



January 16, 2014

Jane Dimyan-Ehrenfeld, Board Chair
Maya Angelou Public Charter School
5600 East Capitol Street, NE
Washington, DC 20019

Dear Ms. Dimyan-Ehrenfeld:

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):

- School designated as Focus/Priority by Office of the State Superintendent of Education

Qualitative Site Review Report

A QSR team conducted on-site review visits of Maya Angelou Public Charter School (“MAPCS-Evans High School”) between September 30th and October 11th, 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.

School leadership also asked PCSB to attend the school on September 18th, 2013 in order to observe how the school’s Priority intervention strategies are being implemented in classrooms. In addition to conducting classroom observations on this day, PCSB attended a school intervention team meeting as well as a department meeting. Due to a scheduling conflict, PCSB was unable to visit a board meeting.

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.

ESEA Focus Qualitative Site Review

The purpose of the visits is for PCSB to gauge the extent to which the school is implementing its Intervention and Support Plan, as required by OSSE’s accountability system granted to D.C. by the federal government under the 2012 ESEA Flexibility Waiver. To observe evidence of the specific intervention and support strategies detailed in your Intervention and Support plan, PCSB staff evaluated your classroom teaching by using an abridged version of the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching observation rubric. PCSB also attended various school events during the scheduled visit, as selected by your staff.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at MAPCS-Evans High School. Thank you for your continued cooperation as PCSB makes every effort to ensure that MAPCS-Evans High School is in compliance with its charter.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of Naomi DeVeaux.

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: School Leader

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Maya Angelou Public Charter School – Evans High School (“MAPCS-Evans High School”) serves grades nine through twelve with a mission to create learning communities in lower income urban areas where all students, particularly those who have not succeeded in traditional schools, can reach their potential. The school was founded in 1998 and had its charter renewed in 2013 for another 15 years. The office of the State Superintendent for Education (“OSSE”) and the D C Public Charter School Board (“PCSB”) both separately have identified MAPCS-Evans High School as being an Alternative school for both accountability and funding purposes due to its mission and the students it serves. However, OSSE’s ESEA waiver application never proposed to the US Department of Education that alternative schools be treated differently under the ESEA Waiver accountability system. Consequently, there is no different treatment for schools such as MAPCS-Evans High School and MAPCS-Evans High School has been identified as an ESEA Priority school for underperformance both in 2012 and again in 2013.

PCSB staff attended a scheduled day at MAPCS- High School to observe the school’s Priority intervention strategies on September 18, 2013. In addition to conducting classroom observations, school leadership asked PCSB to attend a 10th grade academy meeting, attendance team meeting, department professional learning community meeting, professional development session, and discipline team meeting on the scheduled day. During the two-week unannounced observation window, from September 30 through October 11, 2013, PCSB staff and consultants conducted 21 classroom observations of teachers across grades and subject areas. In a few instances, the QSR team may have observed the same teacher twice.

According to the school’s charter, MAPCS- High School’s mission is to serve students in grades nine through twelve by creating learning communities in lower income urban areas where all students, particularly those who have not succeeded in traditional schools, can reach their potential. The school also created mission-specific goals that it has committed to meet each year. These goals were amended in 2013 as part of its charter renewal and reflect changes the leadership is making in the school’s approach to learning. The review team looked for evidence of these new goals being attained in the day-to-day at MAPCS-High School. Beyond “future focus” classes, in which every student participates for one hour each morning to focus on individual goal setting and advising, the team observed limited evidence of the mission and revised charter goals being met.

The review team was most concerned with the lack of high quality classroom instruction observed. On average, just 17% of classrooms received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Instructional Delivery domain. In several classrooms the teacher did not communicate the purpose of the lesson or learning tasks to students. As a general matter student participation was minimal across the school. In some classrooms, the lesson consisted of little or no instruction of the course content. In approximately three-fourths of observations, the teachers made little to no attempt to explain the value of the assignment and model what high-quality work looks like. Observers noted that the majority of teachers asked low level thinking questions or ones with a single one or two word answer, such as asking students to define math or English terms, or questions whose response was either a specific number or a specific term. Teachers performed very little assessment or monitoring of student learning. In most of the classrooms observed teachers gave little to no indication of what high quality work looked like. Students did not have the opportunity to evaluate their own work or the work of other students.

