DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

May 25, 2017

Mr. Thomas O'Hara, Board Chair
Center City PCS – Shaw Campus
711 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mr. O'Hara:

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:

- School eligible to petition for 10-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year

**Qualitative Site Review Report**
A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Center City PCS – Shaw between March 6, 2017 and March 17, 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 Center City PCS – Shaw.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Russ Williams, Executive Director

**Qualitative Site Review Report**

**Date:** May 25, 2017

**Campus Information**

**Campus Name:** Center City PCS – Shaw
**Ward:** 2
**Grade levels:** PreK – 8th grade

**Qualitative Site Review Information**

**Reason for visit:** School eligible to petition for 10-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year
**Two-week window:** March 6, 2017 – March 17, 2017
**QSR team members:** 2 DC PSCB staff including one special education specialist and one English Language Learner (ELL) specialist, and 2 consultants
**Number of observations:** 17
**Total enrollment:** 234
**Students with Disabilities enrollment:** 22
**English Language Learners enrollment:** 35
**In-seat attendance during the two-week window:**
**Visit 1:** March 7, 2017- 93.9%
**Visit 2:** March 9, 2017- 97.5%
**Visit 3:** March 13, 2017- 94.6%

**Summary**

Center City Public Charter School's mission is to empower their students for lifelong success by building strong character, promoting academic excellence and generating public service throughout Washington, DC.

The QSR team noted evidence that Center City– Shaw is meeting its mission. Teachers delivered rigorous instruction in most classrooms and students generally engaged in the content and were eager to learn. However, observers noted differences in classroom management between upper and lower grades. Elementary students conducted themselves in a respectful manner in both hallways and classrooms, while students in the upper grades demonstrated less respect for learning or their teachers. Instruction at the middle school level was more varied across classrooms as a result of behavior, with multiple students disengaged from learning, disruptive, and not responsive to attempted teacher interventions.

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 79% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain, slightly lower than the 85% of observations rated as distinguished or proficient in this domain during the school's April 2013 QSR. Observers rated over 80% of classrooms as distinguished or proficient in the *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport* (82%) and *Managing Classroom Procedures* (88%) components. In these observations teachers and students consistently demonstrated respect for one another and classrooms operated efficiently with minimal loss to instructional time.

The QSR team scored 85% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain, up from 67% of observations rated as distinguished or proficient in this domain during the school's last QSR in April of 2013. Notably, 88% of classrooms earned proficient or distinguished ratings for *Engaging Students in Learning* and *Using Assessment in Instruction* components. In most observations teachers strategically grouped students, implemented activities and assignments to maximize student engagement, and monitored and responded to learning throughout the lesson.

No observations were scored as unsatisfactory in any of the eight components.

Governance

DC PCSB reviewed the meeting minutes from Center City PCS' Board of Directors meeting on March 15, 2017. A quorum was present. The board discussed the recent science fair among all six Center City PCS campuses. The CEO shared that he is working to improve employee retention and academic achievement. The Finance and Academic Committees discussed a joint meeting to finalize the current and three-year budgets of each campus. The Academic Committee reviewed midyear NWEA-MAP results and explained that principals and assistant principals are coaching teachers in preparation for the PARCC test. The CEO informed the Board that Center City PCS received official notification of their accreditation.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, Center City PCS – Shaw responded to a DC PCSB questionnaire regarding the provision of instruction to students with disabilities. The reviewer who conducted special education-specific observations noted the following evidence, which supports that the school is implementing its program with fidelity. Overall, the school successfully provides specialized instruction for students with disabilities because of its well-executed co-teaching model.

- To support the learning of students with disabilities in general education classrooms, the school stated that all general education classrooms include a co-teacher or instructional assistant. Scaffolds, manipulatives, visual aids, and online adaptive resources allow all students to access the curriculum. In all observations of co-taught classrooms, two teachers were present, and each shared in the responsibility of delivering instruction. A variety of co-teaching models were implemented, including team teaching, alternative teaching, and parallel teaching. All teachers observed encouraged students to use visual problem-solving strategies like graphing equations or drawing models. In one classroom students used a variety of resources, including computer-based programs, mini white boards, fraction strips, and division facts charts, to facilitate their learning.

