Other specific targeted strategies pointed out by stakeholders include the district's work to address food insecurity, digital hardware and access, instructional materials delivery to homes, and an increased use of multiple methods of communication, including a texting-with-translation feature for teachers to use. The central office provides written guidance to support students and families, and dedicated support staff are at most schools in various forms, e.g., Community School Managers and Restorative Justice coaches at all elementary and some middle and high schools.

Multiple OUSD stakeholders expressed gratitude and a level of trust in their students' teachers. A number of stakeholders noted an increase in teachers reaching out to parents, a feeling of increased teamwork, and better systems to communicate. They noted examples of specific instances when teachers had been innovative and unyielding in their efforts to communicate with and support families and students. OUSD continues to create support for developing student agency and voice. This is demonstrated by the practice of consistent engagement with multiple family, student, and community stakeholder groups and organizations, such as those called out in the discussion of culture, e.g., *African American Female Excellence*, *African American Male Achievement*, *Asian Pacific Islander Achievement*, and *Latino/a Student Achievement*.

In spite of the areas of improvement in communication and engagement, it must be noted that students who are chronically absent or disengaged do not have equitable access to

services by the very nature of the lack of presence or engagement. The shift to distance learning has only exacerbated these divides. Among some stakeholders, there is a perception that there are linguistic or technological barriers impacting communication access for some families and students. Some stakeholders noted that there was a need for a wider scope of translation services, especially for some subgroups of families and students who speak less commonly supported languages, like Mam. The *Family Central* dashboard is an example of where supporting speakers of languages other than English is addressed by linking its web pages to Google Translate, which supports 108 languages.

OUSD struggles with some stakeholders' lingering perceptions that access and support for digital resources are not equitable. While it was stated by stakeholders that OUSD departments frequently sought input, they also expressed frustration with what they perceive as limited evidence of OUSD taking action based on their input.

There are external pressures that could threaten OUSD's work in the area of family and student engagement. With finite resources available to meet the needs of all OUSD students and families, there is the danger of competing advocacies struggling to reach consensus on OUSD's path to reach its instructional vision. Budget uncertainties could negatively impact programs and staff tasked with family and student engagement and well-being. While a number of stakeholders expressed hope that recent improvements in OUSD's engagement and communication would continue, other OUSD stakeholders reported a perception that issues impacting children's learning are heavily impacted by systemic issues tied to community-based inequities and systemic processes and beliefs.

In addition to hoping that OUSD continues with improvements made in engagement and communication, parents, families, and students expressed a desire to continue the re-imagining of what quality instruction and effective education will look like post-pandemic. OUSD is positioned to strengthen the engagement with many of its parent and community groups and to deepen those partnerships to support all OUSD students. Similarly, there are opportunities to expand the use of existing tools and strategies for engagement. OUSD has robust data dashboards and there is opportunity to refine how to use them to build parents' understanding of their children's progress and development. Finally, with the recognized need for technology as a central component in re-envisioning school, there is an opportunity to deepen family engagement through technical training opportunities for them.

SWOT on Student and Family Engagement

A. Strengths:

- OUSD has targeted efforts to engage families and students, which have been accelerated since the onset of the pandemic.
- Multiple programs are in place to support students in developing agency and voice.
- OUSD has sought to provide equitable access to digital learning and platforms.
- The central office and networks provide written guidance that delineate strategies and practices that promote and engage students and families.

- OUSD strives to support the cultural and linguistic needs of families in terms of communication and translation.
- Family and community groups engage with OUSD and provide input and feedback on the LCAP and the LCP.

B. Weaknesses:

- There is a perception among some stakeholders that there are linguistic or technological barriers impacting some families' and students' access to communications and support.
- There is also a perception among some stakeholders that access and support for digital resources is not equitable.
- A number of stakeholders reported frustration with some of OUSD's engagement opportunities citing they see limited evidence of action taken based on their input.

C. Threats:

- With finite resources available to meet the needs of all OUSD students and families, there is the danger of competing advocacies struggling to reach consensus on OUSD's path to reach the instructional vision.
- Budget uncertainties could negatively impact programs and staff tasked with family and student engagement and well-being.
- There is a perception among some stakeholders that issues impacting OUSD children's learning are heavily impacted by systemic issues tied to community-based inequities and systemic processes and beliefs, i.e., persistent issues of explicit and implicit bias and racism.

D. Opportunities:

- Many stakeholders reported satisfaction with the level and quality of OUSD's communication and expressed hope that it would continue post-pandemic.
- Stakeholders also reported greater satisfaction with communication from a number of school sites and teachers and hope it will continue.
- Parents, families, and students expressed a desire to continue the re-imagining of what quality instruction and effective education looks like post-pandemic.
- OUSD has effectively engaged many of its parent and community groups and is positioned to deepen the partnerships to support all OUSD students.
- OUSD has robust data dashboards and there is an opportunity to refine how to use them to build parents' understanding of their children's progress and development.
- With the recognized need for technology in re-envisioning school, there is an opportunity to strengthen family engagement through technical training opportunities.

Actions: Student and Family Engagement

6A. Shape family and student engagement efforts to include public recognition and appreciation of the level of engagement from families/caregivers, students, and advocacy groups to date, while simultaneously shifting to a tighter focus on

envisioning how those groups could engage in supporting OUSD's instructional vision, the coming Strategic Plan, and the Instructional Focus Plan.

- 6B. Create a communication and engagement plan that details what effective two-way family/caregiver relationships and communication looks like at the central, network, school site, and classroom level. Include persons responsible and timelines.
- 6C. Ensure that site leaders receive differentiated support and professional learning to help them facilitate family/caregiver engagement and communication.
- 6D. With some programs and support personnel involved in family and student engagement facing potential cuts due to budget or the ending of outside support, OUSD should focus targeted professional development opportunities to build capacity for family and student engagement. The goal would be to soften the direct impact of any potential cuts by examining current positions to see where the work can be integrated.

7. School-based Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs)

(CCEE Instructional Component 7) Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs) exist in every school in the LEA and are representative across grades and disciplines with members that make culturally responsive data-driven decisions to design instruction for all students and their needs. ILTs facilitate site-based professional learning and support the implementation of district and site programs and efforts. The LEA has written expectations for ILTs roles, responsibilities, and team members and provides professional development on the purpose, process, facilitation, and outcomes for leadership teams.

Finding 7a. The culture of ILTs are evidenced in various levels of the system, district, and schools, yet used in various ways depending on the school needs and site leadership.

Finding 7b. ILTs vary in the use of data to inform practice and professional learning. There was reporting that data was used for broader budget decisions and in some places to identify professional learning needs, but this did not appear to be consistent throughout the district.

Discussion

According to Stricker (2019), "effective instructional leadership teams (ILTs) are powerful levers for making change in schools . . . and can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important priorities" (p. 56). In OUSD, there is evidence of the importance of ILTs at the central and school levels, but implementation varies across the district. ILTs were described in various ways and perform various duties depending on the stakeholder group and/or school. It was reported that the composition of the team was inconsistent and that roles were not always clearly defined. Some intersection of work is expected as smaller schools often have one committee that serves multiple purposes yet little evidence was collected districtwide to demonstrate that ILTs were functioning at every campus with high levels of fidelity.

The draft of OUSD's Defined Autonomy (V15) document begins the work of outlining the various leadership teams at schools and the purpose for each. It outlines the ILT as the body that "serves as the representative leadership, responsible for the implementation of the site plan and maximizing the coordination of people, time, money, and program in

order to achieve the priority academic and social-emotional learning goals the school has established." It also describes roles and responsibilities that could help clarify use and purpose for ILTs at all levels. Using the ILT to focus on establishing a clear instructional vision aligned with the LCAP, using data to support decision-making regarding student outcomes, and supporting professional learning and coaching can support improved student outcomes particularly for the AA, EL, and HY populations. The draft document does not identify the foundational non-negotiables for all schools, e.g., MTSS, PBIS, CCEIS, etc., that would help to address the AA, EL, and HY populations.

SWOT on School-Based Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs)

A. Strengths:

- Instructional leadership teams are in place at the central and school levels across multiple levels of the system.

B. Weaknesses:

- ILTs were used in a wide variance of ways depending on school and leadership needs.
- Stakeholders' perception is that member selection to ILTs and other committees was relational at all levels of the system (e.g., central office, school).
- Schools may have many different guiding decision-making teams on a site creating a need to be clear in purpose and the intersections of the work.
- The Cycle of Inquiry is not consistently used to distribute practices laterally and vertically within the system. A feedback loop would provide a process for sharing best practices and for informing the networks and the larger district in order to differentiate support to networks and schools.

C. Threats:

- ILTs are not consistently engaging in cycles of inquiry within and across schools to support and differentiate the district's instructional focus at the school or district level, particularly for AAs, ELs, and HY.

D. Opportunities:

- The instructional leadership teams can be strong implementers of the components of autonomy if provided with the skills to identify and evaluate effective programs and strategies.
- ILTs can be powerful levers for moving forward the district's Instructional Focus Plan with differentiations needed to support school needs and the data around AAs, ELs, and HY.

Actions: School-based Instructional Leadership Teams

7A. Revisit draft "Defined Autonomy" policy to define and implement a coherent approach to autonomy as it relates to ILTs and other district leadership teams to include goal setting, accountabilities, and monitoring of team effectiveness.

7B. Create cohesive documents that integrate the goals from the LCAP, Instructional Focus Plan and CCEIS plan that can be used to drive the work of the ILTs at each

level of the system. These documents might include placemats, posters, guiding documents, etc.

7C. As noted in component 5, continue to build clarity, coherence, and capacity across the district, central office, and schools in cycles of inquiry, so that school-based ILTs may develop agency and ownership in improving outcomes for most impacted groups: AAs, ELs, and HY.

7D. Provide professional learning on the purpose, structure, goals, and implementation of ILTs to help stakeholders understand how to plan, facilitate, and be an active participant of an ILT.

7E. Use already existing peer structures (e.g., principal/network check-ins, PAC meetings, etc.) to share ILT progress and practices.

