February 5, 2014

Simmons Lettre, Board Chair
Capital City PCS – Lower School
100 Peabody Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Ms. Lettre:

The Public Charter School Board ("PCSB") conducts Qualitative Site Reviews ("QSR") to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, 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 QSR during the 2013-14 school year for the following reason(s):

o   School designated as Focus by Office of the State Superintendent of Education

Qualitative Site Review Report
A QSR team conducted on-site review visits of Capital City PCS – Lower School between December 2 and December 13, 2013. The purpose of the site review is for PCSB to gauge the extent to which the school's goals and student academic achievement expectations were evident in the everyday operations of the public charter school. To ascertain this, PCSB staff and consultants evaluated your classroom teaching by using an abridged version of the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* observation rubric. PCSB was unable to attend a board meeting due to a conflict in schedules.

Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report is focused 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 Capital City PCS – Lower School. Thank you for your continued cooperation as PCSB makes every effort to ensure that Capital City PCS is in compliance with its charter.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: School Leader

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Capital City Public Charter School – Lower School ("Capital City PCS – Lower School") serves pre-kindergarten-3 through fourth grade students as part of a pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade network. The school serves 983 students LEA-wide and 320 students in the Lower School. DC Public Charter School Board ("PCSB") conducted a Qualitative Site Review ("QSR") at the Lower School campus in December 2013 because Capital City PCS – Lower School was designated as Focus by Office of the State Superintendent of Education ("OSSE").

PCSB conducted observations over a two-week window, from December 2 through December 13, 2013. A team of two PCSB staff members and one consultant conducted observations of 16 classrooms, including classrooms where more than one teacher was present. Observers visited the school on multiple days throughout this two-week window and saw classes in the morning and in the afternoon. In some instances, the review team may have observed the same teacher twice. In fall 2014, PCSB will conduct a QSR at this campus as part of the LEA's charter renewal, the special education teachers will be observed at this visit.

The mission of Capital City PCS is "to graduate a diverse group of young adults who are self-directed, intellectually engaged, and possess a strong sense of personal and civic responsibility. Our students will complete a rigorous academic program that emphasizes both independent and collaborative learning within an inclusive, democratic community." Overall, the QSR team observed evidence that Capital City PCS – Lower School is fulfilling its mission, though the team was unable in its two-week window to observe evidence related to the school being a "democratic community". Overall, students were highly engaged in their learning and teachers coached them through the learning process. Students conducted service projects in the classrooms and common areas, which appeared to give students a sense of ownership in their school. Expeditionary learning tasks also created an opportunity for personal and civic responsibility. Students asked questions and explored topics that connected to their lives. Then, when applicable, students were able to go into the field (ex. Rock Creek Park) and find the answers to their questions from experts in the field or from exploring themselves.

Capital City PCS – Lower School is also meeting many of its goals. Students were working on high-quality independent work in all subject areas. Teachers continuously asked students to explain their thinking and students described their methods of solving problems. Teachers also invited students to extend previous remarks or add additional information to what classmates previously said. The school has implemented Wednesday Community meetings to bring the students and staff together and bi-weekly service hours for students. As evidenced by posters, experiments, and data posted on walls and hallways, the school has implemented a strong expeditionary learning program across all grades.

Overall, the review team rated 85% of observations as proficient or above in the domain of Classroom Environments. The highest rated elements within the Classroom Environments domain were "Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport" and "Establishing a Culture for Learning," with 94% of classrooms rated as proficient or exemplary in both elements. Teachers and students were uniformly respectful to each other. The QSR team observed respectful talk and turn-taking in most classrooms. Additionally, most teachers conveyed the importance of learning tasks, setting expectations that all students could be successful. In most observations, teachers maintained effective routines to transition students and handle materials. Teachers' responses to student misbehavior were generally effective.

The review team rated 75% of observations as proficient or advanced in the domain of Instructional Delivery. The highest rated elements within the Instructional Delivery domain were "Communicating with Students" and "Engaging Students in Learning", with 88% of observations rated as proficient or exemplary in both elements. In most observations, teachers effectively communicated the purpose and content of the lesson and maintained a high level of student engagement through the use of challenging assignments, extensive student choice in activities, and suitable pacing of the lessons. While teachers in many classrooms invited students to explain thought processes behind their responses to questions, less than half of classrooms were rated as below proficient in "Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques." In some classrooms, questioning followed a single path of inquiry or was procedural in nature.

Due to the timing of the QSR visit, a PCSB staff member was unable to attend the school's board meeting. PCSB will be attending the board meeting in January as part of the 15-year renewal visits for the LEA. Board meeting information will be reported on in the Middle and High school QSR reports.

OSSE designated Capital City PCS – Lower School as a Focus school based on the performance of its Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. The school's leadership team provided Focus strategies for the QSR team to observe. Throughout observations, PCSB saw extensive evidence co-planning (though we did not observe an actual co-planning session as part of this review). Specifically, throughout observations the review team observed the workshop model of instruction dominated by small groups led by multiple adults around a common instructional focus. PCSB also saw evidence of differentiated instruction, particularly in literacy classes, with emphasis on the Daily 5 structure; observers saw students reading for stamina, work on independent writing tasks, complete word work. Students throughout the observations prepared for Achievement Network assessments in small groups with teachers. PCSB did not look for nor collect evidence related to family outreach for Latino families, Race and Equity training, professional development for teachers working with ELLs; PCSB will attempt to observe these strategies in the spring 2014 QSR.

CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

This table summarizes Capital City PCS – Lower School's goals and academic achievement expectations as detailed in its charter and subsequent Accountability Plans, and the evidence that the Qualitative Site Review ("QSR") team observed of the school meeting those goals during the Qualitative Site Visit.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
Mission: The mission of Capital City Public Charter School is to graduate a diverse group of young adults who are self-directed, intellectually engaged, and possess a strong sense of personal and civic responsibility. Our students will complete a rigorous academic program that emphasizes both independent and collaborative learning within an inclusive, democratic community.	The QSR team observed evidence of Capital City PCS – Lower School meeting its mission. Consistently, the teachers and staff were teaching students to be self-directed, intellectually engaged, and possess a strong sense of personal and civic responsibility. As evidence to assist students in becoming self-directed learners, teachers intentionally gave multi-step directions. In most classrooms, the QSR team observed teachers repeating, reviewing and rehearsing the directions with students. Teachers would first repeat the procedures, then review them with students, and then have the students rehearse or perform the procedures. This allowed students to complete classroom activities independently. As described in the *Framework for Teaching* element of "Engaging Students in Learning", students were intellectually engaged at all grade levels. Learning tasks required high-level student thinking and were aligned with the lesson objectives. In multiple math classes, students had to explain the strategies they used to solve math problems. In one class, students explained the strategies used to solve different problems with fractions. Additionally, students had a high level of choice in how they completed tasks. One classroom had an abundance of literacy materials in the classroom library; during independent reading, students were able to choose books that interested them. Classrooms kept track of how many minutes they read for. Each classroom challenged

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	students to read for more minutes every day, and the QSR team overheard students comparing the number of minutes that their classes had read. The QSR team observed evidence of expeditionary learning in each grade, which appeared to intellectually engage students and give students a strong sense of personal and civic responsibility. Most themes appeared to take the classes outside for extending field study to study either science or social studies. Third grade was working on a Rock Creek Park study. Pictures posted on bulletin boards indicated that students visited the park each month from September through November to make observations and collect evidence to answer the questions they were exploring about the park. The pictures posted on the walls by these classrooms showed students exploring Rock Creek Park and working with rangers from the park. Pre-kindergarten students explored "Putting the Garden to Sleep." During the observations, students were learning about planting and protecting bulbs during the different seasons. In these classrooms, students explored questions related to personal and civic responsibility. Second grade students were exploring a project based around water. They had also taken trips to Rock Creek Park, as evidenced by pictures around the rooms and hallways. The second grade students explored questions that related to the park, such as "Did Rock Creek have more water 100 years ago?" and "What is the purpose of water?" The QSR team observed evidence that the school fostered a strong sense of personal and civic responsibility through their service activities, which occur twice weekly. The school leader explained that during these opportunities, students participate in various activities such as helping in the front office and cleaning their classrooms. An observer saw a teacher task one group of students to organize their classroom library. Their teacher extended the task by asking the students about the importance of keeping their library tidy, and making

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	sure that students were only keeping the books that they were actively reading because other students may want to read the books as well. The rigor of the academic activities, and student collaboration in these activities, was mixed. In most classrooms, students worked collaboratively without prompting from the teacher. In one such classroom, during "Morning Math", a student who had already finished the assignment helped another student answer questions. In another classroom where students were supposed to be writing independently, some students chose to work on a play together; it was unclear what students were supposed to have accomplished by the end of this writing period. In two other classes, students practiced with the teacher and independently worked on comparing mixed fraction problems in preparation for Achievement Network (ANet) tests the following day.
1. Students will become competent, independent readers.	Reading/Writing Workshop was conducted daily during the observations. On the wall of each classroom were rules for independent reading, such as "quiet", "by yourself", and "read the whole time". Students followed these rules as they read. Observations of literacy instruction throughout the school revealed an emphasis on the Daily 5 structure, allowing for high-level independent tasks and differentiated instruction in reading, word study, and writing skills. Teachers utilized the Daily 5 to help students develop daily habits of reading, writing, and working independently. Teachers tracked the number of minutes the class read independently, usually on the board. After independent reading, the teachers moved to guided reading with small groups and independent writing for other students. Teachers also posted tips around rooms to help students become more competent readers. In one classroom, a chart read "Read to self. Why? To get better at reading! Looking at the pictures, reading words, figuring out words." Classrooms libraries also appeared to be well stocked for student use. One child was reading books in Spanish.
2. Students will become effective oral and written communicators.	The QSR team observed writing and oral tasks across all grades. The QSR team observed the school implementation of the Writer's

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	Workshop model consistently from pre-kindergarten through fourth grades. In a few classrooms, the QSR observer could not determine what the writing outcome was intended to be. Some students were productively engaged in writing activities while others were not. Teachers used turn-and-talk and "table talk" during activities, lunch, and snack time to allow students to practice oral communication. During table talk, teachers sat at the tables of students and engaged students in conversation regarding the activity and relating to the students' lives.
3. Students will be able to reason mathematically and effectively present their thinking to others.	In math classes, teachers asked students to explain their methodology to their small groups. When students were stuck in their explanations, teachers assisted them with prompting questions, such as "What did you do next to solve the problem?" In one classroom, when a student's methodology was slightly off, the teacher asked the rest of the small group, "Does anyone have a difference of opinion?" Teachers praised students for their explanations of how to attack a problem and said, "You used a great strategy!" In one small group, the teacher had students use fraction manipulatives to express mixed numbers before solving the problem, asked students to demonstrate the answer and then work out the problem using the manipulatives. During a classroom ANet practice session, the teacher asked the students to read the math word problem and identify the type of problem and how they knew the answer. Students were able to respond to the teacher. Students were also able to respond to the follow up question on why this particular problem was easier than another similar problem.
4. To promote critical thinking, high-quality original work, and the acquisition of skills necessary for transition to college or career.	In most cases, teachers incorporated higher-order thinking questions into lessons. One teacher asked the class, "What did you do to use Gail Gibbons as a mentor in your writing?" Students had to explain how they modeled their writing after the author in a story. Other writing prompts also allowed students to create original work. One literacy class wrote prompts on a topic of their choice. Many students continued writing a story they had been working on and some wrote