- To co-plan for lessons, the school reported that general education and special education teachers meet daily during their 90-minute planning period. During these meetings and professional development opportunities, teachers produce rigorous materials, gain content knowledge, and determine methods to differentiate and scaffold grade-level curriculum. In all observations both general education and special education teachers played active roles in student learning by facilitating discussion, circulating during small group work, and leading mini-lessons. Feedback to students

reflected a firm understanding of grade-level content. In one classroom the special education teachers correctly explained the differences and similarities between standard form and slope-intercept form. In another classroom the special education teacher described the various strategies to solve fraction-based word problems, including drawing models, using fraction strips, and referencing division facts charts.

- To gauge student understanding specifically for students with disabilities, the school explained that educators use exit tickets, quick checks for understanding, Mastery Connect, Lexia, TenMarks, Achieve3000, and pre- and post-tests. Teachers use this data to reteach skills to students with disabilities. In all classrooms teachers monitored student learning by asking questions, (e.g., "What's the problem asking you to do?" "How did you get this answer?" "What's the next step?"). In many observations teachers provided students with ample time to reflect on their learning. In one classroom, the teachers shared examples of correct and incorrect student work for the class to analyze. The teachers invited students to explain how their classmates arrived at these answers. While discussing, students corrected or added notes to their papers without prompt. In another observation the teachers used computer-based programs such as TenMarks and paper-based assessments from Eureka Math to determine student progress.

- To differentiate a lesson the school wrote that the following strategies and resources may be used: multiple choice, sentence starters, anchor charts with guided notes, math manipulatives, small groups, centers, front loading content-specific vocabulary, and adjusting the length of assignments. In all observations teachers used a variety of differentiated instructional strategies, curricula, and resources. In one classroom all students solved problems that involved fractions; however, the teachers differentiated how students engaged with this content. Students either worked independently on tiered assignments from Eureka Math or TenMarks of tiered difficulty, or they participated in a small group lesson guided by the special education teacher. All students used resources, like fraction strips, division facts charts, and mini whiteboards/erasers, to support their learning. In another classroom the teacher reviewed content-specific vocabulary like standard form and slope-intercept form before students completed small group work.

<u>Instruction for English Language Learners</u>
Center City PCS – Shaw submitted responses to a questionnaire related to the school's provision of services for the school's English Learner (ELL) population. Overall the QSR team observed strong evidence of fidelity to the school's articulated ELL program, which includes both push-in and pull-out instruction. The ELL observer noted the following during the two ELL classroom observations:

- According to the ELL questionnaire, inclusion teachers will provide English Language Learner instruction in the form of pull-out services for Level 1 and 2 ELs via the Newcomer curriculum. During the pull-out observation, a teacher worked one-on-one with a student with a Level 1 or 2 English proficiency level (based on the student's indications that he did not understand the questions the teacher was asking). The learning task required the student to draw a picture of a monster according to the teacher's description with the objective of learning body parts. The student struggled

with the teacher's statements and the teacher adjusted instruction by drawing examples of shapes and body parts and telling the student the correct vocabulary associated with each one. She gave the student a "thumbs up" when he completed a task correctly, and scaffolded when he did not. The teacher provided additional visual support to the student saying the body part, pointing to the vocabulary word, and then pointing to the body part on herself. The student demonstrated understanding by answering questions correctly, stating the correct body part when the teacher identified it on herself and on the picture.

- According to the ELL questionnaire, the inclusion teachers provide English Language instruction in the form of push-in services for level 3, 4 and 5 students via instruction that targets student's English Language Learner Plan goals in listening, speaking, reading, or writing. While the QSR team did not look at individual student's English Language Learner Plan goals, the QSR team saw strong implementation of language instruction in listening and speaking during a first grade math class, along with supports to help ELL students gain content knowledge. Students in the general education setting worked with the ELL inclusion teacher in a small group on addition facts. Throughout the observation the teacher repeated directions several times and modeled the learning task. The teacher checked for understanding by giving students addition quiz. Students had a couple of minutes to answer as many single-digit addition questions as possible before the timer went off and students checked their work by referring to their addition facts in their notebooks. Students then moved game pieces along a board and said the number sentence aloud. Students practiced saying these number sentences until they stated them correctly, with the teacher's help. Students also created the number sentence using manipulatives and the teacher used hand motions to show how to put the numbers together for the sum. Lastly students restated the number sentence with the sum as the teacher corrected language.