On a slightly better note, approximately 45% of observations received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Classroom Environment domain. In the majority of classrooms observed, students seemed only to comply with the teacher's expectations for learning, but they showed little commitment to completing the work at high standards. The school identified "setting expectations that all students are responsible" as an area of focus. However, there was little evidence of this goal being actualized. In some classes, the review team observed students using rude and often profane language. In every instance of observed misbehavior the teacher addressed disrespectful talk or actions among students but with uneven results. In some classrooms the teacher did not consistently model, track or address behavioral issues. In contrast, the review team observed positive and respectful exchanges between teachers and students during some observations. In these classrooms, teachers appeared to be supportive and responsive to students' individual differences.

Despite the overall weak results, the team saw evidence of the school's new leadership addressing the quality of instruction by implementing "Priority Strategies." MAPCS- High School's leadership directed PCSB staff to visit classrooms and attend events during the scheduled day on September 18, 2013 that they felt would demonstrate the intervention and support strategies that the school was implementing. PCSB collected evidence for the following Priority strategies implementation provided by MAPCS- High School's leadership team: the principal's role on building leadership capacity, achieving learning goals, and improving instruction; the teachers engaged in discussion aimed to create a consistent grading system; assessing student learning frequently with standards based assessments; and expecting and monitoring classroom management and instructional practices.

PCSB observed some evidence of implemented strategies designed to illustrate examples of professional learning communities, instructional differentiation and student engagement. During the scheduled observation day, PCSB observed an English and History Professional Learning Community ("PLC") meeting. The English and history teachers discussed ways to calibrate student work. The goal of the PLC meeting was to ensure English and history teachers assessed student work in a consistent manner. In small groups of two or three the teachers discussed the rubric and their thoughts related to the writing samples. One teacher stated that the English department started this process last year. The goal was for the English and History departments to merge, create, and adopt a rubric to grade students' writing assignments. The long-term goal is for the Math and Science department to grade their students' writing assignments in a similar manner.

During the scheduled observation day, PCSB observed teachers and administrators who aimed to increase student engagement and instructional differentiation. In one classroom, the teacher attempted to make connections between the curriculum and their students' interests and experiences. The teacher provided students with several learning options and different paths to demonstrate their content-specific knowledge. PCSB also observed a professional development session led by the school's principal and leadership team. Learning outcomes and success criteria were the topics discussed during the professional development session. The principal asked teachers the following question: "What are the critical skills students need?" The principal identified the following action plan: every teacher will review their lesson plans over the next two days, and add an outcome to what teachers expect students to learn. The principal wants teachers to submit daily lesson plans with more details on expected content related outcomes.

CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

This table summarizes Maya Angelou PCS’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 |
|---|--|
| <p>Mission: The mission of Maya Angelou Public Charter School is to create learning communities in lower income urban areas where all students, particularly those who have not succeeded in traditional schools, can reach their potential. At Maya Angelou PCS, students develop academic, social and employment skills that they need to build rewarding lives and promote positive change in the community.</p> | <p>The review team observed limited evidence that the school is meeting its mission of creating a learning community in which lower income urban students can reach their potential. While PCSB observed a behavior specialist, counselors and other therapeutic staff in classrooms working with students identified by the teacher as needing additional support, they also saw students act disrespectfully to one another and not work to their potential.</p> <p>One class that did speak directly to the mission was the “future focus” classes, which occur each morning for one hour. During these classes reviewers saw students create individual goals.</p> <p>However, in just 17% of the classrooms was the instruction rated proficient or exemplary and in fewer than half of the observations was the classroom management proficient or exemplary, which puts into question how prepared students will be for college or careers upon graduation.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| 50% of students in grades 9-10 will meet their assigned growth targets in English in school years 1-5, 60% in school years 6-10, and 70% in school years 11-15. | Only 14% of the classrooms observed received a ranking of proficient, and none exemplary, in the Engaging Students in Learning section of the rubric. The lack of observed student engagement coupled with only 9% of the classrooms observed scoring proficient in using assessment to gauge student understanding, do not support that the school is meeting any of their academic goals. |
| 50% of students in grades 9-10 will meet their assigned growth targets in math in school years 1-5, 60% in school years 6-10, and 70% in school years 11-15. | |
| 40% of students in grades 9-10 will meet their assigned growth targets in writing in school years 2-5, 60% in school years 6-10, 70% in school years 11-15. | |
| 70% of students will graduate high school in six years | <p>In math classrooms the teachers made only minor attempts to engage students in self- or peer assessment and the feedback provided to students was global.</p> <p>In English classrooms the teachers used Read 180 intervention every day. In general only some of the students were intellectually engaged in the lesson and the majority of learning tasks required only recall. For example, in one English class the teacher identified a series of holidays and asked the class if they should be capitalized (e.g., Valentine’s Day, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, etc.). Observers also noted that very few students participated in discussions of content. In two observed English classrooms the review team saw data walls that displayed and tracked student growth.</p> |
| 85% in-seat attendance rate; 20% of truant students and/or students with a history of truancy will be re-engaged to attend MAPCHS or the Maya Adult Charter School | While PCSB did not ask the school for specific enrollment data the limited numbers of students in many classrooms made observers question the school’s ability to meet the goal of 85% in-seat attendance rate. In several observed classes, there were only five to eight students present. In most cases, students were late to class and offered little to no explanation for why they were late to class. |
| Fewer than 30% of students will receive an out-of-school suspension ¹ in years 1-5; fewer than 25% will receive an out-of-school suspension in years 6-15. | The QSR team neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this goal. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>At least 60% of students <i>will score in the average range or better</i> on at least two of three post-test measures on the RSCA in years 1-5; 65% of students will score in the average range or better on at least two of three post-test measures on the RSCA in years 6-15.</p> | <p>The QSR team neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this goal.</p> |
| <p>75% of exiting graduates will enter the workforce or enter into post-secondary education one year after high school graduation.</p> | <p>The QSR team neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this goal.</p> |

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENTS²

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, 45% 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 | In 62% of observations, the review team rated the element of Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport as proficient or above. In most classrooms the review team observed respectful and appropriate behavior on the part of students to teachers and students to students. The review team also observed positive and respectful exchanges between teachers and students. In these classrooms teachers appeared to be supportive and responsive to students' individual differences. Teachers also appeared to make meaningful personal connections to the lives of their students. For example, in two different classes the teacher made general connections to student's lives ("How is your mom/dad doing"; "Did you eat dinner last night?" "Did you not sleep well again last night?") In another observed classroom the teacher attempted to address a student's misbehavior. After two warnings the teacher entered the hallway to notify a member of the discipline team stationed in the hallway. The member of the discipline team entered the classroom and removed the misbehaving student. After approximately 10-15 minutes, the student was escorted back to class. The student then returned to his seat and remained on task for the remainder of the class period. | Limited | 9% |
| | | Satisfactory | 29% |
| | | Proficient | 52% |

² Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

| Class Environment | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|--|--|--------------------|-----|
| | <p>In just over one-third of the observations, students were observed using rude and often profane language between one another. In every instance of observed misbehavior, the teacher addressed the disrespectful talk but with uneven results. For example, in one classroom, some students were rude and discourteous to the teacher and the teacher responded only once saying, "That was rude." The students continued to be rude and argumentative with the teacher.</p> | Exemplary | 10% |
| Establishing a Culture for Learning | <p>MAPCS-High School had previously identified an area of focus as setting the expectation that all students are responsible. However, in approximately three-fourths of observations the teachers made little to no attempt to explain the value of the assignment and model what high-quality work looks like, making it hard for students to take ownership or responsibility of their work. In the majority of classrooms observed students seemed only to comply with the teacher's expectations for learning without showing commitment to produce quality work.</p> | Limited | 9% |
| | <p>In just over one-quarter of observations teachers were proficient or exemplary in Establishing a Culture for Learning. These teachers demonstrated a belief in the ability of their students to succeed. Students were encouraged to focus on accomplishing their goals. In some cases, teachers were observed encouraged student thinking even in instances where students presented wrong answers. For example, in one class the teacher motivated several students by providing them with positive praise, such as "I know you can do this", "This assignment is important; if you want to go to college".</p> | Satisfactory | 62% |
| | | Proficient | 29% |
| | | Exemplary | 0 |

| Class Environment | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|-----|
| Managing Classroom Procedures | <p>In approximately 50% of observations teachers did not effectively implement procedures and transitions. In one science class, the teacher did not appear to have a classroom procedure for how to assign the laptop computers. In addition, some of the students did not know their log-in information associated with the lesson. The log-in one-on-one tutorial consumed a lot of instructional time at the beginning of the lesson and this delayed several students' ability to start/complete the assignment and led to some students being off task (e.g., asleep, talking about non-academic topics.)</p> <p>Observers scored approximately half of the classrooms as proficient in Managing Classroom Procedures. Observers noted that these teachers lost minimal instructional time due to effective management of classroom procedure. In two classrooms students who left class did not interrupt the teacher or other classmates. In another classroom, without prompt, students effectively used binders to store materials and classroom work. The binders were visibly located on a shelf for all students to access. Students observed were also productively engaged in small group work and the classroom routines functioned smoothly. In a science class the teacher prepped the experiment by passing out the materials and assigning students to various clean-up duties at the end of the lesson. In an English class the teacher instructed students to switch their work with a partner and correct any mistakes.</p> | Limited | 29% |
| | | Satisfactory | 19% |
| | | Proficient | 52% |
| | | Exemplary | 0% |
| Managing Student Behavior | <p>In approximately 60% of observations observers rated the management of student behavior as satisfactory or below. In most of these classrooms observers noticed students repeatedly violated classroom rules and teachers who did not effectively manage student behavior. In two classrooms the teachers did not consistently model, track or address behavioral issues. In one classroom disruptive student behavior interrupted the instruction. Additionally, some students repeatedly violated classroom rules and the teachers did not apply any consequences for misbehavior.</p> | Limited | 19% |
| | | Satisfactory | 43% |

| Class Environment | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|-------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| | <p>Observers rated the management of student behavior as proficient or exemplary in approximately 40% of observations. In these rooms behavior was generally appropriate, with little to no evidence of misbehavior. Students were productively engaged in the classroom-wide discussion and demonstrated no misbehavior. In cases when students needed to be redirected they responded in a positive manner.</p> | Proficient | 19% |
| | | Exemplary | 19% |

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, 17% of classrooms received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Instructional Delivery domain.

| Instructional Delivery | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|--------------------|-----|
| Communicating with Students | <p>Almost three-fourths of the observations were not proficient in Communicating with Students. Students' responses to teacher's instruction were mixed and uneven with high to minimal levels of student participation. In some classrooms, the lesson consisted of little or no instruction of the course content and the purpose of the lesson or learning task was not communicated to students.</p> <p>Approximately 28% of observations demonstrated proficiency in Communicating with Students. In two science classrooms the teacher clearly defined the learning goals, provided an overview of what students were responsible for learning and recalled the appropriate background information needed to complete the assignment. Students engaged with the learning activity and indicated that they understand what they were expected to do.</p> | Limited | 29% |
| | | Satisfactory | 43% |
| | | Proficient | 28% |
| | | Exemplary | 0 |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques | <p>Observers rated Using Questioning And Discussion Techniques below proficient in approximately 86% of the observations. The majority of teachers asked low level questions or ones with a single one or two word answer, such as asking students to define math or English terms, or questions whose response was either a specific number or a specific term. In one</p> | Limited | 29% |