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	about a superpower that they would use to help people. Before starting the activity, students were given the opportunity to share what they were going to write about. This sharing appeared to help students extend their planning and allow for higher quality work. The QSR team observed very few worksheets in use over the two weeks. Teachers asked students to be creative in their learning tasks to create original work.
5. To establish a tone of unanxious expectation, decency, and trust among students, staff, and families.	Classroom rules and expectations were consistent across all grades. Classroom maintained routines and students appeared aware of the expectations. Teachers used similar strategies during transitions and through the daily schedule. The Capital City PCS – Lower School team has created an environment of warmth and trust at the school. Teachers referred to students as "friends" and to their classrooms as "families". To help staff with unanxious expectations, there is obvious extended planning time. This was evidenced by the effective co-teaching routines in the classroom. The QSR team could rarely distinguish between the teacher and the teaching fellow. On Wednesday morning during Whole School Meeting, the school promoted a sense of whole-school community by singing songs together and playing games. The focus of this meeting appeared to be on community and school values.
6. To create meaningful student leadership opportunities and a student body authentically engaged in school governance.	The QSR team neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this goal.
7. To encourage responsibility, respect, compassion, service, and appreciation of diversity in all school community members	During the school's service activity, the school and individual teachers discussed respect and service with the QSR team and students. Two school leaders described to a QSR observer what the school did for service twice a week. Students were assigned to different groups, including groups that filed in the office, cleaned classrooms, or cleaned common spaces. In one classroom, the teacher continued the service conversation by asking the students why it was important to keep their libraries tidy and why students needed to return the books once they had finished them.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	The QSR team observed student compassion when students helped each other to complete a task. In one classroom a group of students wrote about which superpower they would choose to have in order to help others. The school appeared to appreciate diversity. Classroom libraries contained a variety of multicultural literature. A few hall displays celebrated the school staff's different cultures; displays showed staff and their families in authentic clothes that represented their heritages. The school also had a sign up seeking male mentors to work as partners in the classroom and around the school due to the limited number of male teachers and staff. Students' "Bio Poems" hung in every classroom. Younger grades used descriptive words to identify the differences of skin color (dark chocolate, chocolate brown, and dark peach). In the older grades, students used expressive words to describe how they were unique.
8. To implement learning expeditions -- in-depth investigations of a theme or topic that engage students through authentic research, projects, fieldwork and service, and that are interdisciplinary to the maximum extent possible.	The school designated expeditionary projects for each grade level. Evidence of the projects this far in the school year were posted in classrooms and hallways. Students in pre-kindergarten were exploring "Putting the Garden to Sleep;" during the QSR visits, students discussed how to care for a garden during the winter. Third graders were exploring Rock Creek Park and second graders were exploring water. Some of the questions associated with their expeditions were "Why does water exist?", "Was there more water 100 years ago?", and "Why are people picking up trash?" Students in both grades had visited Rock Creek Park monthly this year, collected evidence from the park, and talked with Park Rangers to answer some of their questions. Students also conducted science experiments about water to answer some of their questions. The students had mixed water with other substances and tested water at different temperatures to see what happened.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	The fourth graders had expedition hour on their Friday schedules. The students were exploring the similarities and differences between Egypt and Mali. On the wall of the classroom was a graphic organizer with questions of what they wanted to learn and what they had learned so far. The students explored griot storytelling (oral record of African tribal history) during class and the teacher stated a professional griot storyteller would be visiting soon.
9. To personalize teaching and learning through small class sizes, advisory, and flexibility in scheduling and course formats.	The QSR team observed small student-to-teacher ratios in each class (approximately eight to ten students for every teacher in the room). Most classes had two staff, a teacher and teaching fellow, working with students; additional staff, including instructional assistants and inclusion specialists, also worked with students. The multiple staff members in each room were able to work with small groups of students (about three to four students each) and interact individually with students. The QSR team observed that most instructional staff members were part of the learning and not directing the learning. Teachers sat in the circle and played games with the class or sat with students during snack to talk (Table Time). This also allowed teachers to get to know students on a personal level.

The QSR team neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to advisory or flexibility in scheduling and course formats. |
| 10. To utilize the CES philosophy of student-as-worker, teacher-as-coach as the core of instructional practice. | The QSR team observed strong evidence of student-as-worker and teacher-as-coach during instruction. Teachers circulated classrooms during independent work time, and when a student was stuck, the teacher asked questions and allowed the student to explain his/her thought process to get started working again. During whole group instruction, teachers presented strategies to solve math or writing problems and let students choose which strategies would work best. Many teachers provided specific feedback to students to help them refine their strategies. During small groups, teachers initiated conversations but then encouraged fellow students to respond to one |

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	another. Many times, teachers provided prompts to facilitate the conversation, such as "I agree with ___ when he/she said ___ because ___." or "After listening to ___ I want to know more about _____."
11. To assess learning through portfolios, exhibitions of work, and student performance of authentic tasks.	Classrooms and hallways were covered in unique student work, such as bio poems, Hopes and Dreams assignments, expeditionary learning questions and research, and math explorations (such as How many legs are in this room [two and four])., not worksheets. Posted work was of high quality, with minimal mistakes made by students (appropriate to each grade level). Students posted "Hopes and Dreams" in every classroom, showing what their long-term goals were. There were also posters with questions created by the students about different topics. Some classrooms had KWL "What we know", "What we wonder", and "What we learned" posters completed by the students.