8. Administrative Coaching and Leadership

(CCEE Instructional Component 8) Infrastructures across the LEA support, promote, and enhance a collaborative culture for district and site administrator effectiveness in management and instructional leadership. Data (academic, social-emotional, and behavioral) are consistently used to monitor instruction and inform stakeholders' engagement. Consistent leadership coaching and mentoring provides principals the opportunity to reflect on, monitor, adjust, and increase effectiveness of their roles in strengthening instructional practices to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Finding 8a. Varied coaching models are being employed by the OUSD, such as New Leaders, network superintendent coaching, etc.

Finding 8b. The district recognizes the differentiated needs of new principals and tends to them by providing mentors and differentiated learning.

Finding 8c. Coaching for site leaders does not always match individual needs.

Finding 8d. Teacher leaders are cultivated at some school sites, building their capacity to lead professional learning, data analysis, and planning. Principals play a key role in coaching and guiding these instructional leaders.

Discussion

OUSD avails itself of various coaching models to build leadership at its school sites. Network superintendents have the opportunity to coach principals and also contract with established educational leadership companies to build leaders' capacity. Current district leadership is homegrown, which speaks to the system's tradition of building the capabilities of its educators to lead.

The LEA's leadership evaluation tool, as well as its Instructional Plan, provide school leadership practices (L4.1) that support the district's goals and the professional growth of individuals. Coaching and leadership growth are related to a culture of trust (L4.2). Tschannen-Moran, author of *Trust Matters*, defines trust in the following manner: "Trust is an individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open."

Relationships play a big role at OUSD. These relationships affect the vulnerability, trust, and effectiveness of the coach/coachee interactions. The ability of a site leader to seek coaching and feedback from the district is dependent on such relationships. Whereas some feel comfortable in expressing their needs and areas where they would like to grow, as well as making recommendations for their own professional learning, there is a perception that there does not exist a districtwide structure for seeking professional growth and learning.

SWOT on Administrative Coaching and Leadership

A. Strengths:

- Site leaders are coached utilizing varied models by the networks such as New Leaders, Instructional Partners, Performance Fact, Educate 78, etc. Some networks have a coherent way of coaching all their principals.
- New principals receive differentiated coaching.
- Some principals are partnered up within their networks, having their partner support and coach them.
- Instructional Leadership Teams are a venue for coaching and growth at select individual school sites.

B. Weaknesses:

- Individual needs are not always taken into consideration in coaching.
- There isn't a structured format to gather voices from the principals to design professional learning that meets their needs within their different roles and utilizing student data: veteran administrator, instructional leader with operation/management needs, etc.
- The existing evaluation system is a growth model. The district lacks clarity on guardrails related to time for growth, mandatory leadership improvements, coaching and its effect on leadership growth, etc.

C. Threats:

- Not having a structured way to gather leaders' voices might hinder the growth and development of individuals.
- Relationship-based requests for assistance and guidance might limit access to systemic coaching and leadership development across the district.

D. Opportunities:

- The district has an opportunity to strengthen ongoing coaching for school leaders, which includes a differentiated model of school leadership development, coaching, and supervision based on principal need. Currently, networks vary in their coaching practices and available resources and some administrators reported having to seek and fund additional opportunities. Some principals identified one-on-one coaching with their network supervisors and colleagues from similar schools to be helpful.
- There is an opportunity for OUSD to build on their Instructional Focus Plan and Annual Plans and provide a minimum of on-going coaching sessions that are connected to the district's/school's goals (particularly for AA, EL, and HY

students) and the leadership skills/capabilities needed to achieve these goals.

Actions: Administrative Coaching and Leadership

- 8A. Develop and implement a differentiated model of school leadership development, coaching, and supervision where the needs and experiences of principals, assistant principals, community school managers, lead teachers, etc. are taken into consideration and guide their development.
- 8B. Develop and implement a system of gathering leadership needs for growth, professional learning, and coaching.
- 8C. Clarify expectations related to minimum coaching sessions to build leadership and the relationship between coaching and student outcomes with attention to AA, EL, and HY populations.

9. Professional Learning and Coaching

(CCEE Instructional Component 9) There is a professional learning plan that cultivates the development of a teaching and learning culture through the eyes of a student and reflects the needs of all teaching staff. The LEA-wide data-driven professional learning plan designed for all stakeholders focuses on effective instructional practices that improve student academic, social-emotional, and behavioral learning. The data-based professional learning opportunities the LEA provides are grounded in student performance and foster collective responsibility for improving student outcomes. Instructional coaches support the implementation and improvement of the tiered instructional practices.

Finding 9a. The district has structures for professional learning for administrators, coaches, and teachers on set dates (Wednesdays for teachers and every other Thursday for administrators).

Finding 9b. The scope and sequence for professional learning for coaches/PLC leaders and administrators is integrated and organized around cycles of inquiry and interim assessments.

Finding 9c. Professional learning for administrators and coaches includes facilitation and coaching skills, as well as developing the understanding of a PLC.

Finding 9d. The OUSD plan for professional learning includes expectations of principal walkthroughs on the third Thursday of the month as a way of assessing the impact of professional learning on classroom practices and student learning.

Finding 9e. Differentiated professional learning is offered to new teachers and teachers of English learners.

Discussion

OUSD has structures in place for administrators as well as teachers to grow professionally. These learning opportunities for teachers are published in a yearly calendar in which topics that will be addressed are identified. Aside from these learning opportunities for the entire district, the OUSD calls out cycles of inquiry and Professional Learning Communities

as structures for building teachers' capacity in directly addressing data-driven problems of practice.

In their book *Learning by Doing*, DuFour and DuFour (2016) argue that a Professional Learning Community (PLC) is an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action based on 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 intent of PLCs, as vehicles for engagement in cycles of improvement/inquiry, do not always yield the desired results. Some schools appear to have the inquiry and PLC structures running like clockwork and producing growth for diverse students as measured by SBAC and LCAP. However, there are also schools where there isn't a clear understanding or implementation of these structures, resulting in consecutive years of downward trending data, particularly for AAs and ELs.

Additional training on the why, how, and what of the PLCs and cycles of improvement—in addition to common, districtwide, short cycle, standards-aligned formative assessments—would support coherence throughout the system as well as a reliable system for measuring student growth. Likewise, a system for monitoring the implementation of such cycles, together with a tiering of schools to provide differentiated support, would increase the district's aspirational goals in using these structures to improve teachers'/coaches'/administrators' craft as well as student learning.

Aside from offering varied opportunities for learning, including familiarization with the new curriculum, the OUSD produces other tools and resources that support administrators and teachers alike in reflecting on and growing their practice. New teachers can avail themselves of OUSD's website *Teacher Central* (<https://teachercentral.ousd.org/>) which is updated weekly and provides relevant information. As in the area of Instructional Practice and Strategy, OUSD's challenges are not in the district's intents, plans, or available systems/structures, but rather in the achievement of coherence through consistent implementation of cycles of improvement with common understanding of accountabilities.

SWOT on Professional Learning and Coaching

A. Strengths:

- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are expected by the OUSD, as included in the district's Instructional Plan, as a way for professional learning.
- Some schools purchase instructional coaching that directly support teachers in building their craft, leading PLCs, and providing models for educators.
- There is evidence of coaching by principals and assistant principals, alongside coaches, to improve coherent practices at their school sites.
- Professional offerings by the district before school starts, throughout the year, and on PD days, provide opportunities for teachers from diverse sites to grow their capacity in a coherent manner.
- Professional Learning opportunities provided by ELLMA directly address the needs of the ELs and designated and integrated ELD.
- Dual language school teachers are provided the opportunity to learn together, which supports coherence.

B. Weaknesses:

- The learning taking place during professional development opportunities is not always being transferred to systemic classroom practices and implementation.
- The PLC model differs in implementation and efficacy from school to school.
- Districtwide professional learning does not always match the individualized needs of schools.
- Lack of clarity on the opt-in professional development affects coherence and implementation in the system.
- Systemic professional learning is needed to build teachers' capacity to address racism, bias, and the needs of AA, EL, and HY students.
- Systemic ways of providing feedback to schools/classroom teachers on the implementation of professional learning, or its effects on student achievement, are not clear.

C. Threats:

- Stability in professional learning strategy and its alignment to the Instructional plan is threatened in cases where it is being supported by coaches or mentors funded by grants, such as the grant utilized to contract Performance Fact and grants utilized to fund personnel who support new teachers, etc.

D. Opportunities:

- There is an opportunity to align and provide coherence throughout the system by implementing an accountability system that provides feedback on the implementation of adult learning.
- There is an opportunity to align formative standards-based short-cycle assessments throughout the system to provide coherence and clearer indication of student learning as measured by SBAC or LCAP.

Actions: Professional Learning and Coaching

- 9A. Provide differentiated professional learning and support to schools, increasing district involvement with schools whose outcomes continue to decline for AAs, ELs, and students experiencing homelessness.
- 9B. Revisit draft "Defined Autonomy" policy to define and implement a coherent approach to autonomy/accountability for professional learning, cycles of inquiry, and PLCs that lead to improved outcomes for targeted populations.
- 9C. Establish systems for providing feedback to school sites and classrooms on the implementation of strategies, concepts, and practices acquired through professional learning that supports district priorities.

10. Data Management and Use and Student Information Systems

(CCEE Instructional Component 10) The LEA has a student information system (SIS) that actively stores and tracks all individual student data (e.g., grades, attendance, discipline). The SIS provides LEA-wide appropriate access for teachers, administrators, and parents/caregivers, which allows for aggregate data use for school-based planning and also meets federal/state/local reporting requirements. The LEA has an early

warning system for students' academics, behavior, and attendance at the district, school, and classroom levels. A suite of reports through the SIS that is readily available and customized for the end-user (e.g., principal, teacher, board member, assistant superintendent, parent/caregiver, etc.) and reflect the areas identified as needing improvement for each student.

Finding 10a. OUSD has a robust and thorough data system that is responsive to the needs of the data consumers, including the public. It is evident that data is used in some form from the governing board to the classroom and the public.

Finding 10b. School site consumers need to be able to drive instruction through standards-based data. Requests for standards-level data, grounded in the assessments, would help with continuous improvement practices and constant use of data to re-focus teaching.