**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 charter review or charter renewal process, DC PCSB staff will use quantitative data to assess whether the school met those goals.

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|---|---|
| Mission:<br><br>Center City Public Charter School's mission is to empower their students for lifelong success by building strong character, promoting academic excellence and generating public service throughout Washington, DC. | The QSR team saw an academic climate that was generally supportive of student learning. The academic program reflected grade-appropriate content in all classes that was aligned to grade level standards. In Pre-K, students demonstrated high levels of understanding of complex concepts and exuded joy in learning as they explained planets and constellations and/or constructed launching pads for rockets. Students in a science class learned grade level concepts as the teacher described the classification system of organisms using grade-appropriate vocabulary. Students engaged with one another about the subject matter without teacher intervention. The teacher also gave students the opportunity to extend the discussion by discussing what the students wanted to learn before starting the unit. In most classrooms the teacher made the objective clear to students and instructional activities aligned to the stated goal.<br><br>Quality of instruction varied in some classes. In some observations, students sat passively or exhibited off-task behaviors (e.g., socializing with a neighbor, making silly faces, working on other work) while only a few answered questions. Observers noted behavior issues in most of the middle school observations. While the rigor of the planned instruction was apparent, teachers struggled with lesson delivery as they attempted, often unsuccessfully, to manage student behavior.<br><br>Signage around the building promoted the |

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|---|---|
| | school's mission. The QSR team saw "Next Step College" posters and college specific banners encouraging continuing scholarship and academic preparation. Walls in classrooms displayed multiple, detailed posters of instructional strategies and motivating phrases including the school's values of "Character, Excellence, Service". Other posters advertised the importance of character, trustworthiness, and integrity.<br><br>Observers generally noted positive student conduct in most classrooms and hallways. Students demonstrated courtesy towards each other and adults. During the observation window the QSR team witnessed many examples of teachers encouraging students and/or providing caring and support to others. One teacher sent a student back to the restroom to wait for another student saying, "We do not leave each other alone. We take care of and always help each other."<br><br>Several teachers used point systems to reward positive behavior or provide a consequence and when used, appeared to elicit positive change in student behavior for some students. In a few classrooms the points seemed to have no effect. One teacher gave "levels" throughout the entire lesson to the same few students; the students did not change their behavior. |
| Goals: | |
| Center City PCS proposes that at least 70% of all students in grades K-8 will achieve at or above the 40th percentile or meet/exceed their spring growth target in math and reading based on NWEA MAP national norms by June of each year. | Teachers posted academic goals and targets in reading and math in most classrooms. Instruction across classrooms demonstrated the school-wide emphasis on using textual evidence and thinking processes used in problem solving. Teachers urged students in classes at all levels to draw from the text to justify their reasoning when providing answers. Observers heard teachers prompting with statements such as, "Which quote from the text best supports…?" and |

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|---|---|
| | "Great! Now you need to evaluate the major argument and find the evidence."<br><br>Teachers focused on achievement of targets in their instructional delivery and several teachers used sample exercises from a PARCC study packet to review and extend skill development. Charts, student work, and signage in classrooms displayed instructional activities related to reading and math achievement. In most math observations students engaged with rigorous, multi-step learning tasks that would reflect content on the math NWEA MAP. Teachers encouraged students to justify their reasoning when giving a response. In several math classes students worked with both concrete and abstract methods to represent problems (e.g., counters, white boards, base ten blocks).<br><br>Teachers provided students with multiple ways to access material. In a pull-out session, a teacher worked with a student on language development around body parts. The teacher drew pictures, repeated words, and showed the student body parts as she said the words. By the end of the lesson, the student successfully answered questions about body parts. |
| Students will read and comprehend grade level appropriate text in the core content areas. | Observers saw text and support materials used in ELA lessons in Pre-K, K, 1st, 2nd grade classes were aligned with Core Knowledge and noted the Core Knowledge logo on a computer program disk used to extend student learning during individual assignments.<br><br>Students demonstrated grade level proficiency in comprehension; students across all grades summarized, analyzed, and read with fluency. In most observations interesting and real-life content appeared to generate student interest and participation. |