Most work assigned allowed students to complete authentic tasks. However, assessment of the tasks was uneven throughout the classrooms observed. As described in the *Framework for Teaching* element of "Using Assessment in Instruction", over two-thirds of the teachers tied direct assessment with the learning task. In a few instances, students were able to assess their own work against a rubric.

The QSR team neither looked for nor observed any evidence of portfolios. |
| 12. Capital City will be a learning community for teachers as well as students. Teachers will receive the training and support they need to successfully implement the educational program and best support individual students. | During the observations, two teachers were being observed by Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) observers from the Center for Inspired Teaching. CLASS is a professional development tool to improve teaching for early childhood and elementary programs.

Additionally, the QSR team observed evidence that the teaching staff has planned collaboratively. Classes at the same grade levels had similar lesson pacing and objectives. When an observer left one classroom and walked into the second class in the same grade, the second classroom was continuing with the same lesson. In addition, it |

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	was difficult to tell which teacher was the lead and which was the fellow, further evidence of co-planning and teacher learning communities.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENTS[1]

This rubric summarizes the school's performance on the Classroom Environments elements of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "limited", "satisfactory", "proficient" and "exemplary" are those from the Danielson framework. PCSB considers any rating below "proficient" to be under the standard of quality expected of DC charter schools. On average, 85% of classrooms received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Classroom Environment domain.

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Ninety-four percent of observations scored proficient or exemplary in "Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport". Talk between teachers and students and among students was uniformly respectful. Teachers consistently referred to students as "friends" and demonstrated warmth and caring through personalized conversations. Adults in the pre-kindergarten classrooms sat with the students during center time, circle activities, lunch and snack; they shared in friendly conversation and group activities with students. Additionally, students were generally kind to each other. A student in one classroom helped another student with her morning math assignment without prompting from the teacher. Students also handed out snacks; in one classroom, as a student expressed concern aloud about not getting her snack yet, another student gently reminded her that no one had received their snack yet.	Limited	0%
		Satisfactory	6%
		Proficient	50%
		Exemplary	44%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	Ninety-four percent of observations scored proficient or exemplary in "Establishing a Culture for Learning". Teachers demonstrated high regard for student learning. In math classes, the teachers asked students to explain their thinking to small groups and commended the students on their use of strategies. In one classroom, the teacher was very clear with the expectation that all students participate, saying to the class, "I may call on you even if you don't volunteer, because the expectation is that all of you will know how to approach the problem." Additionally, teachers celebrated success with their students. Classes celebrated when students read stories they had created. Students have also been taught to value longer periods spent reading and celebrate growth for time engaged in independent reading. Several teachers encouraged students to "think with their brains."	Limited	0%
		Satisfactory	6%
		Proficient	81%
		Exemplary	13%

---

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

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Managing Classroom Procedures	Three-fourths of the observations were proficient or exemplary in "Managing Classroom Procedures." Teachers placed emphasis on setting expectations and clear instructions for executed learning activities; teachers reviewed guidelines and wrote procedural steps on charts. Teachers also displayed written procedures for instructional routines, such as "Selecting a Reading Partner."	Limited	0%
	Additionally, in many classrooms, teachers established procedures for what students were expected to do if they finished the assigned task. Overall, routines were generally smooth, though in some classrooms, there was a significant difference between the efficiency of routines in the small groups and in the larger class, with small groups being more efficient. In many classes where small groups were present, students not directly working with the teachers remained on task and engaged.	Satisfactory	25%
		Proficient	63%
	In the remaining one-fourth of the classrooms, routines functioned unevenly. In one classroom, in transitions from morning meeting to service to independent reading, instructional time was lost as the teacher continued to remind students what the expectations were in transitions. In another classroom, a teacher kept reminding students what to do and told students at the end that they needed to tighten up their transitions.	Exemplary	12%
Managing Student Behavior	Three-quarters of the observations were proficient in "Managing Student Behavior", with none scoring exemplary. Overall, classrooms operated in an orderly fashion and teachers effectively corrected behaviors as needed. Student behavior was appropriate during instructional activities and there was little need for teachers to intervene. In many observations, teachers reinforced positive behavior (such as, "I love how students are lined up so quietly, I didn't even hear them!" and "Wow! What a rock star, doing exactly what was asked!") In a few classrooms, the QSR team observed a "Break Time" corner where a student had procedural steps to calm down in order to return to the group. Some of the	Limited	0%
		Satisfactory	25%

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	steps to calm down included drawing a picture and counting to ten. In a few classrooms, teachers had to keep reminding students of the behavior expectations. In one classroom, though the teacher had told students the expectation was for them to raise their hands with questions; she continued to answer questions that students shouted out. In another classroom, a few students engaged in inappropriate and possibly unsafe behavior, such as running, tripping over toys on the floor and pushing; these behaviors went unchecked by the teacher.	Proficient	75%
		Exemplary	0%

INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY

This rubric summarizes the school's performance on the Instructional Delivery elements of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "limited", "satisfactory", "proficient" and "exemplary" are those from the Danielson framework. PCSB considers any rating below "proficient" to be under the standard of quality expected of DC charter schools. On average, 75% of classrooms received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Instructional Delivery domain.