Finding 10c. Stakeholders reported the use of cycles of inquiry, mini-cycles of inquiry, and PLCs to support instructional practices, yet there is a misalignment on the type of data that they use to engage in the cycles of inquiry. The processes appear well established based on the information collected, but there is no substantive evidence of alignment and implementation across school sites.

Discussion

A robust data structure serves multiple purposes in an educational system. First and foremost, it serves to inform instruction by identifying what students have learned. *The American Association of School Administrators (2002)* identified the following reasons a data system is needed: “measure student progress, make sure students don't fall through the cracks, measure program effectiveness, assess instructional effectiveness, guide curriculum development, allocate resources wisely, promote accountability, report to the community, meet state and federal reporting requirements, maintain educational focus, and show trends (but not necessarily solutions)” (pg. 10).

OUSD has invested time, expertise, and resources into the development of data systems that allow all levels of the system to be data informed. The system is interwoven and consists of usable dashboards for different data needs. It is aligned with the assessment and accountabilities in LCAP and the Superintendents Work Plan, allowing for continual monitoring toward stated goals. It can be used to closely monitor the progress of AAs, ELs, and HY at each level of the system.

Many stakeholders throughout the system were data versed. They were able to freely cite data that aligned with their assigned work. There was evidence that data is a driving indicator for discussion within departments. Evidence of its use in accountability was not as available. Stakeholders knew their goals, but the accountability for reaching them was not as evident. One question to consider: What data is—or should be—used to measure progress?

At the school level, the recognition and use of data varied. Some schools use data to drive decisions about school resources but do not use data at the student level. Others reported identifying five students from each class as focus students, based on the data, and the provision of interventions tied to the data. The use of the Cycle of Inquiry was noted by site-level stakeholders. Teachers discussed the need for data at the level of the standards

assessed so instruction and intervention could be provided. Another question to consider: What systems are in place for collaboration across the district?

SWOT on Data Management and Use and Student Information Systems

A. Strengths:

- OUSD has a strong data structure with various suites of reports including an early warning system and a public data dashboard to ensure transparency. The reports can be disaggregated to support the monitoring of AAs, ELs, and students who might be homeless.
- Almost all central office staff can speak to the data that relates to the work they oversee.
- Stakeholders shared the use of cycles of inquiry to inform practice.

B. Weaknesses:

- The various dashboards can be overwhelming to users who may not be as proficient with data systems.
- There is a limited number of dashboards specifically for teacher users.
- The use of data varies from school to school.

C. Threats:

- Without clear guidance on both the use of data and the data to be used, consumers can be overwhelmed by the data, causing data paralysis.

D. Opportunities:

- Training on the use of data to inform instructional practice is an outgrowth of the development of teacher dashboards.
- The various data dashboards allow for a deeper accountability system that holds departments accountable for improved student outcomes for all students and particularly for AAs, ELs, and HY.

Actions: Data Management and Use and Student Information Systems

10A. Clearly define, model, and monitor how student-level data is used at the school level to support acceleration, prevention, and intervention. This should include a review of the purpose and effective use of cycles of inquiry in a continuous improvement model. It is important to include the disaggregation of data to the populations of ELs, AAs, and HY.

10B. Provide Protocols for standards-based data digs for teachers to ensure the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

10C. Continue to build clarity, coherence, and capacity across the district, central office, and schools in cycles of inquiry with a focus on AAs, ELs, and HY by outlining how cycles of inquiry are used at the central, network, and school level.

10D. Provide professional learning on the use of data in a Cycle of Inquiry to inform instructional practice and define accountabilities for the practices at various levels of the system, teachers, ILTs, networks, and central office.

11. District and Leadership Capacity

(CCEE Instructional Component 11) The LEA contains strong multi-level (school and district leadership) organizational capacity and processes to make coherent, coordinated decisions that ensure goals and metrics are mission and vision aligned across sites and departments. District and school leadership develop and facilitate collaborative and transparent processes to implement shared goals regarding teaching and learning, effective leadership, and accountability and commitment to equity. Established processes ensure each member, regardless of position, is supported and can fulfill their role and responsibilities. Each department's strategic workflow, metrics, and benchmarks are verified with data, aligned with district goals and vision, and reviewed regularly.

Finding 11a. OUSD's senior leadership is perceived as being capable and stable, and there is a perception that the district also has capable leaders throughout the system.

Finding 11b. Perceptions of site-level autonomy impact OUSD's central office's ability to implement the district's instructional vision due to variance in curriculum and assessment practices.

Finding 11c. Particular attention should be paid to seek and retain more Latinx leaders to align their demographics with the student population.

Discussion

A recurring theme echoed by multiple stakeholders is the belief that OUSD leadership is populated with capable individuals at all levels. Stakeholders at many levels pointed out that one of OUSD's strengths was "the people." As noted in previous discussions, the stability of senior leadership is viewed by many as being critical.

OUSD's planning and instructional documents demonstrate that OUSD engages in ongoing assessment of central, network, and school leadership culture, coherence, and professional learning. Central office departments establish performance metrics and review growth in a continuous improvement model. Coaching is part of the evaluation process for site leaders, and structures for mentoring are in place for new principals, although a number of stakeholders reported having to seek and fund more comprehensive coaching opportunities. This points to an opportunity for OUSD to make its administrative coaching more robust. In terms of instructional guidance provided, stakeholders appreciated that the past year brought a district focus on literacy, academic writing, and academic language.

While OUSD has strengths in its leadership and administrative support, there are also systemic issues that negatively impact the development and support of OUSD leaders. For example, the understanding of the perceived culture of site autonomy varies across the system. This impacts OUSD's processes in making decisions that are coherent, coordinated, and aligned to district initiatives with school implementation. Stakeholders shared that access to information through dashboards was exceptional, but in some cases also pointed to a need for greater support in school operations, which would facilitate leaders' ability to focus on instruction. Stakeholders also reported variance among sites in their use of data to verify alignment with district vision and goals. While there are clear

expectations for current and future leaders in the development of their assessment and technological literacy, there appears to be a greater need for clear expectations about site leaders leading cycles of inquiry and outcome-focused accountability conversations to realize those expectations.

Stakeholders appreciated the network structure but noted it was still challenging to offer differentiated PD due to the lack of common curriculum. They also reported feeling that site leader voices are more heard at the network level than at the central office level. There is a perception that leadership opportunities are sometimes dependent upon relationships. One area of leaders' frustration is the way in which central PD calendars override site level PD. Although assessment of leadership culture, coherence, and professional learning is occurring, there is a lack of common agreement on how results of that assessment are to be integrated across the system.

While OUSD site leadership retention rates are better than national averages, it must be noted that a misperception exists among stakeholders that there are issues of retention and stability within the principalship in OUSD. Serving as a principal in any large, urban district is challenging and many OUSD administrators must struggle to address critical student and family needs that go beyond instructional leadership. It is vital for OUSD to make every effort to retain strong leaders given the financial impact of principal turnover as well as the effect it has on a school's instructional program.

In addition, OUSD should recognize a need to cultivate succession plans to build the capacity and bench of potential leaders at both the central office and school site levels. The perceptions of stakeholders about the importance of leadership stability point to that issue being a systemic threat at multiple levels.

Finally, there is an opportunity to seek to hire and develop more Latinx leaders to bring into better alignment the ratio of leadership demographics with the students they serve. In 2019-20, the percentage of Latinx leaders was 19% compared with the student population, which was 47.8%. Twenty-two percent of OUSD's students are African American as are 41.1% of the district's site administrators. Ten percent of the district's students are White and 29.9% of OUSD's site administrators are White. The district has 6.6% Asian site administrators and 11.6% of its students are Asian.

SWOT on District and Leadership Capacity

A. Strengths:

- There is a perception among those interviewed that OUSD demonstrates organizational leadership capacity at the central, network, and site levels.
- Some central office departments have established performance metrics and review growth in a continuous improvement model.
- Some central office departments use data to verify workflow, metrics, and benchmarks.
- A district instructional team (PAC) is in place with the purpose to continually assess the needs of networks and schools to provide differentiated support.

B. Weaknesses:

- The perceived culture of autonomy impacts OUSD's processes in making decisions that are coherent and coordinated, aligning district initiatives with school implementation.
- OUSD has an Instructional Focus Plan that puts forth district values and instructional focus, and for 2019-20 created Annual Plans that outlined actions to be taken by teachers, leaders, and the central office. The plans and mechanisms are in place, but departments have not internalized their use and certain departments have also followed their own agenda instead.
- Although assessment of leadership culture, coherence, and professional learning is occurring, there is a lack of common agreement on how results of that assessment are to be integrated across the system.
- Stakeholders reported variance among sites in their use of data to verify alignment with district vision and goals.
- While there are clear expectations for current and future leaders in the development of their assessment and technological literacy, there appears to be a greater need for accountability to realize those expectations.

C. Threats:

- There is a perception that the struggle to address student and family needs with limited resources, as well as other internal and external pressures on the system, negatively impacts the OUSD's retention of administrators.
- The perceived threat of multiple superintendent changes continues to impact the culture of OUSD.

D. Opportunities:

- OUSD has the opportunity to seek to hire and retain more Latinx administrators to better align the ratio of leadership demographics with the students they serve. Partnerships currently exist with leadership preparation programs, and every effort needs to be made to activate all opportunities to increase the pipeline of Latinx administrators.
- OUSD has capable leaders at all levels, including in the ranks of teacher leaders. An opportunity exists for OUSD to examine and realign its practices in building the capacity and bench of potential leaders for both district and school leaders.
- In an effort to build a leadership pipeline, there is also an opportunity to leverage leaders currently in the field and further develop career ladder opportunities (e.g., central, network, school level).
- There are already some practices occurring for the ongoing assessment of central, network, and school leadership culture, coherence, and professional learning, which could be strengthened using data, benchmarks, and cycles of inquiry.