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|---|---|
| | In most classes teachers emphasized themes and integrated instruction across content areas in centers. In one class, centers for art, science, ELA, library and social studies centers focused on activities involving space and astronomy. In a science class students evaluated arguments on a controversial topic to inform their work on a research paper. |
| Students will master and apply grade-level appropriate computation skills and concepts; they will use mathematical reasoning to solve problems. | In math observations students engaged with learning tasks that required them to explain their thinking. Content such as graphing linear equations in eighth grade, solving multi-step fraction word problems in fourth, and solving multi-step multiplication word problems in third, reflected grade-level standards. Teachers monitored student mastery by asking questions and providing feedback (e.g., "What's the problem asking you to do?", "How did you get this answer?", "What's the next step?"). Teachers required students to solve computations but emphasized thinking or reasoning processes that led to accuracy.<br><br>In the middle school hallway, a bulletin board advertised a math contest where students could submit answers to the grade-specific questions posed and win prizes.<br><br>Observers saw teachers focus on math fact proficiency. Students completed short, timed math quizzes in multiple grades to practice addition, subtraction, or multiplication, as appropriate. One teacher asked students to self-assess using a math fact sheets, and then had students practice math facts through a game that allowed them to use manipulatives to create number sentences. The teacher continuously provided language support to students as they had difficulty stating number sentences, giving all of the students a chance to be successful. |

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|---|---|
| | Observers noted that several teachers used Engage NY, including drills and guided math groups to master and apply skills. |
| All Center City PCS campuses will achieve an average of at least 90% attendance each year. | On each day of observations, the school had attendance rates above 90%.<br><br>In-seat attendance during the two-week window:<br>Visit 1: March 7, 2017- 93.9%<br>Visit 2: March 9, 2017- 97.5%<br>Visit 3: March 13, 2017- 94.6% |
| All Center City PCS campuses should achieve an average of at least 75% re-enrollment each year. | DC PCSB will review quantitative data from the Performance Management Framework to assess this goal for the review. |
| Center City PCS students will build character by performing community service. Our goal is for at least 75% of students in grades 4-8 to participate in a minimum of two community service activities annually as measured by student exit tickets and tracked through PowerSchool. | The QSR team did not observe evidence related to this goal. DC PCSB will review data from the school's records to assess this goal for the review. |

**THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[1]**

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Classroom Environment 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 79% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Classroom Environment domain.

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport** | The QSR team scored 82% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers and students treated each other with kindness and respect. Both displayed warmth and used polite language when speaking to each other using phrases such as "bless you", "please open your book" or "thank you for listening." Teachers used student names as they asked for responses or gave directions. Observers noted strong evidence of positive relationships in multiple classrooms. One teacher knelt to maintain eye contact as she reminded students to share and respect each other and another gently held the hands of a student as he fidgeted while another student shared an answer. In another class a student thanked her instructor for helping her complete a writing assignment. She asked the teacher, "may we shake hands?"<br><br>Teachers modeled and encouraged respectful behavior amongst students. In one classroom a teacher demonstrated respect for a student's dignity by acknowledging the correct part of the student's answer and asking another student to correct the rest of it. In another classroom when a student struggled during a response, other students raised their hands and the teacher responded, "No, we don't do that. Let her finish first. Go ahead, sweetheart." | Distinguished | 0% |
| | | Proficient | 82% |