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Communicating with Students	Eighty-eight percent of observations scored proficient in "Communicating with Students," with none scoring exemplary. Overall, teachers clearly referred to the purpose of the lesson throughout the learning time. Teachers used clear and accurate written and spoken language to communicate with students. Teachers communicated instructions orally and in print; students demonstrated clear understanding of the teachers' presentations, as evidenced by limited student questioning regarding the content or purpose of the lesson. In small groups, teachers consistently referred back to the lesson purpose and students knew what they were supposed to do. In one class, teachers invited student participation in explaining methodologies for solving mixed number problems. In a few classrooms, teachers explained very little content. In one classroom, students were independently reading and writing, but the instructional purpose was unclear. Students did not appear to be enhancing a particular skill or knowledge. In another classroom, the students did not comprehend the content and kept asking clarifying questions.	Limited	6%
		Satisfactory	6%
		Proficient	88%
		Exemplary	0%
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	Approximately half of the observations scored proficient in "Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques," with none scoring exemplary. These classrooms were characterized by high levels of student engagement in discussions. In one classroom, students in small groups were actively engaged in discussion around strategies to solve mixed numbers. During whole group	Limited	0%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	discussions, teachers called on all students. One teacher emphasized the expectations for all students to participate because they knew how to solve the problem. During a pre-kindergarten expeditionary lesson, "Putting the Garden to Sleep," the teacher asked students questions to expand their thinking such as, "Where have you seen seeds?" and, "What do seeds need to grow?" After students answered, the teacher asked additional questions to extend the learning. In another classroom, the teacher asked critical thinking questions (such, "How does this work represent what you just said?" and, "What's another way we could do this problem?") and students expressed their mixed numbers with manipulatives and described how they solved the problems.

However, in just under half the classrooms, teachers asked procedural questions, which required a single correct answer. Teachers asked few open-ended questions and students were reluctant to participate in the discussion. One teacher circulated through the room asking students questions about their book choices without asking questions that required academic thought. During center time in another classroom, the teacher monitored by asking, "Is this the way we play with these materials?" The teacher did not further engage with the students. | Satisfactory | 44% |
		Proficient	56%
		Exemplary	0%
Engaging Students in Learning	Approximately 90% of observations were proficient in "Engaging Students in Learning," with none scoring exemplary. Students were intellectually engaged in lessons, asking questions and applying strategies previously learned. In math classes, students productively worked on morning math packets, which were differentiated by student ability. For example, for one student, the teacher had added additional hints and explanations to the packet that other students at that table did not receive. During reading time, students in all classrooms worked to extend the amount of time they read independently. Teachers also used "turn and talk" to engage students with one another. Additionally, students had choice in completion of tasks. In reading class, students selected their own books of interest to read. In a math classes, students chose which strategy they wanted to use to compare mixed fractions.	Limited	0%
		Satisfactory	12%
		Proficient	88%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	In a few classrooms, student engagement was not universal; students did not answer the teacher's questions about the book they were reading or their writing topic were off task, socializing or drawing.	Exemplary	0%
Using Assessment in Instruction	Approximately 70% of observations were proficient in "Using Assessment in Instruction," with none scoring exemplary. In many classrooms, teachers tracked student understanding through assessment. Teachers maintained a running record of student errors during independent reading in several classrooms. Teachers also gave specific feedback to advance student learning.	Limited	0%
	In one classroom, the teacher invited students to asses each other. The teacher asked students, "Was ___ right? Why or why not?" In pre-kindergarten and kindergarten classroom, most teachers closely monitored student play activities during centers and recorded notes. In another classroom, the teacher and students compared their writing with the book's author's writing. The students explained how they wrote similarly to the author. Another teacher introduced writing criteria to the students: using sequence words. During independent work, teachers monitored work activities and provided correction as needed.	Satisfactory	31%
		Proficient	69%
	In some classrooms, feedback was general and non-specific or it was unclear how the students were evaluated. In one classroom, the teacher asked, "Do you understand how to solve this problem?" When students responded affirmatively, the teacher moved on to another table.	Exemplary	0%

APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

Class Environment	Limited	Satisfactory	Proficient	Exemplary
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: INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY OBSERVATION RUBRIC

Instructional Delivery	Limited	Satisfactory	Proficient	Exemplary
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.

Instructional Delivery	Limited	Satisfactory	Proficient	Exemplary
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.

SCHOOL INTERVENTION AND SUPPORT STRATEGIES

The following table summarizes

  a) Capital City PCS – Lower School's intervention and support strategies for its Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups, as detailed in its web-based tool; and,

  b) the evidence that the PCSB staff member observed of the school implementing the strategies between December 2, 2013 and December 13, 2013 for the purposes of the 2012 ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

Schools that have been identified as Focus schools in August 2013 are in the beginning stages of their implementation; as such, PCSB uses only the two-week observation window to gather evidence as to the school's initial implementation, as opposed to the two-week observation window plus a scheduled day of strategies. As such, it may not be possible to observe certain strategies chosen by the school. PCSB will attempt to observe these strategies in the next monitoring visit in Spring 2014.

In cases where PCSB did not have the opportunity to observe the strategy, we will use the standard language of 'While this strategy may be in place, PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy.' Different language will be used to indicate poor implementation of a given strategy.

Please note that much of the evidence for the implementation of intervention and support strategies was seen through classroom observation, and was aligned to the *Framework for Teaching*. As such, PCSB noted the specific classroom observation elements that speak to these strategies, where appropriate, in order to avoid repetition.

