DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

March 20, 2017

Donald Hense, Board Chair
Friendship Public Charter School – Armstrong Academy
1400 1st Street NW
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mr. Hense:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, DC PCSB shall monitor the progress of each school in meeting the goals and student academic achievement expectations specified in the school's charter. Your school was selected to undergo a Qualitative Site Review during the 2016-17 school year for the following reason:

o   School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report
A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Friendship PCS - Armstrong Academy between January 23, 2017 and February 3, 2017. Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report focuses primarily on the following areas: charter mission and goals, classroom environments, and instructional delivery.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at Friendship PCS - Armstrong Academy.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Pat Brantely

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: March 20, 2017

Campus Information
Campus Name: Friendship PCS – Armstrong Academy
Ward: 5
Grade levels: PK3-5

Qualitative Site Review Information
Reason for visit: School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year
Two-week window: January 23, 2017 - February 3, 2017
QSR team members: 1 DC PCSB staff, 4 consultants including 1 English Language Learning (ELL) specialist, and 1 Special Education specialist
Number of observations: 25
Total enrollment: 438
Students with Disabilities enrollment: 38
English Language Learners enrollment: 35
In-seat attendance[1] on the days the QSR team conducted observations:
Visit 1: January 24, 2017-92.5%
Visit 2: January 26, 2017- 84.5%
Visit 3: January 31, 2017- 92.7%
Visit 4: February 3, 2017- 94.1%

Summary
Friendship Public Charter School's mission is to provide a world-class education that motivates students to achieve high academic standards, enjoy learning, and develop as ethical, literate, well-rounded and self-sufficient citizens who contribute actively to their communities.

The school's website states that the Friendship – Armstrong offers a Reggio Inspired Center as a child-centered approach to learning. The website also states that the school offers innovative, research-based classroom instruction and 21st century technology. School leadership explained that the school aims to include small group differentiated instruction and online learning platforms designed to meet individual student needs. There is also an on-site reading specialist who supports teachers and students through Guided Reading.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environments and instructional delivery (see Appendix I). The QSR team scored 83% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest scoring component in either domain was *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport.* The QSR team rated 88% of the observations as

---

[1] This data has not been validated by the school. DC PCSB pulled the data in February 2017.

proficient or distinguished. The majority of classrooms were warm and inviting. Teachers and students demonstrated genuine care for each other. School-wide practices such as morning meeting helped to build a strong environment.

The QSR team scored 74% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. All components in this domain scored relatively similarly with 76% of all observations receiving a rating of either proficient or distinguished. The exception to this was *Using Question and Discussion Techniques*. The QSR team scored one-third of these observations as basic and the rest as proficient or distinguished. School leadership stated that a variety of questioning and discussion techniques would be used, including Socratic Seminars and small group student discussions. The QSR team did not consistently observe these specific practices, nor did they observe the variety and depth of questions indicated by school leadership. Several teachers utilized open-ended questions designed to facilitate student thinking, dialogue, and multiple responses. However in other observations teachers either led students through a single path of inquiry or did not push students to explain their thinking.

Governance
DC PCSB reviewed Friendship PCS' October board meeting minutes. A quorum was present. The Finance Committee approved the LEA's clean audit and discussed the net income and enrollment trends. The School Performance Committee reviewed academic data from each campus. The Board discussed the LEA's upcoming charter review. Friendship PCS informed DC PCSB that they were only having an executive session when a staff member tried to observe the December meeting. DC PCSB is planning to observe the March 30, 2017 meeting,

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities
Prior to the two-week window, Friendship PCS provided answers to specific questions posed by DC PCSB regarding the provision of instruction to students with disabilities. During the visits the reviewer who conducted the special education-specific observations noted the following evidence. The evidence aligns with the feedback provided in the special education questionnaire. This indicates that all of the instructional strategies and supports outlined are being implemented within the classroom settings.

- The school noted that teachers co-plan weekly with the direction of the instructional specialist, and that the lessons are developed collaboratively with a focus on differentiation. Evidence of co-planning and differentiation was seen in the two inclusion classes observed. In both inclusion classes observed the special education and general education teachers provided instruction using the parallel instruction model. The general education teachers in the inclusion classes provided direct instruction to most of the class, while the special education teachers provided individualized instruction on the same content to a smaller group of students. In one inclusion class, the students were asked to examine a painting, and, with teacher support, to compare it to a text. The special education teacher pulled a small group of students with disabilities and provided support by giving them their own copy of the painting via laptop. This modification eliminated the students' need to focus on the whiteboard being utilized by the rest of the class. The special education teacher working with this specific group of students also facilitated a

discussion specific to the painting. The larger group was given a variety of questions directed at making a connection between the painting and a text that the students had recently read. The group working under the direction of the general education teacher participated in a whole group discussion that required periodic "pairing and sharing." While doing this the small-group facilitated by the special education teacher moved at a slower pace and was given more teacher prompting in order to answer the same questions posed to the larger group surrounding the painting and the text.