Actions: District and Leadership Capacity

- 11A. Finalize and implement OUSD's draft of its *Defined Autonomy Framework*, which operationalizes the directions contained in Board Policy 6006.
- 11B. In order to differentiate the learning and coaching needs of a diverse group of school leaders, OUSD should set guidelines and provide network support for administrators to co-design short cycles of inquiry to focus their professional learning needs.
- 11C. In order to avoid central's PD demands overriding school plans, set district PD plans earlier in the year and support sites in aligning their school plans with the district's instructional vision and goals.
- 11D. Seek to hire and retain more Latinx school site leaders to better align leader and student demographics.
- 11E. Seek to identify individuals at all levels of the system who can serve OUSD as exemplars of model leadership for achieving OUSD's instructional vision and Instructional Focus Plan.
- 11F. Set the expectation that site leaders will lead their teams in cycles of inquiry and outcome-focused accountability conversations.
- 11G. Set the expectation that the district will work to seek common agreement on how results of ongoing measurement of leadership culture, coherence, and professional learning are to be integrated across the system.

12. Governance Support with Instruction

(CCEE Instructional Component 12) The LEA's governing board has clearly established written policies, processes, and protocols to assist in the implementation of strong instructional practices and educational supports for each and every student. The board's policies support the goal that all students are provided with, know, and understand clear learning targets in all courses and at all grade levels. The district's governing board has a delineated function and members have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities in improving district, school, and student outcomes. The district's governing board members demonstrate conflict resolution, effective communication, and interpersonal respect for each other, the district leadership, staff, and the community they serve.

Finding 12a. As evidenced by decreasing deficits and stakeholder interviews, the OUSD Board has demonstrated an improving ability to move away from deficit spending.

Finding 12b. Board policies are not in place to support the Board's ability to consistently monitor district systemic improvement efforts.

Finding 12c. The Board does not have practices in place that include structures to support the need to assure that instruction, curriculum, and assessment are at the forefront in their collective efforts as trustees to support the academic needs of students.

Discussion

One of the major accomplishments of the OUSD Board was to reach a unanimous agreement to put forth a bond measure, Measure Y, to address OUSD school facilities' infrastructure needs and school safety. The bond measure passed in the November 2020 election and provides \$735 million dollars. The 77% support of Oakland's voters demonstrates voters' support for OUSD and the Board's direction.

The OUSD Board of Education has historically demonstrated its understanding of the Board's function and role in improving district, school, and student outcomes by providing consistently updated policies to guide the district. For example, *BP 0200: Goals for the District* calls for the district to provide an LCAP plan in accordance with state statute, including clear goals. The Board also grants broad authority to the superintendent and school site leaders to develop additional plans as long as goals include "benchmarks or short-term objectives that can be used to determine progress toward meeting the goal." It also stipulates that, "Such goals may address the improvement of governance, leadership, fiscal integrity, facilities, community involvement and collaboration, student wellness and other conditions of children, and/or any other areas of district or school operations." As the Board moves forward, attention must be paid to how their policies are interpreted and implemented.

Observations of Board meetings revealed consistent opportunities to engage with OUSD staff and departments through presentations and reports. In order to develop their capacity to lead policy development, Board members participate in ongoing professional learning on policy development, e.g., workshops focused on strategically aligned finances. With the seating of four new Board members in January 2021, there will be a need for dedicated participation in collaborative professional learning for Board members.

The Board's role in being able to adopt policy and work with the superintendent in attaining instructional outcomes and student achievement is critical. Although there is evidence that the OUSD board members have a shared interest in addressing equity and instruction within the district, it was shared by some stakeholders that the Board struggles to keep instruction as a major public focus. Instances were cited in which discussions of curriculum, instruction, and assessment were pushed late into the evening during regular meetings. In supporting instruction, the California School Board Association (CSBA) describes improvements in student achievement occurring when there is a shared vision for instruction that prioritizes that achievement. They noted that, "Effective boards spend more time focusing on student achievement and policy than on administrative details" (2017, p. 5). While setting direction and creating a clear vision for student achievement is work that is to be done in collaboration with OUSD's superintendent, CSBA's guidance provides direction for governing boards on their role in instruction focused on student achievement.

SWOT on Governance Support with Instruction

A. Strengths:

- The OUSD Board has demonstrated improvement in addressing fiscal solvency.
- The Board guided an adoption of Measure Y by Oakland's voters.

- According to Board Policies 0200: Goals for the School District, the OUSD Board of Education grants broad authority to the superintendent and to school sites to include in their plans measures to improve and increase student achievement.
- The Board has supported equity and inclusion, e.g., in BP 5032 Equity Policy and in its George Floyd Resolution, which also directed, among other actions, additional implicit bias and anti-racism training.
- The Board recognizes the critical need to engage its community's constituents in support of all OUSD students.

B. Weaknesses:

- The Board currently lacks a structured method to prioritize its focus on student achievement.
- There is a perception among some stakeholders that the Board has struggled with political division based on members' positions on key issues, which has impacted cohesion in approaching policy development related to guiding instruction.

C. Threats:

- OUSD projects funding declines over the next three years, which will impact how the Board makes strategic funding decisions impacting the instructional program.
- Funding projections will necessitate spending cuts in the district for the next two or more years.

D. Opportunities:

- Continue to align OUSD's vision and goals with actionable policy guidance in support of all OUSD students and families.
- Continue to develop more opportunities to engage with multiple student, family, and stakeholder groups in crossover groupings. Most engagement currently is done with individual groups, though there are some reported instances of crossover occurring.
- Multiple stakeholders reported a desire for the OUSD Board to provide more specific guidance on expectations regarding how OUSD measures the impact of funding aligned to LCAP goals by tracking funding in relation to student outcomes.

Actions: Governance Support with Instruction

- 12A. Re-examine board policy on school site autonomy to clarify how schools are to balance their autonomy with OUSD's instructional vision and to align with the Instructional Focus Plan's Building Blocks. As recommended in other components related to autonomy, consider partnering with an outside agency specializing in autonomy.
- 12B. With new governing board members joining the OUSD board, a board retreat and work sessions should be held, in collaboration with OUSD's superintendent, to get

grounded in a shared vision of student achievement and to clarify roles and expectations for attaining this vision.

- 12C. Seek opportunities for building board members' capacity to support the efforts of the administration to assure the use of data and performance metrics that guide instructional improvement.
- 12D. Prioritize sustaining practices, rather than specific programs, that have improved achievement for EL, AA, and HY and are moving OUSD in the right outcome-based direction.

VIII. Conclusion

This SIR report was commissioned pursuant to subdivision (g) of Section 52064.5 (CA School Dashboard) for three or more pupil subgroups identified pursuant to Section 52052. Although all student group performance is examined during the SIR process to ensure all students are meeting priorities for learning, OUSD's African American students, English learners, and students experiencing homelessness failed to meet progress for three consecutive years according to statewide data. In addition to statewide priorities data, the SIR report is a result of an analysis of artifacts submitted by the district as evidence along with extensive empathy interviews, individual interviews, stakeholder interviews, and virtual classroom visits. The discussions and respective SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) for each of the 12 SIR components provides the foundation for actions provided.

While the action steps for OUSD in the table, found in Appendix B, were created based on SIR components, they are grouped by themes as well in recognition that many of them cut across SIR components. For example, regarding the issue of implementation of district plans with fidelity, it appears in discussion sections across several SIR components and impacts the coherence of the OUSD system, notions of connected autonomy, and issues of accountability. In addition, many of the action steps also cascade to other action steps because they are interconnected. For example, developing a two-way communication plan for community engagement may require professional learning to occur before this action step can move forward.

As has been stated throughout this report, CCEE interviewed knowledgeable and dedicated educators at all levels of the system. It was also evident that equity is a core value for these educators and the stakeholders involved with the OUSD community. There are multiple plans that have been developed; however, it is evident that the systematic implementation of these plans has been limited and is demonstrated in student outcome data. After using the SWOT process to analyze and triangulate data collected for each of the 12 SIR components, three primary themes emerged: **coherence, autonomy, and accountability.**

Coherence refers to "what is in the minds and actions of people individually and especially collectively" (Fullan & Quinn, 2016, p. 14). As noted in multiple areas of the report, the understanding of school autonomy varies widely across OUSD's system and contributes to inconsistent implementation of evidence-based instructional practices with an agreed upon degree of quality. As a main focus of this report, addressing autonomy involves OUSD taking action to re-envision and re-define the parameters of autonomy that connect how the district, networks, and schools are operating towards common outcomes. Accountability is both internal and external, and for OUSD to be successful in attaining achievement for all students it must be a reciprocal experience, including across schools and communities. "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” (Fullan & Quinn, p. 111).

OUSD has instructional plans, but they are not always implemented with fidelity across all school sites and departments for a variety of reasons. These plans, if implemented with fidelity, can work to build system coherence. In terms of connected autonomy, it is really a question of what the central office holds tight and what is more loosely held in terms of centralized decision-making. The district has nationally recognized support programs such as Restorative Justice and the Community Schools model. However, there seems to be limited evidence of how these programs have been successful in improving academic achievement outcomes for students. This is more of a reflection of OUSD's multiple program offerings that are not aligned to clear achievement and academic targets. It is also reflecting a need to clarify the promising best practices that have produced positive student achievement and academic outcomes that can be cross-pollinated and adopted, rather than a focus on a specific program model. Yet, even with many bright spots, OUSD remains in a situation where the promise of the district is not reaching all schools and all students equitably.

OUSD has a decentralized system that espouses student-centered values, embedding them into all guiding documents. The challenge for OUSD is in increasing what Fullan and Quinn (2016) refer to as “systemness,” in which there is an instructional alignment and congruence between values and actions at all levels of the system. In other words, work remains to define what roles the central office, networks, and school sites play in the defining of autonomy and how it is implemented. System coherence will only be realized through consistent work to define and agree upon what autonomy for schools should look like in OUSD's current context as well as the refinement of commonly agreed-upon steps to have internal and external accountability. This is not to say that autonomy is the way forward; it is to point out that if it is chosen that it needs to be clearly defined and needs to foster the collective mindset of connected autonomy. Coherence building is work that each level of the system must undertake in a shared effort and toward common outcomes.

In order to achieve unity, OUSD must outline and clarify the understanding of reciprocal accountability, where all levels of the system are accountable to each other and shared ownership for student achievement. As mentioned in the *Culture, Coherence, and the Planning Process* section of this report, this is manifested through connected autonomy, the understanding that each layer of the system has a role and understands and supports the work of each other. It is supported through the work of cycles of continuous improvement to ensure instructional and student achievement benchmarks are being met and readjusting what is not working. OUSD needs to be clear on expectations and supports to address what is needed to increase student achievement. Ultimately, OUSD must, as a system, define how connected it will be by directly addressing whether it will be a true unified school district or a collection of separate schools. It was communicated by many stakeholders, evident in multiple artifacts, and observed in the teaching and learning that the collective commitment exists to attain this.