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
1. Emphasis on co-planning and co-teaching with teaching fellows and inclusion teachers to ensure high quality lesson plans and instruction that supports differentiation for all students.	Strategies and structures observable in classrooms and during planning/consult meetings: Workshop model instruction, where students start together for a mini-lesson (in whole or small groups), then move into independent work time, during which all teachers are pulling small groups for instruction	PCSB saw extensive evidence of the workshop model of instruction, dominated by small group instruction with multiple adults present throughout classrooms. In at least two observations of math classes, teachers were practicing for ANet testing with students. They

Qualitative Site Review Report   Capital City PCS – Lower School   February 5, 2014

13

SCHOOL INTERVENTION AND SUPPORT STRATEGIES

The following table summarizes

  a) Capital City PCS – Lower School's intervention and support strategies for its Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups, as detailed in its web-based tool; and,

  b) the evidence that the PCSB staff member observed of the school implementing the strategies between December 2, 2013 and December 13, 2013 for the purposes of the 2012 ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

Schools that have been identified as Focus schools in August 2013 are in the beginning stages of their implementation; as such, PCSB uses only the two-week observation window to gather evidence as to the school's initial implementation, as opposed to the two-week observation window plus a scheduled day of strategies. As such, it may not be possible to observe certain strategies chosen by the school. PCSB will attempt to observe these strategies in the next monitoring visit in Spring 2014.

In cases where PCSB did not have the opportunity to observe the strategy, we will use the standard language of 'While this strategy may be in place, PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy.' Different language will be used to indicate poor implementation of a given strategy.

Please note that much of the evidence for the implementation of intervention and support strategies was seen through classroom observation, and was aligned to the *Framework for Teaching*. As such, PCSB noted the specific classroom observation elements that speak to these strategies, where appropriate, in order to avoid repetition.

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
1. Emphasis on co-planning and co-teaching with teaching fellows and inclusion teachers to ensure high quality lesson plans and instruction that supports differentiation for all students.	Strategies and structures observable in classrooms and during planning/consult meetings: Workshop model instruction, where students start together for a mini-lesson (in whole or small groups), then move into independent work time, during which all teachers are pulling small groups for instruction	PCSB saw extensive evidence of the workshop model of instruction, dominated by small group instruction with multiple adults present throughout classrooms. In at least two observations of math classes, teachers were practicing for ANet testing with students. They

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
	or conferring 1:1 with students. Inclusion teachers are pulling a small group of students in or out of the classroom, depending on the needs of the group. Each team has common planning time each day. One day each week is consult with admin team and focus on inclusion support, academic structures/student data, ELL support or equity discussion groups. Other days include team planning, teacher/fellow check-in meetings and grade-level collaborative planning. These meetings take place Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday. On Wednesday afternoons after PD time, grade level teams meet to do begin collaborative planning/goal setting for the following week's plans.	gauged understanding of their small group before letting students work on their own, and asked questions as the students worked independently. In observations of reading workshops, teachers listened to students read and took notes in the students' running record assessments. In another observation, students read aloud in a small group and answered comprehension questions. In one ELA class, students worked on writing and reading, but these seemed to be more "free" activities, without a mini-lesson or deliverable attached. While common planning time may be in place, and an observer did notice it happening, PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy, as time was devoted to classroom observations.
2. Strategies to support reading instruction for struggling readers (including Latino and Low-Income Subgroups)	Daily 5 Structure for literacy workshops to allow for high-level independent tasks, and differentiated instruction in reading, word study and writing skills.	Observations of literacy instruction throughout the school revealed an emphasis on the Daily 5 structure, allowing for high-level independent tasks and differentiated instruction in reading, word study, and writing skills. Observers heard and saw an emphasis on reading for stamina, both in posters and in teachers' discussion with students. Students worked on highly independent tasks in writing. Students revised writing pieces in at least two classrooms; in one of these observations, the teacher had students add additional descriptive language. In another observation, the teacher had students add more

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
		sequencing words (beginning, next, during, finally). Students in another literacy class worked on the "Word Work" component of the Daily Five. Students worked at a table with an adult, talking through the words on their list and identifying words by their definitions. In at least one classroom observation, students read books of their choosing independently, though it was unclear what the skill or strategy was that students were supposed to be practicing, as the teacher's individual questions toward students did not reference any skill, strategy, or reference to reading for stamina. These activities did not begin with any type of mini-lesson that students were then to practice on their own. In at least two of the classroom observations, PCSB visited the class during literacy instruction (according to the class schedule) though students worked on math the entire time.
3. Increased use of formative assessments and tighter assessment cycle, and strategies for data driven instruction	Administration, scoring and analysis of math benchmark assessments to assess student understanding of foundational skills and concepts at each grade level, K-4. This supports differentiated instruction in math--guided math groups (homogeneous groups). Fountas and Pinnell reading benchmark assessment and Running Records assessments to determine student reading levels for guided reading grouping and teaching points. ANET Interim assessments for third and fourth grade students in ELA	In at least two classroom observations, the teachers were preparing students for their next ANet assessment. Teachers were working with students in small groups on adding together mixed numbers. In another classroom observation, students worked on Morning Math activities. The observer saw at least one Morning Math packet that was differentiated, with additional pictures and hints to support student success in answering the problems.