| Instructional Delivery | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| | <p>classroom the teacher failed to ask students any content-specific questions.</p> <p>Many of the questions could be answered by “yes/no” versus open-ended. For example, an English teacher identified a series of holidays and asked the class if they should be capitalized (e.g., Valentine’s Day, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, etc.). Observers also noted that very few students participated in discussions of content, even in the few situations when a teacher asked higher-level questions. In another classroom observed only two students provided the answers to questions posed by the teacher. The teacher made no explicit attempt to engage the other students in the class</p> <p>Observers noticed limited examples of proficiency (approximately 14%) in questioning. In one classroom the teacher encouraged students to discuss results from their science experiment with one another and to report at least part of their results to the whole class. The teacher provided the students with open-ended questions. For example, the students were prompted to complete the following sentence: “After experimenting I discovered ____ and (proved or disproved) my hypothesis” and to include a summary sentence.</p> | Satisfactory | 57% |
| | | Proficient | 14% |
| | | Exemplary | 0 % |
| Engaging Students in Learning | <p>Just 20% of the observations scored proficient or exemplary in Engaging Students in Learning. In the majority of classrooms students had little to no choice in how they completed learning tasks. Few students were intellectually engaged in the lesson. The majority of students completed the same problem set. In some cases students were engaged but were not given many opportunities to actively discuss or present their work. In one science class few students were intellectually engaged in the lesson. Instead, the students were asleep, playing games on their cell phones, or discussing non-academic topics. The academic rigor of many activities seemed low; for example, in one 11th grade English class the assignment was to identify words</p> | Limited | 34% |
| | | Satisfactory | 52% |

| Instructional Delivery | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---------------------------------|--|--------------------|-----|
| | <p>or phrases that needed to be capitalized.</p> <p>In a small number of observations (approximately 14%), students were generally engaged. In one classroom students had choice in how they completed the learning task, and were able to select one of three scientific experiments to complete. The students seemed to enjoy this academic freedom and, as a result, were actively engaged and excited to present their findings to their small group partners and to the class as a whole.</p> | Proficient | 14% |
| | | Exemplary | 0% |
| Using Assessment in Instruction | <p>Over 90% of observations scored below proficient in Using Assessment in Instruction. Most teachers performed very little assessment or monitoring of student learning. In one such classroom the teacher made no effort to determine whether students did not understand the lesson, nor did the lesson give students the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding. In most classrooms observed students do not have the opportunity to evaluate their own work or the work of other students. In most of the classrooms observed teachers gave little to no indication of what high quality work looked like.</p> <p>In approximately 9% of observed classrooms students were invited to assess their own work or the work of their classmates. In one class the teacher used the exit ticket and specific feedback to provide students an opportunity to present their work. In this same class the teacher monitored student work by circulated the classroom and checked students work and, when needed, provided assistance.</p> | Limited | 29% |
| | | Satisfactory | 62% |
| | | Proficient | 9% |
| | | 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 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. |
| Organizing Physical Space | Teacher makes poor use of the physical environment, resulting in unsafe or inaccessible conditions for some students or a serious mismatch between the furniture arrangement and the lesson activities. | Teacher’s classroom is safe, and essential learning is accessible to all students, but the furniture arrangement only partially supports the learning activities. | Teacher’s classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; teacher uses physical resources well and ensures that the arrangement of furniture supports the learning activities. | Teacher’s classroom is safe, and students contribute to ensuring that the physical environment supports the learning of all students. |