Next steps after the completion of the report include CCEE supporting the district, in partnership with the Alameda County Office of Education, in efforts to prioritize SIR actions/recommendations and engage in progress monitoring. The identification of

ongoing support the district needs to implement the SIR actions will also be discussed and determined. CCEE will provide the district, County Superintendent, and State Superintendent of Public Instruction progress updates, at a minimum, on the implementation of the SIR actions/recommendations in the spring semester of 2020-2021 and during the 2021-2022 school year.

References

- Ainsworth, L. & Donovan, K. (2019). *Rigorous curriculum design: A roadmap for creating a cohesive, comprehensive, and relevant curriculum*. International Center for Leadership in Education & Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
https://leadered.com/wp-content/uploads/wf1200180_icle_2020_rcd-research-foundations_paper-fo_hr-3.pdf
- American Association of School Administrators. (n.d.). *Using data to improve schools: What's working*. KSA-Plus Communications.
https://aasa.org/uploadedFiles/Policy_and_Advocacy/files/UsingDataToImproveSchools.pdf
- Auditor of the State of California. (2019). *K-12 local control funding: The state's approach has not ensured that significant funding is benefiting students as intended to close achievement gaps*. <https://www.auditor.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2019-101.pdf>
- Beers, K. & Probst, R. (2017). *Disrupting thinking: Why how we read matters*. Scholastic.
- California School Boards Association. (2017). *The school board role in creating the conditions for student achievement*.
https://csba.org/GovernanceAndPolicyResources/~/_media/CSBA/Files/GovernanceResources/Reports/201705BoardResearchReport.ashx
- Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2021). CASEL.
<https://casel.org/>
- Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2021). *Equity and SEL*. CASEL guide to schoolwide SEL.
<https://schoolguide.casel.org/what-is-sel/equity-and-sel/>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Newton, S., Montgomery, K., & Vasudeva, A. (2009). *Oakland unified school district new small schools initiative evaluation*. School Redesign Network at Stanford University.
- Dillon, D. (2016-2017). *Academic social emotional learning guidance document*. Oakland Unified School District.
<https://www.ousd.org/cms/lib/CA01001176/Centricity/Domain/3671/AcademicSocialEmotionalLearningGuidanceDocument2016-17.pdf>
- DuFour R., DuFour R., Eaker R., Many T., & Mattos M. (2016). *Learning by doing: A handbook for professional learning communities at work*. Solution Tree Press.
- Fullan, M. (2015). *Leadership for the middle: A system strategy*. Canadian Education Association.

- Fullan, M., & Gallagher, M.J. (2020). *The devil is in the details: System solutions for equity, excellence, and student well-being*. Corwin.
- Fullan, M., & Kirkman, L. (2019). *Coherent school leadership: Forging clarity from complexity*. ASCD.
- Fullan, M., & Quinn, J. (2016). *Coherence: The right drivers in action for schools, districts, and systems*. Corwin.
- Jacques, W. (2020, September 23). *State of curriculum and instructional materials* [PowerPoint slides]. Oakland unified school district board meeting, Oakland, CA, United States.
- Oakland Unified School District. (2021). *OUSD public reports*. <http://www.ousddata.org/public-dashboards.html>
- Oakland Unified School District. (2018). *Community of schools citywide plan*. https://drive.google.com/a/ousd.k12.ca.us/file/d/1mOqpYTqAGmUY24QRHhhD4NWeEQBq_7xo/view?usp=sharing
- Oakland Unified School District. (2016). *Improving special education services in the oakland unified school district*. https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B_6lfySAgS_NcVFHdk5iRUJYb29vVkgMWVdmQk81RUpTU1hv/view?usp=sharing
- Oakland Unified School District. (2020, November 13). *Legislative information center: Comprehensive coordinated early intervening services (CCEIS) plan*. Oakland Unified School District. <https://ousd.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4725088&GUID=0A3C92FE-8CB9-4DDA-82AB-7EBD12D41894&Options=&Search=>
- Oakland Unified School District. (2004, August 25). *Oakland unified school district board policy philosophy, goals, objectives and comprehensive plans: BP 0200: Goals for the school district*. Board of education. <https://boepublic.ousd.org/Policies.aspx>
- Oakland Unified School District. (2018, June 27). *Oakland unified school district board policy instruction: BP 6006: Quality school development: Community of schools*. Board of education. <https://boepublic.ousd.org/Policies.aspx>
- Oakland Unified School District. (2014). *Restorative justice in oakland schools: Implementation and impacts*. <https://www.ousd.org/cms/lib07/CA01001176/Centricity/Domain/134/OUUSD-RJ%20Report%20revised%20Final.pdf>
- Oakland Unified School District. (2021). *Teacher central*. OUSD Teacher Central. <https://teachercentral.ousd.org/>

Smith, D., Frey, N., Pumpian, I., & Fisher, D. (2017). *Building equity: Policies and practices to empower all learners*. ASCD.

Stanford University, John W. Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities, & Oakland Unified School District. (2019). *Oakland unified school district full-service community schools outcomes: A retrospective: Shifting school culture & relationships with families and the broader community*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED604095>

Stricker, J. (2019). Bringing intentionality to instructional leadership teams. *Educational Leadership*, 76(9), 56-60.
<http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/jul19/vol76/num09/Bringing-Intentionality-to-Instructional-Leadership-Teams.aspx>

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2014). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools*. Jossey-Bass.

U.S. Department of Education. (2019, May). *Principal turnover: Stayers, movers, and leavers*. National Center for Education Statistics.
https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_slb.asp

Instructional Components	Characteristics
<p>1. Culture, Coherence, and the Planning Process</p> <p><i>LCFF/LCAP:</i></p> <p><i>Priority 6: School Climate (Engagement)</i></p>	<p>The local educational agency (LEA) demonstrates a strong value on 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 that are designed to create coherence around an inclusive instructional mission and vision achieved through continuous improvement practices and processes. This is evidenced by the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A supportive and engaging culture and climate that is visible for stakeholders (e.g., teachers, leaders, staff, parents, students) and cultivated and evident across all district efforts. ● A culture of accountability that considers the whole child (e.g., academic, social, and emotional developmental) and provides students multiple opportunities and alternatives for developing learning strategies that result in improved achievement and school performance. ● A commitment to developing and refining a culture of teaching and learning that is based upon clear learning targets consistently assessed across multiple measures. ● A clear understanding of the importance of using achievement outcomes to guide coherent and collaborative work while fostering knowledge of expectations around teaching, learning, and accountability. ● Practices and planning processes that reflect an inclusive instructional vision and mission using a multi-tiered system of support that is sensitive to the diverse student community (e.g., gifted, students with disabilities, English learners, homeless and foster youth). ● Professional learning opportunities are provided, from the boardroom to the classroom and home, that create and sustain a district-wide culture of inclusivity and celebration of diversity and language, as well as include culturally reflective practices and policies. ● Student diversity is celebrated and recognized in a variety of units or school/district-wide awareness campaigns (e.g., May is National Foster Care Month, October is Disability Awareness Month, November is National Homeless Youth Awareness month, and one week is designated as National Hunger and Homeless Awareness Week). ● Continuous improvement practices and processes are utilized and shared to determine whether the instructional mission and vision are being attained. ● Support and development of the use of technology that promotes effective pedagogy and student engagement in an adaptive world (e.g., blended learning, hybrid, flipped classroom). ● A culture of clarity around the roles and responsibilities of central office and schools in planning and engaging in activities that deepen the commitment to ensuring all students attain educational success. ● A District Leadership Team provides direction, guidance, differentiated support, and oversight for ensuring the health and wellness of the district.

SIR INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENTS

Instructional Components	Characteristics
<p>2. Curriculum, Learning, and Support</p> <p><i><u>LCFF/LCAP:</u></i></p> <p><i>Priority 2: State Standards</i></p> <p><i>Priority 5: Pupil Engagement</i></p> <p><i>Priority 8: Other Pupil Outcomes</i></p>	<p>The LEA has an MTSS framework that documents and assesses the implementation of all standards-aligned materials, curricula, learning, and social-emotional and behavioral supports (e.g., differentiation options, tiered support options, integrated aligned ELD supports). This is evidenced by the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A coherent, standards-aligned curriculum, instruction, and assessment system is in place that is culturally and linguistically responsive and meets the needs of all learners (e.g., gifted, English learners, students with disabilities, and homeless and foster youth). ● Evidence-based programs, including supplemental and enrichment curricular and instructional materials, are provided and reflect the diverse needs of the student population and provide equitable access for all learners. ● A multi-tiered approach is used to align and allocate district resources and support based on students' and schools' needs across multiple measures (e.g., academics, suspension, attendance, grades). ● A targeted focus on ensuring teachers hold high expectations for their students and have positive student-teacher relationships. ● Clearly articulated learning goals, across all grade levels and content areas provide students a path to mastery of the strategies, skills, and concepts embedded in the curriculum. ● Ensuring teachers are able to clearly articulate their concept of student progress and appropriately challenge surface, deep, and conceptual knowledge and understanding. ● Assessment components of the curricula and instructional practices clearly support the evaluation of the learning of all students across multiple measures. ● A written continuous improvement process exists and includes reviewing academic and social-emotional and behavioral performance data to identify and make decisions on curriculum and supplemental supports. ● High-quality, stimulating, and rigorous instructional materials that engage English learners (ELs), students with disabilities (SWDs), foster and homeless youth, and accelerate grade-level content and language development. ● A clearly articulated and executed plan that ensures ELs across all levels of language proficiency can access, fully engage with, and achieve rigorous grade-level academic content standards. ● An identified curriculum for designated ELD and non-graduation-bound SWDs is implemented with fidelity. ● Continuous improvement processes are used to routinely evaluate the fidelity of implementation of curricula and their respective quality. ● Ample available curricular materials and support are available for all students (e.g., electronic devices, tiered, and differentiated instructional materials).

SIR INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENTS

Instructional Components	Characteristics
<p>3. Instructional Practice and Strategies</p> <p><u>LCFF/LCAP</u></p> <p><i>Priority: 1 Basic Conditions</i></p> <p><i>Priority 2: State Standards</i></p> <p><i>Priority 7: Course Access</i></p>	<p>The LEA has established and defined instructional practices and strategies that are culturally inclusive, differentiated, rigorous, coherent, and standards aligned. Instructional technology, project-based learning, and other experiences beyond the textbook are regularly utilized. Instructional practices and strategies positively support students in developing self-agency and building metacognitive skills. This is evidenced by the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A district-wide intentional focus on providing a rigorous teaching and learning experience that uses Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles for improving and extending differentiated instructional practices that increase student engagement. ● Evidence-based instructional practices focus on providing students access to and experience with rigorous, relevant, and coherent standards-aligned instruction and are responsive to the needs of all learners, including gifted students, culturally and linguistically diverse students, students with disabilities, homeless and foster youth. ● Teaching practices emphasize the engagement of students in the learning process, clear articulation of the strategies of instruction, learning intentions, and the criteria for success. ● District-wide instructional practices and strategies are actively cultivated, communicated, clearly documented, and evaluated. ● Continuous improvement data are regularly used to celebrate growth and problem solve areas in need of targeted assistance. ● Instructional practice and strategies ensure that the teachers of all student groups (gifted, culturally and linguistically diverse students, students with disabilities, homeless and foster youth) are included and participate in collaborative integrated planning for instruction. ● Teachers regularly meet to share and review student work. ● Instructional support staff provide in-class support for students needing additional support/remediation and extension. ● Intensive support teachers deliver the most targeted instruction for students in small groups. ● Instructional practices support the development of student agency for learning (i.e. academic self-efficiency and self-regulation). ● Students with disabilities are educated in the least restrictive environment. ● Digital learning and experiences beyond the textbook (e.g., project-based learning) and the classroom are used to actively engage students in learning, emphasize critical thinking skills, and adapt to a flexible world (e.g. synchronous and asynchronous). ● Systematic frequent and ongoing measurement of student learning allows multiple means and modalities to demonstrate mastery. ● Systematic use of school data to plan, design, and deliver culturally responsive instruction results in an increased rate of student growth across multiple measures (e.g. academic and social emotional and behavioral) ● Teachers are provided with opportunities to serve as a peer resource for teaching and learning. ● Regular communication and engagement provide opportunities for parents/caregivers to support their students' learning.

SIR INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENTS

Instructional Components	Characteristics
<p>4. Social-Emotional and Behavioral Health and Development</p> <p><i>LCFF/LCAP:</i></p> <p><i>Priority 6: School Climate</i></p>	<p>Social-emotional and behavioral (SEB) well-being of the whole child is a critical component in the LEA's mission and vision. Identified social-emotional and behavioral skills are integrated into the curriculum, instructional practices, and resources identified for student support and school capacity building. Social-emotional and behavioral health is embedded in LEA policies and practices and is modeled by adults. This is evidenced by the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Social-emotional and behavioral health of the whole child is supported/substantiated within the written instructional vision, policies, and practices. ● Systemic and strategically embedded instruction that includes explicit teaching of expected student behaviors appropriate to the development level. ● Specific and differentiated social-emotional and behavioral strategies address students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III. ● Specific metrics measure and refine the impact of the SEB instruction. ● Rapid formative assessments are available for highly mobile students and are used to assess new students' abilities, recognize emotional needs, employ a variety of teaching strategies, arrange for students to complete homework at school, and provide individual or group tutoring. ● Professional learning is provided to enable teachers to understand the nature of homelessness and foster care, to create positive experiences for homeless children, and to provide strategies for discussing this topic in the classroom. ● A continuum of resources available at every site provides support to students whose behavior and well-being is of concern. ● Meaningful outreach engages families and caregivers with the continuum of available resources. ● Planned and intentional professional learning builds staff capacity in the use of Student Success Teams (SST) and Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS). ● Social-emotional, behavioral, and health development is practiced and modeled by adults throughout the district. ● A continuum of school-based social-emotional, and behavioral supports are identified and external partnerships are cultivated. ● The school site culture among teachers and school leaders engages, challenges, and supports social-emotional, behavioral, and academic development. ● Social-emotional and behavioral health and respective curricular programs are routinely evaluated and use data to ensure fidelity of implementation, quality of the selected curriculum, and to inform continuous improvement instructional decisions. ● On-going professional learning opportunities provide a safe space for teachers and leaders to learn about the importance of SEB.

SIR INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENTS

Instructional Components	Characteristics
<p>5. Assessment and Accountability</p> <p><i>LCFF/LCAP:</i></p> <p><i>Priority 2: State Standards</i></p> <p><i>Priority 4: Pupil Achievement</i></p>	<p>The LEA has a systemic process to measure and analyze student data—academic, behavior, and SEL—that drives the accountability system for all stakeholders (classroom to boardroom and home) and informs a continuous improvement process. This is evidenced by the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A system of assessment that ensures all students are provided with, know, and understand clear learning targets in all courses and at all grade levels with the goal that each student comprehends precisely what and how to attain mastery of key skills and concepts. ● 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). ● Targeted and on-going assessment of ELs ensure they are moving toward advanced levels of English, reclassification, and closing the academic language gap. ● The redesignation rate of ELs and the declassification rate and movement of service delivery (e.g., LRE) for students with disabilities are monitored, assessed, shared, and used to make instructional decisions for improved student outcomes. ● Measures are used that promote resilience in foster and homeless youth and assess students’ soft skills such as motivation, social adaptability, and interpretive abilities. ● Assessment data are used to monitor the rate of growth for foster and homeless youth to ensure students are receiving differentiated and well-rounded support for academics, social-emotional, and behavioral health. ● District-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 (e.g., establish Professional Learning Communities, Communities of Practice, etc.). ● Progress monitoring of district culture, coherence, curriculum, and instructional and professional learning provides two-way communication with stakeholders and ensures district benchmarks and goals are met. ● There is an established district-wide process (e.g., problem solving/continuous improvement protocols) for using assessment data to make instructional decisions at the student, classroom, school and district levels. ● The district’s multi-tiered system of support has established decision rules that articulate entrance and exit criteria for students needing intensified instruction and intervention. ● A functional student information system (SIS) is in place that readily provides data to inform continuous improvement and instructional decisions from the boardroom to the classroom. ● Assessment and accountability data are regularly collected and shared throughout the school year and align with district formative and/or benchmark assessments (e.g., beginning, middle, and end of year).

SIR INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENTS

Instructional Components	Characteristics
<p>6. Student and Family Engagement</p> <p><i>LCFF/LCAP:</i></p> <p><i>Priority 3: Parental Involvement (engagement)</i></p> <p><i>Priority 5: Pupil Engagement</i></p>	<p>The LEA practices two-way communication that reflects the cultural and linguistic needs of families in the community and provides resources and activities that give students agency, promotes student leadership, and provides a space for active family and community engagement. This is evidenced by the following characteristics:</p> <p><u>Student Engagement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Student agency and voice are fostered to promote critical thinking and leadership that contribute to decisions being made. ● Students are able to articulate what they are learning and why. ● Students are able to identify and use self-regulatory strategies for learning. ● Students are able to self identify instructional strategies for their learning. ● Students are provided with opportunities to self-assess. ● Students are provided equitable access to digital learning platforms and devices. <p><u>Family Engagement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The LEA actively seeks and acts upon two-way communication with students, families/caregivers, and underrepresented groups. ● There are written protocols that delineate strategies and practices that promote and engage students and families. ● The district has both systems and supports in place to successfully engage families and students in an adaptive learning environment (e.g., distance learning, blended learning, flipped classroom), internet connectivity, devices, orientation, and guidance on hybrid learning environments. ● Clear two-way communication is used with families and cultivates a clear understanding of steps and progress required for students to show mastery of skills, concepts, and grade-level and graduation requirements. ● The cultural and linguistic needs of the community are reflected in the resources, engagement activities, and curriculum. ● Families/caregivers are active participants in PTA/PTO, school site council meetings, and other forums. ● The LEA provides support to schools to ensure family/caregivers and students are actively informed members and decision makers within the district system of support and school community. ● Parent groups engage and collaborate with school and district leaders in prioritizing goals and providing LCAP input and feedback. ● Universal use and provision of language translation and interpretation (e.g., written, oral language) is provided.

SIR INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENTS

Instructional Components	Characteristics
<p>7. School-based Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs) <u>LCFF/LCAP:</u> <i>Priority 6: School Climate</i></p>	<p>Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs) exist in every school and are representative across grades and disciplines with members that make culturally responsive data-driven decisions to design instruction for all students and their needs. ILTs facilitate site-based professional learning and support the implementation of district and site programs and efforts. This is evidenced by the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Written expectations exist for ILTs roles, responsibilities, and team membership. ● ILTs exist in every school and meet regularly with organized agendas and minutes. ● ILTs are provided professional development on the purpose, process, facilitation, and outcomes for leadership teams. ● ILTs reflect cross grade and disciplinary representation of student groups including EL, gifted, homeless, foster, and students with disabilities. ● ILTs have a clear vision that aligns with the LCAP goals, student needs, and data. ● ILT members are capable and empowered to use data to design instruction based on the needs of each and every student. ● ILTs include a focus on supporting all educators in developing assessment literacy. ● ILTs are actively involved in facilitating culturally responsive data-driven decision making and creating the instructional supports necessary to deliver best first instruction that results in improved school-wide student outcomes. ● ILTs facilitate site-based professional development and coaching on instruction, assessment, and data-driven decision making.