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
	and Math. Administration of ANET #2 will take place on 12/3 and 12/5. Data days are a part of each cycle, giving teachers the opportunity to analyze the student data and plan for differentiated instruction. A data day is planned for the Wednesday PD time (1:45-4:15) on December 11th for third and fourth grade teams. Frequent administration of formative assessments (exit tickets, student work for example), including those mentioned about, help us target instruction to each student's level.	PCSB did not see or hear references to Fountas and Pinnell reading benchmark assessments. As stated in Strategy #1, observers saw frequent small group activity with multiple adults present in classrooms.
4. Daily 5 Reading Structure to increase rigor of independent work time during literacy periods, differentiated instruction in literacy	Daily 5 is a structure for literacy blocks that classrooms K-4 are using to support literacy instruction and rigorous independent work times. Students are reading independently or with a buddy, writing independently or doing word work tasks while teachers are pulling small groups for reading instruction or conferring 1:1 with students on reading, writing and word work tasks. There are typically 3-5 cycles of instruction, each of which includes a mini-lesson, independent work time and small group reading instruction for all students. This should be seen during literacy blocks in K-4 classrooms.	Please refer to the evidence listed under Strategy #2 as documentation of the presence of the Daily 5 structure in literacy blocks.
5. Expeditionary Learning	Learning expeditions, a component of the Expeditionary Learning model, should result in increased student engagement and time on task. Expeditions typically focus on science and social studies topics, but integrate literacy and math skills. Students are digging into complex texts, researching in the chosen content area, learning from experts in the field, going on fieldwork to learn more about expedition topics in real-life situations (Kindergartners visiting Columbia Heights multiple times to study pigeon habits). During the window, several grade levels are going to be in expedition showcase preparation time, finishing projects/products, preparing display boards to demonstrate the process of their learning, for example. In addition, the Wednesday PD time on December 11th will be showcase preparation time for teachers in grades K-2.	Reviewers saw extensive evidence of expeditionary learning throughout the school. Within each grade level, observers saw that they have various themes that take students on learning experiences. For example, one grade level is studying how the atmosphere impacts the habitat of Rock Creek Park. Charts in the classroom documented how students brainstormed questions about Rock Creek park. In a pre-k classroom, the observer saw evidence that the students were exploring gardens by planting and removing bulbs in order to protect them from the elements and raking leaves.

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
		There was evidence that outside experts related to explorations come into the school, with someone from Rock Creek park coming in to talk to the students and in another class, an African Storyteller (also related to an expeditionary learning theme). Students in another classroom came up with hypotheses related to the question, "What happens to waste after it leaves the toilet?" as they continued to investigate the outside world.
6. Outreach to Latino families	Increased outreach to Latino families by teachers and administrators to encourage their being more a part of the school community-- volunteering in the classroom and on field work or during whole-school service time, as examples. Document translation--working toward every document that goes to parents being translated for non-English speaking families, including advertisements for evening events, all of Thursday folder contents and homework. Interpretation provided at conferences and at all family events. ELL Specialist provides workshops for parents on supporting their children at home.	With regard to outreach to Latino families, document translation, interpretation at family events and workshops put on by the ELL specialist, this strategy may be in place, but PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy.'
8. Race and Equity training and on-going professional development	Five PDs this school year are dedicated to Race and Equity training for staff, including a 3-day launch in August, 2013. Two of the 4 other PDs are half days when students are not in session, and two are Wednesday PDs. PD calendar can be provided to indicate dates for these PDs.	With regard to Race and Equity training, this strategy may be in place, but PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy.
9. Improved instruction for ELLs	ELL Specialist works with teachers, coaching and training them in strategies to support ELLs in the classroom. This includes individual and team coaching cycles, training on SIOP strategies, teacher study group (PLC) to study teaching vocabulary in the classroom, for	Throughout one of the observation days, PCSB observed the ELL specialist working with various small groups of students (though did not observe these lessons for content, as observers

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
	examples. ELL Specialist conducts PD with Inclusion Teachers on specific strategies to support ELLs in the classroom. ELL Specialist works directly with students, implementing LLI and other strategies to support ELLs. ELL Specialist and Reading Intervention Specialist have consult meetings with all grade level teams monthly, to look at student data, strategize with teachers about supporting ELL students and share strategies for supporting ELLs.	were on their way to other classrooms). PCSB plans to observe ELL instruction during the Spring 2014 visit. With regard to professional development conducted by the ELL specialist, and consult meetings between the ELL specialist and the reading intervention teachers, this strategy may be in place, but PCSB neither looked for nor observed evidence related to this strategy.
10. Differentiation in math	Morning Math--This year we are implementing morning math school-wide in every classroom, K-4. This work period takes place from 8:15-8:45 in all classrooms K-4. This is a math work period in addition to the regular math workshop block, during which students are focused on critical thinking and contextualized story problems typically working on story problems in an "inverted workshop" model, or engaging in activities that promote math fluency work or, in third and fourth grade, standardized testing strategies. In our regular math workshop period our school uses a variety of structures to meet all student needs. 1) Guided math groups is a structure where students are in homogenous ability groups in order to target instruction to the specific needs of the group; 2) The workshop model, where students begin together for a short mini lesson, experiencing direct instruction around a specific concept or skill, then spend time working on practice problems/tasks whiles teachers float and confer with students; and 3) An inverted workshop model, where students are presented a task or problems to "grapple" with and come up with strategies for solving independently or in small groups. The	PCSB observed differentiation in a Morning Math session. Students all had packets placed on their desks as they walked into the classroom. Packets contained story problems. In at least one student's packet, the teacher had added additional pictures and hints to differentiate the tasks. Students worked independently as teachers walked around. At least two students worked as a pair, with one student explaining to the other how to approach the problem. During the math lesson observations, students worked in small groups with the teachers on mixed numbers in preparation for ANet assessments. In one of these small groups, the teacher asked students, "What do you know about mixed numbers?" The teacher then guided students in solving a few problems as a