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 situated 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 many 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. |
| Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness | Teacher adheres to the instruction plan in spite of evidence of poor student understanding or of students' lack of interest, and fails to respond to students' questions; teacher assumes no responsibility for students' failure. | Teacher demonstrates moderate flexibility and responsiveness to students' needs and interests, and seeks to ensure success of all students. | Teacher seeks ways to ensure successful learning for all students, making adjustments as needed to instruction plans and responding to student interest and questions. | Teacher is highly responsive to students' interests and questions, making major lesson adjustments if necessary, and persists in ensuring the success of all students. |

SCHOOL INTERVENTION AND SUPPORT STRATEGIES

This table summarizes Maya Angelou PCS’s intervention and support strategies as detailed in its web-based Intervention and Support Plan, and the evidence that the PCSB staff member observed of the school implementing those strategies during both the scheduled day and the unscheduled observation window for the Fall 2013 Qualitative Site Review for the purposes of the 2012 ESEA Flexibility Waiver. PCSB leaves it to the discretion of school leadership to determine the best use of time during the scheduled day of observation for the purposes of Focus/Priority intervention strategies. As such, it may not be possible to observe certain strategies chosen by the school. In cases where PCSB did not have the opportunity to observe the strategy, we will use the standard language of ‘While the 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 observed 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.