- The school team reported that teachers are provided with a behavioral intervention plan that was developed by the school psychologist and special education coordinator with student input. Behavioral interventions were observed in two of the pull-out groups. In one session a student received a "movement break" to do jumping jacks before returning to complete the guided reading activity. A student who was not communicating orally was able to demonstrate alternative ways of understanding using hand gestures (e.g., thumbs up). In a second pull-out session observed, the teacher used an incentive chart/point system, where students received stars for positive behavior and a prize from the treasure chest based on the number of stars that they received throughout the week. When a student engaged in off task behavior, the teacher referenced the "stars" and the student immediately returned to the task at hand.

- The school team reported that students are given pre-assessments for each goal written on their IEP. The school team reported that portfolios are created for each student that include; work samples, projects and assessments to ensure students are on target for mastery of their annual academic goals. Evidence of progress monitoring specific to IEP goals was seen a pull-out class session where a goal ball machine was posted on the wall. The goal ball had the student's various IEP goals listed on the wall. Throughout the pull-out session references were made to students working and progressing toward meeting their IEP goals in reading.

- The school team reported that reading interventions are in place that includes guided reading groups for struggling students. Evidence of this was seen in the pull-out sessions observed which focused on literacy skills such as consonant blending, diagraphs, reading comprehension (finding evidence to support claims) and letter-word identification. Three pull-out sessions were observed: two sessions had a 2:1 student to teacher ratio and one session had a 4:1 student to teacher ratio.

Instruction for English Learners
Prior to the two-week window, Friendship PCS provided answers to specific questions posed by DC PCSB regarding the provision of instruction to English Language Learners (ELLs). During the visits, the reviewer, who conducted ELL-specific observations noted, the following evidence, which strongly supports that the school is implementing its program with fidelity:

- The school explained that ELLs receive both pull-out and push-in services based on the student's individual proficiency levels and needs. Both instructional models were observed. Within the classroom ELLs are grouped with their monolingual peers. Within the classroom students are completely integrated working in small groups and with peers to complete assigned work. Students receive pull-out services based

on the WIDA proficiency level descriptors. ELLs were observed during the pull-out session receiving instruction that extended and supported classroom learning.

- The school said that the English Language Coordinator and the general educators are involved with the planning and the instruction of English Learners and that each ELLs' goals and academic progress are monitored throughout the year by the ELL coordinator and the general educators. The observer did not see the English Language Coordinator on site nor the planning for the instruction of ELLs. However the observer saw the WIDA rubric for each ELL posted in the ELL teacher spaces and each student's academic progress noted on their chart. The observer also witnessed student's receiving pull-out and push in services based on their proficiency levels.

- The school listed resources available to support ELLs as differentiation guidelines, technology such as Chrome book laptops and Promethean Boards. Resources observed in the classroom were the Chrome book laptops but did not see the Promethean boards in use. Visible in the classroom and the ELL learning spaces were visual aids, labels, word walls, book centers, and concrete objects. Students, PK3 and PK4 in the Reggio Center created visual representations of their learning using raw materials and a sensory approach. The students created a planetarium like representation of the solar system in one section of the school where the walls were covered in black, each planet was created with raw materials and each accompanied by a student written description. Differentiation in the instructional program was noted. Lesson supports observed were: cooperative learning groups, KWL charts, activities designed to promote student interaction and movement and varied groupings that made it possible for ELLs to interact with different classmates.

- The school noted that the general educators are intentional about providing specific accommodations and modifications for ELLs. The observer saw that within the classroom environment the general educators accommodate for individual student learning. The "Inclusion Model" provides for leveled grouping, push-in services such as technology resources, hands-on experiences and visual aids all designed to adapt instruction to their specific needs. Also observed uniformly were the use of questions that allowed students to explain their thinking and expand their use of language in a natural context which, in turn, increased the oral language development and checks for comprehension.

- The school described that the ELL Coordinator checks for understanding both informally during pull-out sessions. The school ELL Coordinator was not present the day of the visit and therefore could not be observed. However, the ELL teachers were observed communicating with students, asking strategic questions, working with ELLs within the classroom. The general educators were also observed working with specific ELLs checking for understanding informally through questions and monitoring their work.