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
	teaching point comes at the end of the lesson, during the debrief, when students present and defend strategies and results, and teachers confirm or correct mathematical understandings of the targeted concept or skill.	group, and invited student participation in explaining their strategies. Lastly, students practiced problems on their own. In a different class where they were working on the same skill (adding and subtracting mixed numbers), the teacher used manipulatives representing whole numbers and fractions to help the students figure out mixed number addition and subtraction problems. In a similar way to the other small group, the teacher worked on figuring out the needs of the students by asking them if they could do the problem on a small white-board. Some students seemed unsure, and the teacher proceeded to guide students in how to attack the problem, asking individual students to explain the approach. Students then had the opportunity to practice problems on their own as the teacher provided individual feedback. Later in this classroom observation, the teacher worked with the entire class on a story problem modeled after one they would see on their ANet assessments. The teacher asked students to identify the key words that would let them know what type of problem it was, and then proceeded to work through the problem step-by-step, inviting student -participation along the way.
11. Increased emphasis on higher-order questioning	Teachers should be pushing student thinking through discussion and questioning, as demonstrated by high ratings on element 3B of the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching Rubric.	Please refer to evidence in the *Framework for Teaching* section of this report, in the Instructional Delivery element of Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques for

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
		evidence collected around higher-order questioning.
12. Improved school culture	Responsive Classroom - Through Responsive Classroom implementation, PCSB observers should see an emphasis on morning meeting, teachers greeting students, and students having the opportunity to share in classrooms. PCSB should also see class-created classroom rules/norms, and logical consequences for behavior problems.

Community Values - The lower school went through an in-depth process last spring to create community values. We have continued this work this year in "bringing them alive" for children through activities in classrooms and during all school meeting. We are currently working with staff, and will begin to engage students in linking our values to school-wide expectations for common spaces in the building. This is a year-long process to create our school-wide expectations.

Parent Workshops - We are offering 4 parent workshops this year, each with a community and academic component. The first one took place in on Tuesday, October 29th, with a parenting focus. The second is Math Night and will take place on December 5th, 5:30-8pm. Our Math Cadre teachers are working together with the PSA (Parent School Association) to offer family math games centers and workshops for parents around supporting their children with math at home. Agenda and planning documents are available for review, and the event falls during the 2-week QSR visit.

Teachers should be using positive language towards students, with high ratings in element 2A of the Charlotte Danielson Rubric, Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport. | Throughout classroom observations, observers noted that classes were welcoming and caring. As students entered one classroom for the day, teachers greeted each of them individually, asking them how they were, and in one classroom, asking a particular student if she was feeling better (presumably because she was absent the day before). In this same classroom, the teachers quickly and efficiently dealt with behavior issues without incident; one particular student had various challenges throughout the class with staying on task; the teacher asked her to stay behind at the end of the class (as students transitioned to the whole-school meeting), addressing the challenges privately. In one morning meeting observation, the teacher encouraged all students to share and emphasized students giving respect to their other classmates as they shared. Clear postings of classroom rules throughout classrooms reinforced the positive, orderly culture. In one classroom, the teacher had posted classroom rules along with pictures of students who had done a particularly effective job at following that rule.

PCSB had the opportunity to observe the all-school meeting on a Wednesday morning. The |

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
		meeting focused on building community in their school. During one part of the meeting, classes of students acted out a profession (such as firefighter, rock star, or musician) and the other classes had to guess what the profession was. During the next part of the morning meeting, students spoke to the person next to them about their favorite TV show. After this, all students who had a birthday that week and were invited to come up on the stage. A song then began as students transitioned back to class, and the school leader reminded everyone about the math night taking place the following evening, and reminded students not to bring toys to school.

With regard to parent workshops, PCSB neither looked for nor observed evidence related to this strategy beyond the school leader's mention of math night during the school-wide meeting.

Please refer to evidence in the *Framework for Teaching* section of this report, in the Classroom Environment element of Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport for information related to positive relationships observed in classrooms. |
| 13. Behavior intervention strategies | Lower school staff and teachers are currently engaged in a series of behavior PDs to work on classroom management strategies to support students with tier one, two and three interventions. | With regard to individual class strategies related to behavior intervention, this strategy may be in place but PCSB neither looked for nor observed |

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
	PD#1: Tier One/Responsive Classroom/CHAMPS learning/reflection. Teaching teams have set goals and created plans to achieve these goals with the support of lower school admin team and colleagues. Teachers are observing one another and putting into place the strategies outlined in their plans. A google doc with all teams' plans is available and strategies should be observable during classroom observations. PD#2: Tier Two Interventions (an outside consultant was hired to observe in classrooms and then conduct a PD to support teachers in learning and using Tier Two interventions to support students). During inclusion consult the week of 12/2-12/6 teams will be discussing plans for supporting students with tier two interventions. These meetings take place during grade level planning times throughout the week. A schedule can be provided for the QSR team to visit/join those meetings. PD#3: Revisit and reflect on previously set goals/plans. Our OT provider will also be offering strategies for teachers to use with students in the classroom during this PD. This PD will take place on December 4th from 1:50-4:15pm. Strategies should be observable in classrooms after this date.	evidence related to this strategy.
14. After-school math intensives	Our ELL specialist and 4th grade Inclusion Teacher are conducting after school math intensives on Tuesdays and Thursdays, to support students who are struggling in math. This group is focusing on specific skills that data has pointed to as deficits for this group of 20 students. In addition, teachers are focusing on vocabulary acquisition and test-taking strategies. This group meets in room 104 every Tuesday and Thursday afternoon from 3:45-5:00pm.	With regard to after-school math intensives, this strategy may be in place, but PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy