



Supporting Quality Implementation of the Hawaii State Department of Education's 6 Priority Strategies

Implementation Continuum
Academic Review Team (ART)

As part of the Professional Learning Community Framework, Academic Review Teams at the complex area and school levels embody the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) process of continuous improvement. An Academic Review Team is charged with planning, doing, checking (monitoring), and taking action (next steps) for strategic projects and initiatives. Key leaders must have regular routines in place that facilitate dialogue and action around student outcomes aligned with the strategic plan. These routines are focused on achieving measurable success. The ART must analyze whether strategies and enabling activities are having the desired effect on outcomes. At the school level, the ART will systemically and consistently review the extent to which the school is successful in meeting the measures in the academic plan, and take appropriate action as necessary. At the complex level, the ART will systematically and consistently review the K-12 construct and the extent to which each school in the K-12 complex area is successful in meeting the measures in the complex area plan, and take appropriate action as necessary.



The ART continuum is a tool for assessing the quality of existing ART routines. Specifically, it focuses on three key elements that should be present in a strong ART routine:

- **Routines are focused on a common purpose**
- **Routines identify problems and commit to clear next steps**
- **Routines encourage learning and collaboration**



Supporting Quality Implementation of the Hawaii State Department of Education's 6 Priority Strategies

Implementation Continuum
Academic Review Team (ART)

	1 ESTABLISHING	2 APPLYING	3 INTEGRATING	4 SYSTEMATIZING
<p>Routines focused on a common purpose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are routines clearly established for the ART to meet and work on reviewing data and taking action? • Do all people participating in the ART routine clearly understand and agree on its purpose – to discuss performance against HODOE priorities, to identify and solve problems, and to identify and commit to clear next steps? • Is the discussion structured to help participants discuss and agree on current progress against HODOE priority goals? • What range of evidence is used to support this discussion? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no clear ART lead and team composition changes from meeting to meeting • There are no clear routines or other mechanisms for regularly reviewing data and taking action; conversations on progress happen occasionally, but sporadically • Quantitative evidence is sporadic and inconsistent • Data are presented in raw format with little or no attempt to discern patterns or implications • Discussion is grounded more in opinion and anecdote than it is in evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routines exist, but are check-ins during which participants give updates on their work, with some connection to HODOE priorities • Preparation for routines is minimal; mostly conducted on-the-fly as a way of touching base • The purpose of the routines is unclear to some participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings and other routines occur regularly, and all participants are prepared to dialogue about commonly understood outcome measures aligned with the state strategic plan • Routines are used as an opportunity to regularly explore outcome data aligned with the state strategic plan and discuss progress of implementation of key strategic plan initiatives • Participants are well prepared, clear on the purpose of the routines to review progress and make decisions; often they have the right data to do so, but sometimes require scheduling additional meetings to gather additional data and further explore root causes • Agenda, key messages and discussion questions, and relevant data are clear, concise, and prepared in advance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings and other routines occur regularly, and all participants are prepared to dialogue about commonly understood outcome measures of performance • HODOE priorities, including the outcome measures that define success, are well understood as the anchor for discussion • A wide range of evidence, mostly quantitative, is presented and analyzed in a way that is clear, sharp, consistent, focused on student outcome data, leading indicator data, and evidence on quality of implementation of strategic plan initiatives • Dialogue is vigorous but usually results in consensus about overall performance/progress, areas of strength, and areas of weakness



Supporting Quality Implementation of the Hawaii State Department of Education's 6 Priority Strategies

Implementation Continuum
Academic Review Team (ART)

	1 ESTABLISHING	2 APPLYING	3 INTEGRATING	4 SYSTEMATIZING
<p>Routines identify problems and commit to clear next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the ART routine help participants to identify and agree on the most critical barriers to achieving priority goals? Does the ART routine create a space for creative problem-solving that empowers participants to address these challenges? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Problems may be identified but are too vague to be actionable; their root causes are poorly understood, if at all Discussion tends to dwell on the problems, with little or no attempt made to actively seek creative solutions Next steps are not identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Problems are identified, and rooted in the data; some root causes are identified but additional investigation into these root causes is not pursued Next steps are identified, but responsibility and deadlines for next steps are nebulous at times 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion allows participants to identify specific barriers to success, with a focus on root causes that are actionable There is time in the agenda for focused problem-solving around the biggest challenges Routine includes the identification of clear next steps for all participants that are specific, actionable, and time-bound 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion encourages all participants to reflect on what it will take to overcome barriers and to identify realistic solutions Next steps tend to be accomplished as agreed. Minutes of meeting are kept and next steps are tracked and monitored to determine effectiveness of actions
<p>Routines encourage learning and collaboration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the ART routine encourage participants to identify challenges that are common amongst their peers and to learn from each other's best and most promising practices? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Routines do not provide an opportunity for collaboration or for learning from one another 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When routines bring peers together, they are reluctant to engage in open dialogue about their own performance and how it compares to others Participants simply report out on what they have done 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion is structured to encourage learning and sharing across peers, including common challenges and best/promising practices Data compares performance and leads to collaborative conversations on implementation progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Routines include opportunities to compare progress across peers/grades/schools in order to learn from one another These routines and comparisons create a spirit of friendly support and professional learning about how to improve performance

See "A Framework for Professional Learning Communities" for additional guidance.