- The school stated that within the inclusive setting the teachers differentiate the lessons for the ELLs. The ELLs were participating in the lesson just as much as their classmates, and they were striving to learn. The teacher provided hands-on learning experiences and visual aids which allowed students to maximize their learning in the inclusive setting.

CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

This table summarizes qualitative evidence related to the goals and academic achievement expectations as detailed in the school's charter and subsequent charter amendments. Some charter goals can only be measured quantitatively. The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team recorded evidence of what the school is doing on the ground to meet these quantitative goals. During the 5-year charter review, 10-year charter review, or 15-year charter renewal process, DC PCSB staff will use quantitative data to assess whether the school met those goals.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
Mission: The mission of Friendship Public Charter School is to provide a world-class education that motivates students to achieve high academic standards, enjoy learning, and develop as ethical, literate, well-rounded, and self-sufficient citizens who contribute actively to their communities.	The QSR team saw evidence that Friendship PCS – Armstrong Academy is meeting its mission. Throughout the building students engaged in grade and skill-level appropriate work with positive attitudes. Students in PK3 and PK4 in the Reggio Center created visual representations of their learning using raw materials and a sensory approach. The students created a planetarium-like model of the solar system in one section of the school where the walls were covered in black and each planet was created with raw materials and accompanied by a student written description. Classroom morning meetings provided a time for students to contribute actively to the building of their own community. Core values and classroom-created rules or contracts were present in the majority of classrooms. These standards for behavior were often referenced during lessons and teacher-student dialogue. Choices in centers and opportunities for peer collaboration contributed to self-sufficiency.
Goals: PMF Indicator #1: Student Progress – Academic Improvement over time PMF Indicator #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards	The schedule included a two-hour literacy and a two-hour math block for instruction. Literacy instruction included small-group reading lessons with classroom teachers and the reading specialist. Students rotated into skill-based centers during the literacy block. Many students engaged with computer programs that appeared to be

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	individually geared for review and instruction. Math instruction included opportunities for students to make sense of problems independently and with a partner as well as time to determine the best operation for problem solving. In an early childhood classroom, teachers incorporated math concepts into literacy centers. Teacher questioning varied across classrooms. Several teachers posed open-ended questions and allowed students to present various perspectives in both reading responses and math problem solving. Other teachers utilized single track question and responses that did not provide the opportunity for students to engage in meaningful dialogue with each other.
PMF Indicator # 3: Gateway – Outcomes in key subjects that predict future educational success	The QSR team observed concrete academic skill development in multiple settings. Students worked on specific skills in centers, in small group instruction, and on the computer. Posted instructional objectives often included a connection to the aligned grade-level standard. Starting in third grade, classes are content based and students see different teachers for ELA and Math.
PMF Indicator #4: School Environment – Predictors of future student progress and achievement	DC PCSB measures attendance to evaluate the climate of a school. DC PCSB believes that if students are not in school, they lose opportunities for learning. The school met the threshold of at least an 85% attendance rate on all but one day of the QSR visits.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	In-seat attendance[2] on the days the QSR team conducted observations: **Visit 1:** January 24, 2017-92.5% **Visit 2:** January 26, 2017- 84.5% **Visit 3:** January 31, 2017- 92.7% **Visit 4:** February 3, 2017- 94.1%

---

[2] This data has not been validated by the school. DC PCSB pulled the data in February 2017.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[3]

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Classroom Environments domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 83% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Classroom Environment domain.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	The QSR team scored an impressive 88% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Across most classrooms, teachers and students used polite and respectful language such as "please" and "thank you." Particularly in several of the early childhood classrooms, students and teacher displayed warmth and affection. Students across grade levels often celebrated each other, including the use of "give a shine."	Distinguished	16%
	Many teachers talked about progress with students and offered encouraging language when students struggled. Several teachers also used positive narration to reinforce expected behaviors. In many classrooms small group rules and class norms were posted on the walls and referred to by teachers and some students during work times. Student work was prominently displayed in all classrooms. The overall tone and atmosphere of the school was inviting. Students were referred to by name in classrooms and halls by many adults. Several student greeters also welcomed the QSR team members in their classrooms.	Proficient	72%
	The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component.	Basic	8%

---

[3] Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	4%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team scored 80% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. On the walls of many classrooms were students' hopes and dreams as well as word walls with appropriate vocabulary. Classroom contracts and expectations for students' roles in centers were also visible. Several teachers utilized chants to reinforce expectations of students, such as, "Let's learn, I'm so smart, and we're super scholars." Teachers also reinforced expectations with smiles, words of encouragement and verbal recognition of student accomplishments and efforts.	Distinguished	8%
	Students across many classrooms expended effort to complete work of high quality. They were often offered choices for how to demonstrate their understanding. In one observation the teacher noted that if writing wasn't the favorite thing, students could write two bullet points instead of complete sentences. Teachers emphasized effort and strategizing. Math instruction in several classrooms focused on problem solving and strategies for learning. In one distinguished observation, the teacher reminded students, "if we encounter words we don't know we are going to use some of our strategies to sound it out or we are going to use our context cues." In another classroom students were offered the option to pass if needed. This allowed another student to answer and then the teacher came back to the initial student to check in on their understanding.	Proficient	72%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 20% of observations as basic in this component. In these classrooms teachers often displayed a lack of energy and students were less than enthusiastic towards the learning experience. Students were compliant with instructional directions, but lacked initiative to work hard on their own. Several students in various classrooms were more eager to engage in off-topic conversations than the task at hand. In one classroom the only motivator for learning and good behavior was extrinsic. The teacher stated that if we do well, we get an acknowledgement or a point.

In several observations the teacher offered some students a break from learning due to behavioral issues. A few of these students were then ignored for the duration of the QSR team's observation. In one classroom a student was left in a corner to play with play dough. The teacher did come back to check once and the student was offered two more minutes of alone time. The student did not receive any additional behavioral support and also missed out on learning and work time. | Basic | 20% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| **Managing Classroom Procedures** | The QSR team rated 84% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Most classrooms were well organized and had easily accessible materials. Students clearly knew how to use and put away their tools for learning and work. Student helpers passed out or collected materials in many observations. | Distinguished | 8% |

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	In most observations there were clear expectations for transitions. Teachers throughout the school employed a wide variety of timing strategies, such as singing, playing music, counting down, and displaying a timer on the SmartBoard. Some teachers also modeled expectations for students. In one distinguished observation as soon as the timer rang, the teacher did not give any direction but observed as students immediately transitioned to their next center.	Proficient	76%
	The QSR team scored 16% of the observations as basic in this component. In these classrooms instructional time was lost due to ineffective transition management. Although routines existed students did not respond appropriately to them. For example, several teachers attempted the routine of "Step 1, 2, 3" but in two observations this was ineffective. The routine had to be repeated several times, resulting in loss of time on task. Center rotations were common across grade levels and students often worked independently, or in small groups. In several instances students not working directly with an adult were minimally engaged in the work. The tasks themselves did not often have a built-in accountability structure which allowed for off-topic dialogue and other unproductive behavior.	Basic	16%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 80% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. 20% of these observations scored as distinguished, the highest rating for this report. The QSR team observed several strategies for managing student behavior from Class Dojo points to behavior sticks. Students received positive and negative reinforcement as needed.	Distinguished	20%
	In several distinguished observations, teachers had unique ways to monitor and respond to student behavior. These strategies were respectful of all students and sensitive to individual students. One teacher asked a struggling student to come to the front of the room as serve as the "pointer". Another teacher offered a stuffed animal to hold and noted, "(the animal) is going to be with you so you have to be still when you have him and keep your hands still". This was very effective at helping the student stop fidgeting.	Proficient	60%
	The QSR team scored 16% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations there appeared to be standards of conduct but their implementation was inconsistent. Several teachers gave many reminders about behavioral expectations but students remained unresponsive. In one classroom the teacher had the students redo a transition because he forgot to tell students what level of voice to use when they returned to their seat. This resulted in additional lost time for instruction and learning.	Basic	16%
	The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	4%