SIR INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENTS

Instructional Components	Characteristics
<p>8. Administrative Coaching and Leadership</p>	<p>Infrastructures across the LEA support, promote, and enhance a collaborative culture for district and site administrator effectiveness in management and instructional leadership. Data (academic, social-emotional, and behavioral) are consistently used to monitor instruction and inform stakeholders' engagement. This is evidenced by the following characteristics:</p> <p><u>District Leadership:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central office administration ensures expectations of the school site administrators are clear and district infrastructures exist to support, enhance, and develop effective instruction and managerial leadership. ● Principal supervisors spend an extensive amount of time in schools observing instruction in both general and special education settings and providing strengths-based and actionable feedback to site leaders. ● District administrators demonstrate consistent use of qualitative and quantitative school-based data to assess the rate of growth for academic, behavioral, and social-emotional learning and differentiate levels of support. ● District leadership actively cultivates a growth mindset in a trusting and safe environment, in which personnel feel comfortable taking risks and actively contribute to decision making. ● District infrastructures provide professional learning to support site administrators in developing their assessment literacy. ● District leadership provides targeted coaching to site administrators that facilitates growth and development of assessment literacy for their respective instructional personnel. <p><u>Site Leadership:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District infrastructures exist that support and enhance site administrators' effectiveness in instructional leadership. ● Consistent leadership coaching and mentoring provides principals the opportunity to reflect on, monitor, adjust, and increase effectiveness of their roles in strengthening instructional practices to meet the needs of diverse learners. ● Administrators clearly demonstrate a balance of their time between building management and instructional leadership. ● Administrative practices include targeted instructional coaching for staff to support and facilitate effective teaching strategies and practices that span all students—general education, special education, gifted and English learners, homeless and foster youth. ● Administrators spend an extensive amount of time in classrooms, including special education, 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, behavioral, and social-emotional learning for all students. ● Administration actively cultivates a growth mindset and a safe environment for personnel to take risks, speak their truth, and contribute to decision making. ● Administrators actively facilitate and engage parents/caregivers as welcomed partners in the school community/family.

SIR INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENTS

Instructional Components	Characteristics
<p>9. Professional Learning and Coaching</p> <p><i>LCFF/LCAP:</i></p> <p><i>Priority 1: Basic</i></p> <p><i>Priority 2: State Standards</i></p>	<p>There is a professional learning plan that cultivates the development of a teaching and learning culture through the eyes of a student and reflects the needs of all teaching staff. The LEA-wide data-driven professional learning plan designed for all stakeholders focuses on effective instructional practices that improve student academic, social-emotional, and behavioral learning. Instructional coaches support the implementation and improvement of the tiered practices. This is evidenced by the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is a written comprehensive multi-year professional learning (PL) and coaching plan based on best practices for improving effective instruction for veteran and new principals, teachers, and staff (classified and certificated) and has clear expectations for implementation and monitoring. ● District-led, highly effective, data-based professional learning opportunities are grounded in student performance and foster collective responsibility for improving student outcomes. ● There is a relentless focus on developing the capacity of all teaching staff to deliver effective lessons that actively engage ELs and SWDs and advance their learning and language proficiency across the curriculum. ● There is intentional focus on developing systemic implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). ● The development of assessment literacy provides for continual analysis of student data that results in effectively raising achievement academically, socially-emotionally, and behaviorally. ● There is a clear focus on digital literacy within an adaptive environment that provides opportunities to practice and build skills in this area (e.g. blending and online learning, flipped classrooms, maximizing the use of digital platforms and resources, synchronous and asynchronous). ● A structure exists for school site professional learning that is focused on collaborative cultures, e.g. PLC, CoPs, ILTs. etc. ● A data-driven professional development plan exists at each school site that is intentional and differentiated for the learning needs of teaching staff. ● Professional learning feedback is regularly collected and shared to support continuous improvement. ● A structure exists to support teachers' reflections and efforts to improve classroom practices for academics, social-emotional, and behavioral learning (e.g., instructional coaches and/or support personnel). ● There is a written multi-year plan for engaging parents and other stakeholders in learning that is aligned to the district's strategies for improving academic, behavioral, and social-emotional learning. ● Regular professional learning and data-driven feedback is provided to the governing board.

SIR INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENTS

Instructional Components	Characteristics
<p>10. Data Management and Use and Student Information Systems</p>	<p>There is a student information system (SIS) that actively stores and tracks all individual student data (e.g., grades, attendance, discipline). The SIS provides LEA-wide appropriate access for teachers, administrators, and parents/caregivers, which allows for aggregate data use for school-based planning and also meets federal/state/local reporting requirements. This is evidenced by the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SIS data that support and align with the district’s assessment and accountability system(s). ● An early warning system (EWS) for academics (e.g., grades), behavior (e.g., major/minor events), and attendance is developed, available at the district, school, and classroom levels, and has established criteria for each level. ● A suite of reports that is readily available and customized for the end-user (e.g., principal, teacher, board member, assistant superintendent, parent/caregiver, etc.) and reflect the areas identified as needing improvement (e.g., EWS that can be disaggregated by student group, grade, gender, graduation rates, family/caregiver engagement, targeted indicators for ELs and students with disabilities). ● The SIS communicates with other data systems that are required and maintained by other departments (e.g. special education, English learners, foster and homeless youth). ● Regularly provide training on how to use and access SIS data. ● Regular district monitoring and reviewing of data in an effort to support educator access and usage of the SIS. ● Professional learning opportunities that unpack the need for and use of SIS data to drive student, school, and district improvement, inclusive of a continuous improvement problem-solving approach to help consumers analyze and act upon areas of need. ● Data are regularly used, from the governing board to the classroom and parent/caregiver levels, to monitor progress and ensure curriculum, instruction, and tiered support result in positive student outcomes in academics, social-emotional, and behavioral health. ● District leadership utilizes SIS data regularly (e.g., quarterly) to monitor a variety of data points (D/Fs, EWS trends, referral rates for special education, etc.). ● School leadership utilizes SIS data on a regular basis to monitor school based EWS indicators (academic, behavior, attendance) and other data to include, but not limited to, SST referrals, the success of Tier 2 and 3 interventions, success of the implementation of curriculum, etc. ● Longitudinal data are regularly provided and reviewed at the school and district level to track and report student progress. ● Readily available data that support cross-departmental, classroom to school analysis to inform continuous improvement instructional decisions. ● 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, English learners, and students with disabilities. ● Activities (e.g., PLCs, pairing of schools) that are organized using aggregated data and create opportunities for schools to collaborate and learn from and give each other feedback.

SIR INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENTS

Instructional Components	Characteristics
<p>11. District and Leadership Capacity</p>	<p>The LEA contains strong multi-level (school and district leadership) organizational capacity and processes to make coherent, coordinated decisions that ensure goals and metrics are mission and vision aligned across sites and departments. Established processes ensure each member, regardless of position, is supported and can fulfill their role and responsibilities. This is evidenced by the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strong organizational capacity, dynamics, and processes exist to make coherent, coordinated decisions that improve the overall health and wellness of the district. ● District and school leadership develop and facilitate collaborative and transparent processes to implement shared goals regarding teaching and learning, effective leadership, and accountability and commitment to equity and excellence across the district. ● On-going assessment of district and school leadership culture, coherence, and professional learning provides two-way communication with the superintendent to ensure district benchmarks and goals are met. ● Performance metrics aligned with district goals and vision are established across all central office departments and regularly reviewed for growth and sustainability using a continuous improvement model. ● Each department’s strategic workflow, metrics and benchmarks are verified with data, aligned with district goals and vision, and reviewed regularly. ● Aligned, systemic processes, both qualitative and quantitative, are in place to measure how, what, and how well district and school leaders are functioning in their current roles. ● On-going coaching is provided across the cabinet and superintendent that supports team cohesiveness and provides for individual growth and development. ● School leaders are provided with professional learning and coaching opportunities to enhance their knowledge and skills to fulfill their roles and responsibilities. ● A district instructional leadership team exists that continually assesses the needs of schools and provides differentiated support to sites. ● There are clear expectations and support for current and future leaders in the development of their assessment and technological literacy. ● A written leadership succession plan exists and is executed that works to build the capacity and bench of potential leaders for both the school and district levels. ● Career ladder opportunities are provided that support the development of a leadership pipeline for future leaders.

SIR INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENTS

Instructional Components	Characteristics
<p>12. Governance Support with Instruction</p>	<p>The governing board has clearly established written policies, processes, and protocols to assist in the implementation of strong instructional practices and educational supports for each and every student. This is evidenced by the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The district’s governing board has policies and practices that support the focus that all students are provided with, know, and understand clear learning targets in all courses and at all grade levels. ● The district’s governing board has a delineated function and members have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities in improving district, school, and student outcomes. ● The district’s governing board members demonstrate conflict resolution, effective communication, and interpersonal respect for each other, the district leadership, staff, and the community they serve. ● The district’s governing board participates in ongoing professional learning on policy development, leadership, and practices for effective teams. ● The district’s governing board meetings provide regular opportunities to engage with staff and departments via presentations and reports. ● Governing board work sessions are held regularly (e.g., 3 times per year) and provide deeper study into various topics of district need and interest and involve appropriate staff.

Appendix B: Action Steps by Themes

One of the first steps for the district will be to review the SIR actions found below and identify and align priority actions. Although provided as discrete actions, many of the actions are complementary, cascade to other actions, and can be prioritized to leverage a group of actions. The role of CCEE is to advise and assist the district, in partnership with the county office of education, in prioritizing actions, progress monitoring of the SIR actions, and, as appropriate, assist with identifying supports for the district.

Theme 1: Coherence	
1G	Set the expectation that, as a system, all organizational decisions and data monitoring mechanisms will utilize the tenets of the Strategic Plan being finalized as well as the Instructional Focus Plan.
1H	Ensure that all communications within the system and with stakeholders are grounded in the tenets of the finalized Strategic Plan and the Instructional Focus Plan.
2C	The central office should provide required professional development in all curricular areas and integrate the explicit teaching of reading, ELD, and academic language strategies.
2D	The network structure should examine how it will be used to provide differentiated support and monitoring of the implementation of a systemwide literacy focus and implement a consistent model across the different networks.
2E	Use the CCEIS plan and the Early Literacy plans as opportunities to build a systemwide literacy focus, grounded in a Multitiered System of Support, that identifies specific measurable literacy goals at each level.
3A	Build on the district's instructional focus plan working with the central office, networks, and schools to clarify instructional non-negotiables related to priorities for the district. These non-negotiables would focus on systemwide instructional and engagement practices to ensure all students experience meaningful and relevant instructional tasks that support student mastery of content standards. Non-negotiables should include common expectations of instructional practice (across networks and schools), minimum cycles of inquiry school teams engage in, the central office having a set minimum of improvement goals from one cycle of inquiry to another, and a set number of common strategies to support students.
3D	Expand policies, professional learning, and implementation of culturally relevant practices utilized by AAMA teachers that allow students to feel safe and respected and to engage in learning intended to improve AA students' academic outcomes.
4A	Identify the criteria for measuring the success of social-emotional programs, i.e., student outcomes, attendance, reduction in discipline referrals, etc. to determine what programs should be either transitioned to a close, remain as pilots, or recognized for greater scale.