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

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | The QSR team rated 18% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers responded to disrespectful talk among students with uneven results. In one class the teacher said, "We don't use that language in school" and gave students a consequence for disrespect. The students continued to fool around and ignore the teacher.<br><br>In other classes students used disrespectful language such as "shut up" and some students showed hesitancy to engage in small groups. In these instances the teachers did not intervene. | Basic | 18% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| **Establishing a Culture for Learning** | The QSR team scored 71% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations teachers conveyed high expectations for all students and the classroom culture emphasized a shared belief in the importance of learning. In a distinguished observation the teacher conveyed the satisfaction of hard work and persistence, saying, "Raise your hand if you saw your mistake when we worked through it. [Many students raised their hands.] This is why it is so important that we review our problems, so that we can learn from our mistakes and we can understand these types of questions better next time."<br><br>In another distinguished observation the teacher demonstrated high expectations for students, projecting student work with and without | Distinguished | 12% |

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | mistakes. In both cases she asked the whole class to explain the reasoning behind the answer and, if necessary, identify the mistake. Without prompting, students made connections to past problems and added to their notes. In another distinguished observation students explained content to one another and others corrected each other as they worked at a center.<br><br>Teachers established expectations for high quality work and publicly recognized students meeting expectations. One teacher narrated different strategies used by students to solve problems and prompted other students to "keep asking good questions." Students were motivated to put forth effort in their work and enthusiastically participated in class discussions. | Proficient | 59% |
| | The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations most students complied with teacher directions but did not extend conversation or participate enthusiastically. Teachers communicated high expectations for some students but not all as they called on a sub-set of students to answer questions.<br><br>In one class two students looked for ways to avoid their work during an assessment. One asked some students who had finished for some help, and another after being told that calculators are not allowed, said aloud, "I'm just going to guess." In both situations the teacher told the students, "No talking during the assessment," but did not address the content of their words. | Basic | 29% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Managing Classroom Procedures** | The QSR team scored a high 88% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations clearly established procedures led to maximized instructional time. In a distinguished classroom students engaged in differentiated activities and used a variety of resources, including computers, mini white boards, and fraction strips, without teacher direction to accomplish their learning goals.<br><br>In proficient observations students performed routines like rotating between large and small group activities with minimal teacher guidance. When necessary teachers used positive narration to manage small groups and transitions. In these observations students knew where and how to get the materials and supplies needed for a lesson and students remained on task whether an adult was present. In one observation a teacher left a small group to address the behavior of another student and students in the small group continued working with no interruption. | Distinguished | 6% |
| | | Proficient | 82% |
| | The QSR team scored just 12% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations the QSR Team noted loss of instructional time due to inefficient or poorly executed procedures. In one class handing out computers resulted in loud talking and confusion about who needed to be where. In another observation it took over five minutes for students to get out their books and turn to the correct page to follow along with the teacher. | Basic | 12% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Managing Student Behavior** | The QSR team scored 76% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations students demonstrated acceptable behavior and when students did misbehave, teachers responded quickly and effectively. Teachers used proximity and close monitoring. One teacher used eye contact to redirect off-task students and another addressed minor off-task behavior stating that she "noticed some fidgeting and small movements." Another teacher narrated positive behavior and awarded positive incentive points.<br><br>Multiple classrooms displayed behavioral tracking data charts and other and one teacher distributed Scholar Dollars at the end of class. | Distinguished | 0% |
| | | Proficient | 76% |
| | The QSR team scored 24% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers responded to student misbehavior with uneven results. In other cases, teachers ignored or did not see student misbehavior. In a middle school class, 6 of 18 students ignored teacher instructions to follow along with a text, despite multiple requests and redirection. Several students sat with their head down, left their seats, or held side conversations while the teacher read aloud and ignored the behavior. In one observation the teacher administered consequences inconsistently. Some students received a point deduction for talking while others talked with no consequences. | Basic | 24% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |

**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 85% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Instruction domain.

| Instruction | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Communicating with Students** | The QSR team scored 82% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers communicated the lesson objective and modeled procedures when appropriate. Teachers in these observations scaffolded instruction and pointed out possible areas for misunderstanding. One math teacher prompted students to analyze common errors before attempting a set of word problems and another modeled for students how to refer to a facts sheet. Most classrooms contained signage with checklists and procedures to facilitate student work. | Distinguished | 0% |
| | | Proficient | 82% |
| | The QSR team scored 18% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations the teacher did not make the lesson objective clear and students struggled to follow along. In one class half of the students listened to the teacher read excerpts of text and answer questions while they followed along as a whole group. The other half of the students read an online text with no learning task. At no point did the teacher clarify the learning objective for either group. | Basic | 18% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |

| Instruction | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques** | The QSR team scored 82% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers asked open-ended questions that promoted student thinking and invited multiple perspectives, such as "What strategies could you use?", "How can we check our work?", "What did we discover?" Teachers used questioning to focus student attention on using textual evidence in their reading or to justify their thinking in mathematics.<br><br>Most students willingly participated in class discussions. Teachers provided time for students to listen to or react to opinions or ideas of peers during whole or small group work. Several teachers used equity sticks to call on students and others used cold calling to solicit input from multiple students. Teachers also provided multiple opportunities for students to engage in the discussion including turn and talks and KWL charts. Questions allowed for varied responses such as "name at least three characteristics of…". | Distinguished | 0% |
| | | Proficient | 82% |

| Instruction | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers asked some questions to promote thinking but student participation was limited. In one observation, the teacher asked, "why might they want to maintain positive relationships with…?" but only a sub-set of students participated in the conversation. The teachers made no attempt to engage other students and the discussion remained between the teacher and students with no opportunity for students to discuss questions with each other. | Basic | 18% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| **Engaging Students in Learning** | The QSR team scored a high 88% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers engaged students with learning tasks that required them to explain their thinking and represent information in multiple ways. In a math class students used counters and number sentences to display multiplication, and in another class students completed a Do Now that required them to connect the prior day's | Distinguished | 0% |

| Instruction | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | lesson with the new objective. Students were intellectually engaged as evidenced by their contributions to group work, note taking, and participation in class discussion. Teachers supported student learning by providing resources such as computers, fraction strips, fact charts, and whiteboards. Teachers led small group or individualized instruction as a dominant strategy in most classes. Students in these observations spent more time working on tasks than watching or listening as teachers worked. | Proficient | 88% |
| | The QSR team scored just 12% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers took a more active role in leading instruction with lecture-style delivery resulting in less engagement from students. In several classes some students demonstrated intellectual engagement, but not all. In one class students worked in two groups – one on computers and the other listening as the teacher read excerpts of texts. Some students on the computers were disengaged, only staring at the computer, while others actively worked on a packet. The group listening to the teacher also was partially engaged; some students answered questions, some students fidgeted and did not pay attention, other students whispered to each other. | Basic | 12% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |

| Instruction | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Using Assessment in Instruction** | The QSR team scored a high 88% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations teachers monitored student learning by asking questions and providing feedback (e.g., "What's the problem asking you to do?" "How did you get this answer?" "What's the next step?"). In a distinguished observation the teacher projected examples of correct and incorrect student work for the class to analyze. The teachers invited the class to explain how their classmates arrived at these answers. While discussing, students corrected or add notes to their papers without prompting. | Distinguished | 6% |

| Instruction | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | In several observations teachers circulated between groups to monitor progress and offered feedback or praise. In one class students posted their work at the end of class to compare answers and reveal that seemingly disparate equations led to the same graph. The teacher facilitated a conversation about what students observed and could conclude from the activity.<br><br>Observers noted teachers assessing student learning in several ways including a Do Now about a learning concept from the prior day, asking global comprehension questions, completing a KWL chart independently and sharing out, and writing answers on whiteboards. Teachers also provided students with tools to assess their own work. In a math class the teacher showed students how to use their math reference sheets, and another teacher asked students to brainstorm strategies about how they could check their work. Most teachers collected exit tickets at the end of each class period. | Proficient | 82% |
| | The QSR team scored just 12% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers asked some comprehension questions to gauge student understanding but did not involve all students or allowed the same sub-set of students to answer all questions. | Basic | 12% |
| | 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. |