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 74% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Instruction domain.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Communicating with Students	The QSR team scored 76% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. The instructional purpose of the lesson was often written on the board or stated at some point during these observations. One teacher offered a clear statement during the introduction and set the tone for what was to be accomplished, why it was important and the steps to be followed. Many teachers, across content areas, focused on strategies students might use for solving problems. In one observation the teacher led students through a visualization exercise to better understand the text. Another teacher used a tape diagram to help students solve math problems and referred to a helper sheet with key words for tackling problems involving addition and subtraction.	Distinguished	4%
	Teachers' explanations of content were clear and developmentally appropriate. Several teachers embedded vocabulary instruction within the context of the work. In one lesson on consonant blends, the teacher explained that a blend is when there are two separate sounds but they sound nice when they are together.	Proficient	72%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated 24% of the observations as basic in this component. In several classrooms teacher directions and explanations of content were unclear. This was evidenced when students went to complete the work in a center but were still unclear on what to do and had to go ask the teacher multiple clarifying questions. In other observations the directions had to be repeated by the teacher several times. In one observation students were supposed to work in groups to answer a focus question but it was not clear what they were supposed to do after the discussion. In one early childhood classroom, the teacher erroneously used the vocabulary of "sounds" and "letters" interchangeably resulting in student confusion and misinformation.	Basic	24%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques	The QSR team scored 67% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Many teachers used accountable talk strategies and students had opportunities in several classrooms to turn and talk. One teacher used equity sticks to ensure all students were involved in the class discussion. This teacher also balanced high and low-level questions and gave students ample wait time or allowed them to call on a peer when they were stuck.	Distinguished	4%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	Teachers in these observations used open-ended questions. In some math observations teachers asked students to explain how or what helped them solve a problem. In another classroom the teacher posed, "Why do you think this is fantasy? Can you point to one part in the book that is not real?"	Proficient	63%
	The QSR team rated 33% of the observations as basic in this component. This was the lowest, overall, scored component in the review. In these observations there were limited opportunities for students to respond to each other or discuss meaningful content. Teachers either asked single-response questions, such as "what sound do you hear?" or did not pose rigorous questions worthy of conversation. In one observation the questions did not challenge students or provide any opportunities for dialogue. In other observations when teachers engaged with students in centers, there was more language around behavioral redirection than questions to promote student thinking. In one classroom the teacher worked with a small group on task completion only and did not prompt students to explain their answers.	Basic	33%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team scored 76% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Many tasks were designed to promote and challenge student thinking at various levels. In one early childhood classroom, students engaged in a construction project simulating the construction workers on the large classroom map. Students wore hard hats and goggles; and used hammers, wrenches and other tools. In a distinguished observation the teacher built in leveled work for students through the use of online materials on the laptops, and leveled resources that students easily accessed and self-sufficiently used.	Distinguished	4%
	The pacing of lessons in many observations provided students sufficient time to be engaged. Several lessons incorporated whole group, small group and independent work times as well as lesson closure. Students in many classrooms rotated through centers and many tasks in the centers had built-in accountability measures for students and teachers to be able to review learning.

Teachers offered students choices throughout their day including what topic to write about and how students could show their thinking. Many centers offered choice to students, such as selecting which text to read in the library area.

Teachers provided students with opportunities to learn from and correct their errors. In one observation students recorded their answers to the teacher's questions on a white board. During their review several students corrected their mistakes unprompted by the teacher. | Proficient | 72% |

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 24% of the observations as basic in this component. In some of these lessons, the tasks were not structured in a way to engage students in deep thinking or critical work. Tasks either solely required recall or there was limited opportunity for students to explain their thinking. In one observation the task was to find the area with pattern blocks; however students traced the blocks on the provided paper but did not do any thinking or computation to calculate area. Other center tasks lacked a clear purpose or were unconnected to the stated learning objectives. In one center students in one classroom were asked to write about seahorses and heroes.	Basic	24%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team scored 76% of the observations as proficient in this component. Many teachers circulated to monitor student learning or used questions in whole and small group instruction to diagnose student understanding. The QSR team also observed other strategies for assessment such as exit tickets, call and	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	response with immediate corrections, running records, and guided practice. In many observations feedback to students was specific and direct. Teachers often asked questions such as, "What feature are you writing about?" while they checked student work. In another classroom when students wrote the wrong letter, they were given another example or word in order to correct their own response. One teacher used circle time to evaluate and give general and specific feedback on the Center Activity period.	Proficient	76%
	The QSR team scored 24% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers in these observations monitored learning and provided feedback for the class. Even when they circulated, several teachers monitored behavior only and did not probe individual students to check in on their learning. In one classroom the teacher was only partially engaged during group work and did not circulate to monitor student learning. Instead, the teacher checked paperwork and was involved doing personal work. During the lesson summary, one student responded with a correct response and the teacher quickly moved on without ensuring that all students understood. In another observation students were unaware that their work would be collected.	Basic	24%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

The Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are negative or inappropriate and characterized by sarcasm, putdowns, or conflict.	Classroom interactions are generally appropriate and free from conflict but may be characterized by occasional displays of insensitivity.	Classroom interactions reflect general warmth and caring, and are respectful of the cultural and developmental differences among groups of students.	Classroom interactions are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring toward individuals. Students themselves ensure maintenance of high levels of civility among member of the class.
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The classroom does not represent a culture for learning and is characterized by low teacher commitment to the subject, low expectations for student achievement, and little student pride in work.	The classroom environment reflects only a minimal culture for learning, with only modest or inconsistent expectations for student achievement, little teacher commitment to the subject, and little student pride in work. Both teacher and students are performing at the minimal level to "get by."	The classroom environment represents a genuine culture for learning, with commitment to the subject on the part of both teacher and students, high expectations for student achievement, and student pride in work.	Students assumes much of the responsibility for establishing a culture for learning in the classroom by taking pride in their work, initiating improvements to their products, and holding the work to the highest standard. Teacher demonstrates as passionate commitment to the subject.
Managing Classroom Procedures	Classroom routines and procedures are either nonexistent or inefficient, resulting in the loss of much instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures have been established but function unevenly or inconsistently, with some loss of instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures have been established and function smoothly for the most part, with little loss of instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures are seamless in their operation, and students assume considerable responsibility for their smooth functioning.
Managing Student Behavior	Student behavior is poor, with no clear expectations, no monitoring of student behavior, and inappropriate response to student misbehavior.	Teacher makes an effort to establish standards of conduct for students, monitor student behavior, and respond to student misbehavior, but these efforts are not always successful.	Teacher is aware of student behavior, has established clear standards of conduct, and responds to student misbehavior in ways that are appropriate and respectful of the students.	Student behavior is entirely appropriate, with evidence of student participation in setting expectations and monitoring behavior. Teacher's monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive, and teachers' response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs.

Appendix II: Instruction Observation Rubric

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Communicating with Students	Teacher's oral and written communication contains errors or is unclear or inappropriate to students. Teacher's purpose in a lesson or unit is unclear to students. Teacher's explanation of the content is unclear or confusing or uses inappropriate language.	Teacher's oral and written communication contains no errors, but may not be completely appropriate or may require further explanations to avoid confusion. Teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose, with limited success. Teacher's explanation of the content is uneven; some is done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow.	Teacher communicates clearly and accurately to students both orally and in writing. Teacher's purpose for the lesson or unit is clear, including where it is situation within broader learning. Teacher's explanation of content is appropriate and connects with students' knowledge and experience.	Teacher's oral and written communication is clear and expressive, anticipating possible student misconceptions. Makes the purpose of the lesson or unit clear, including where it is situated within broader learning, linking purpose to student interests. Explanation of content is imaginative, and connects with students' knowledge and experience. Students contribute to explaining concepts to their peers.
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	Teacher makes poor use of questioning and discussion techniques, with low-level questions, limited student participation, and little true discussion.	Teacher's use of questioning and discussion techniques is uneven with some high-level question; attempts at true discussion; moderate student participation.	Teacher's use of questioning and discussion techniques reflects high-level questions, true discussion, and full participation by all students.	Students formulate may of the high-level questions and assume responsibility for the participation of all students in the discussion.
Engaging Students in Learning	Students are not at all intellectually engaged in significant learning, as a result of inappropriate activities or materials, poor representations of content, or lack of lesson structure.	Students are intellectually engaged only partially, resulting from activities or materials or uneven quality, inconsistent representation of content or uneven structure of pacing.	Students are intellectually engaged throughout the lesson, with appropriate activities and materials, instructive representations of content, and suitable structure and pacing of the lesson.	Students are highly engaged throughout the lesson and make material contribution to the representation of content, the activities, and the materials. The structure and pacing of the lesson allow for student reflection and closure.
Using Assessment in Instruction	Students are unaware of criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and do not engage in self-assessment or monitoring. Teacher does not monitor student learning in the curriculum, and feedback to students is of poor quality and in an untimely manner.	Students know some of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and occasionally assess the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards. Teacher monitors the progress of the class as a whole but elicits no diagnostic information; feedback to students is uneven and inconsistent in its timeliness.	Students are fully aware of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards. Teacher monitors the progress of groups of students in the curriculum, making limited use of diagnostic prompts to elicit information; feedback is timely, consistent, and of high quality.	Students are fully aware of the criteria and standards by which their work will be evaluated, have contributed to the development of the criteria, frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards, and make active use of that information in their learning. Teacher actively and systematically elicits diagnostic information from individual students regarding understanding and monitors progress of individual students; feedback is timely, high quality, and students use feedback in their learning.