4B	Identify social-emotional practices, based on established criteria and evidence of effectiveness, that will be reflected in the instructional focus plan and to make decisions on what practices should be scaled or expanded as schools consider their specific SEL needs.
4C	Develop tools for schools to use to analyze the data in the area of social-emotional learning and identify what SEL practices and supports should be implemented to meet the identified needs of the student population as identified in the school's SPSA.
3C	Connect the Instructional Focus Plan to existing professional practices within the district that have resulted in improved outcomes for targeted populations. Use successful models within the district to scale the work at the central office and increase schools accessing them.
5B	Continue to build clarity, coherence, and capacity across the district, central office, and schools in cycles of inquiry so that local ILTs may develop agency and ownership in improving outcomes for the most impacted groups: AAs, ELs, and HY.
6A	Shape family and student engagement efforts to include public recognition and appreciation of the level of engagement from families/caregivers, students, and advocacy groups to date, while simultaneously shifting to a tighter focus on envisioning how those groups could engage in supporting OUSD's instructional vision, the coming Strategic Plan, and the Instructional Focus Plan.
6B	Create a communication and engagement plan that details what effective two-way family/caregiver relationships and communication looks like at the central, network, school site, and classroom level. Include persons responsible and timelines.
6C	Ensure that site leaders receive differentiated support and professional learning to help them facilitate family/caregiver engagement and communication.
6D	With some programs and support personnel involved in family and student engagement facing potential cuts due to budget or the ending of outside support, OUSD should focus targeted professional development opportunities to build capacity for family and student engagement. The goal would be to soften the direct impact of any potential cuts by examining current positions to see where the work can be integrated.
7B	Create cohesive documents that integrate the goals from the LCAP, Instructional Focus Plan and CCEIS plan that can be used to drive the work of the ILTs at each level of the system. These documents might include placemats, posters, guiding documents, etc.
7C	As noted in component 5, continue to build clarity, coherence, and capacity across the district, central office, and schools in cycles of inquiry, so that school-based ILTs may develop agency and ownership in improving outcomes for most impacted groups: AAs, ELs, and HY.
7D	Provide professional learning on the purpose, structure, goals, and implementation of ILTs to help stakeholders understand how to plan, facilitate, and be an active participant of an ILT.

7E	Use already existing peer structures (e.g., principal/network check-ins, PAC meetings, etc.) to share ILT progress and practices.
8A	Develop and implement a differentiated model of school leadership development, coaching, and supervision where the needs and experiences of principals, assistant principals, community school managers, lead teachers, etc. are taken into consideration and guide their development.
8B	Develop and implement a system of gathering leadership needs for growth, professional learning, and coaching.
8C	Clarify expectations related to minimum coaching sessions to build leadership and the relationship between coaching and student outcomes with attention to AA, EL, and HY populations.
9A	Provide differentiated professional learning and support to schools, increasing district involvement with schools whose outcomes continue to decline for AAs, ELs, and students experiencing homelessness.
9C	Establish systems for providing feedback to school sites and classrooms on the implementation of strategies, concepts, and practices acquired through professional learning that supports district priorities.
10B	Provide Protocols for standards-based data digs for teachers to ensure the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
10C	Continue to build clarity, coherence, and capacity across the district, central office, and schools in cycles of inquiry with a focus on AAs, ELs, and HY by outlining how cycles of inquiry are used at the central, network, and school level.
11C	In order to avoid central's PD demands overriding school plans, set district PD plans earlier in the year and support sites in aligning their school plans with the district's instructional vision and goals.
11E	Seek to identify individuals at all levels of the system who can serve OUSD as exemplars of model leadership for achieving OUSD's instructional vision and Instructional Focus Plan.
11G	Set the expectation that the district will work to seek common agreement on how results of ongoing measurement of leadership culture, coherence, and professional learning are to be integrated across the system.
Theme 2: Autonomy	
1A	Analyze the effects of existing school autonomies on student outcomes, perhaps with support from an outside partner, to inform the district's policy on autonomy.

1B	After analyzing the effects of existing school autonomies on student outcomes, finalize and implement OUSD's draft of its Defined Autonomy Framework, which operationalizes the directions contained in Board Policy 6006. Part of this process should be to reach common agreement and shared understanding of how school autonomies in OUSD support better outcomes for students.
2A	The central office is to outline the non-negotiables in the selection of curricular materials to ensure all students receive instruction using curricular tools that are standards-aligned, rigorous, and culturally relevant.
2B	Revisit and revise the draft "Defined Autonomy" policy to define and implement a coherent approach to autonomy in curriculum selection as well as accountabilities for at the site level (teachers), network level (principals), and district level (network superintendents). As recommended in action 1A, potentially partner with an outside organization well versed in earned school autonomy to define the concept of autonomy and establish agreed-upon guardrails, monitoring, and support structures.
3B	As recommended in 1A, define the concept of autonomy, possibly with the support of an outside organization, and establish agreed upon guardrails, monitoring, and support structures. Given this definition, revisit and revise the draft "Defined Autonomy" policy to define and implement a coherent approach to autonomy as well as accountabilities for instructional practices at the site level (teachers), network level (principals), and district level (network superintendents).
5C	As recommended in 1A, define the concept of autonomy, possibly with the support of an outside organization, and establish agreed upon guardrails, monitoring, and support structures. Given this definition, revisit and revise the draft "Defined Autonomy" policy to define and implement a coherent approach to autonomy as well as districtwide common formative assessments (formative/summative), goal setting, accountabilities, and monitoring at the site, network, and district levels.
7A	Revisit draft "Defined Autonomy" policy to define and implement a coherent approach to autonomy as it relates to ILTs and other district leadership teams to include goal setting, accountabilities, and monitoring of team effectiveness.
9B	Revisit draft "Defined Autonomy" policy to define and implement a coherent approach to autonomy/accountability for professional learning, cycles of inquiry, and PLCs that lead to improved outcomes for targeted populations.
11A	Finalize and implement OUSD's draft of its Defined Autonomy Framework, which operationalizes the directions contained in Board Policy 6006.
11B	In order to differentiate the learning and coaching needs of a diverse group of school leaders, OUSD should set guidelines and provide network support for administrators to co-design short cycles of inquiry to focus their professional learning needs.
Theme 3: Accountability	

1C	Identify an Instructional Equity Framework that 1) extends from the instructional plan and, when finalized, the strategic plan 2) defines what equity and anti-racist practices look like at the central office, network, school site, and classroom levels, and 3) includes an equity matrix for leaders to use in decision-making.
1D	In an effort to make OUSD's vast data resources more accessible, build an Equity Dashboard that standardizes a data set from the indicators on p. 5 of the Instructional Plan. This dashboard would make public the network and school actions to address disproportionality, systemic racism, and explicit and implicit bias.
1E	Set expectations for a culture of continuous improvement at school sites based on regular implementation of short cycles of inquiry grounded in data.
1F	Set the expectation that full implementation of MTSS practices at all school sites will support OUSD's focus on serving the needs of the whole child.
1I	Require school leaders to engage in training on facilitating dialogue on race, racism, white supremacy, and anti-Blackness.
1J	Develop an expectation that schools will begin to initiate inclusive strategies such as Equity Walks to evaluate their culture and climate (for an example see https://west.edtrust.org/data-equity-walk-toolkit/).
4D	Examine the data to clearly identify homeless youth to allow for intentionality in the connecting of academic, social-emotional, and physical well being supports, and then put structures in place so case management can occur. This could also include community and city service providers. Consider connecting with ACOE to support the development of this approach.
5A	Clarify the non-negotiables for school sites related to assessment and accountabilities that are aligned to the district's priorities. Non-negotiables might include a common set of assessment metrics, minimum cycles of inquiry, minimum improvement goals from one cycle of inquiry to another, set number of common strategies to support AAs, ELs, and HY, and the role of the network superintendent, executive directors, site leaders, and Instructional Leadership Teams in these short cycles of inquiry.
5D	Implement districtwide, rigorous, standards-aligned common formative assessments to be used in cycles of inquiry to measure impact on student learning, particularly for impacted groups: AAs, ELs, and HY.
5E	Set guidelines and expectations for system-wide data dashboard usage in conjunction with formative, interim, and summative assessments.
10A	Clearly define, model, and monitor how student-level data is used at the school level to support acceleration, prevention, and intervention. This should include a review of the purpose and effective use of cycles of inquiry in a continuous improvement model. It is important to include the disaggregation of data to the populations of ELs, AAs, and HY.

10D	Provide professional learning on the use of data in a Cycle of Inquiry to inform instructional practice and define accountabilities for the practices at various levels of the system, teachers, ILTs, networks, and central office.
11D	Seek to hire and retain more Latinx school site leaders to better align leader and student demographics.
11F	Set the expectation that site leaders will lead their teams in cycles of inquiry and outcome-focused accountability conversations.
12A	Re-examine board policy on school site autonomy to clarify how schools are to balance their autonomy with OUSD's instructional vision and to align with the Instructional Focus Plan's Building Blocks. As recommended in other components related to autonomy, consider partnering with an outside agency specializing in autonomy.
12B	With new governing board members joining the OUSD board, a board retreat and work sessions should be held, in collaboration with OUSD's superintendent, to get grounded in a shared vision of student achievement and to clarify roles and expectations for attaining this vision.
12C	Seek opportunities for building board members' capacity to support the efforts of the administration to assure the use of data and performance metrics that guide instructional improvement.
12D	Prioritize sustaining practices, rather than specific programs, that have improved achievement for EL, AA, and HY and are moving OUSD in the right outcome-based direction.