| <i>Area</i> | <i>Indicator</i> | <i>Strategy</i> | <i>Evidence Collected</i> |
|---|---|---|--|
| School Leadership and Decision-Making: Establishing a team structure with specific duties and time for instructional planning | <p>ID11: Teachers are organized into grade-level, grade-level cluster, or subject-area instructional teams</p> <p>ID05: All teams maintain official minutes of their meetings</p> <p>ID10: The school’s Leadership Team regularly looks at school performance data and aggregated classroom observation data and uses that data to</p> | <p>ID11: <u>Full Implementation:</u> Teachers are organized by grade-level in academies. These grade-level academies meet weekly to discuss instructional strategies, student data, and academic interventions. Academies plan grade-level activities and events to enhance student participation and involvement as well. Teachers are also organized by department. Departments meet weekly to discuss curriculum and resources, pacing, and instructional strategies. Each department has its own common planning time to further refine and enhance the delivery of their curriculum. To sustain these efforts, all teachers, by academy and department must meet weekly. Administration must continue to provide time for grade-level academies to meet as well as common planning periods by department. Teachers must utilize common planning time effectively to discuss and evaluate data, make curricular decisions, and strategically plan.</p> <p>ID05: Mr. Roorda will follow up with departments, teams, and/or academy’s to ensure timely completion of minutes.</p> | <p>During the scheduled observation day, PCSB observed an English and History Professional Learning Community (PLC) meeting. During this meeting, the teachers discussed ways to “calibrate student work”, across all English and History classes. The lead teacher handed out various student writing samples to all teachers in attendance. The teachers also discussed a rubric and were instructed to evaluate each student’s writing sample on a scale of 1-4. In small groups, the teachers discussed the rubric and thoughts related to the writing samples.</p> <p>One teacher stated that the English department started this process last year and the goal is for English and</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| | make decisions about school improvement and professional development needs | <p>ID10: <u>Full Implementation:</u> When this objective is fully met in our school there will be a clear path of communication and work flow around student performance and professional development activities. Horizontal and vertical discussions will be held to ensure that all stakeholders in school improvement will remain "in the know" regarding how the data is used. The evidence that will be provided will include student performance and observation data and meetings minutes of all teams along with the professional development plan.</p> | <p>History departments to merge, create, and adopt a universal writing standard with a goal of reaching out to the Math and Science department to assign students' writing assignments in a similar manner.</p> <p>The teachers then engaged in discussion aimed to create a consistent grading system.</p> |
| School Leadership and Decision Making: Focusing the principal's role on building leadership capacity, achieving learning goals, and improving instruction | IE08: The principal spends at least 50% of his/her time working directly with teachers to improve instruction, including classroom observations. | <p><u>Limited Development:</u> The principal currently spends 40% of his time working directly with teachers to improve instruction. This includes but is not limited to observing classrooms. The principal keeps notes on his meetings with teachers, as well as a schedule for classroom observations, both formal and informal. In addition, the principal's observation data is kept in Teachscape for review.</p> <p><u>When Fully Met:</u> The principal creates and adheres to a schedule of observations and teacher meetings so that he spends at least 50% of his time working directly with teachers and addressing classroom instruction. The principal delegates some responsibilities so that his schedule allows for adequate time to hold pre-observation conferences, observe entire classes for every teacher at least once a quarter, and hold post-observation conferences.</p> | <p>During the scheduled observation day, a PCSB staff member attended a discipline and attendance meeting. During the attendance meeting, the principal met with the chief academic officer, a teacher and two other school leaders to discuss current attendance policies and processes. The committee described how they handled daily absences and various strategies (e.g., home calls, home visits, parent/teacher conferences) to reduce student absences. Next, the committee reviewed attendance data and the role of the PMF and internal goals related to attendance. The Principal highlights that 9th grade has the lowest attendance rate and hypothesizes that it is probably related to the transition to a new school. The principal would like to develop a strategy to target new student attendance (especially 9th graders). The principal acknowledged that weekly attendance data is "trending in the right direction."</p> <p>The committee identified the</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>following next steps: develop an incentive plan for all students (truant and non-truant students), schedule meetings for students who are over or near the 5 absences; keep identifying students in jeopardy of absences, and work with team teachers to identify students with notes for excused absences.</p> |
| <p>Curriculum, Assessment, and Instructional Planning: Assessing student learning frequently with standards based assessments</p> | <p>IID09: Instructional Teams use student learning data to plan instruction</p> | <p>IID09: <u>Limited Development:</u> Teachers use formal and informal assessment data to monitor learning. This assessment occurs in every class at least once every two weeks. Teachers have common planning time by department every day, as well as common planning time every Wednesday with their grade level.</p> <p>Up to this point, we have not tracked how teachers use student learning data to plan instruction. There is some evidence that this tracking occurs in teacher's lesson plans. Occasionally, teachers re-teach standards based on their formal and/or informal assessments.</p> <p>When Fully Met: We will utilize an assessment analysis document (created by one of our teachers) to track how teachers use assessment data to modify instruction. This form will be submitted by department twice per quarter.</p> | <p>Discussed above in strategy "ID11".</p> <p>During the scheduled day, PCSB observed a school-wide professional development (PD) session led by the principal. The principal introduced several learning topics, but it was unclear how these topics were aligned to one another. The first topic of the PD was learning outcomes and success criteria. During this part of the session, the principal asked the teachers the following question: "What are the critical skills students need?" And one teacher represented to the group a plan to improve student achievement. The second section led by the principal was to "unpack goals, in which a couple teachers presented different methods. Finally, the principal stated that the next steps for the teachers were to review lesson plans for the next 2 days, and add a student learning outcome. Moving forward, the principal wanted teachers to submit daily lesson plans with more details related to expected content related outcomes.</p> |
| <p>Classroom Instruction: Expecting and monitoring sound instruction in a variety of modes</p> | <p>IIIA06: All teachers test frequently using a variety of evaluation methods and maintain a record of the results</p> | <p><u>Limited Development:</u> All core-content area teachers give quarterly exams using Scantron Achievement Series. Some teachers give unit or chapter tests and even weekly quizzes. In addition, a few teachers use informal assessments to grade student participation in classroom activities. Further, some teachers use alternative assessments to evaluate their students' mastery of standards. These assessments are often counted as</p> | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | <p>quiz or test grades.</p> <p>Evidence of these various evaluation methods can be found in teacher's grade books in PowerTeacher.</p> <p>Further use of Scantron Achievement Series for unit tests, chapter tests, and bi-weekly assessments should occur.</p> <p>Additionally, teachers must utilize more alternative assessments that allow for student creativity.</p> <p><u>When Full Met:</u> All core-content teachers will utilize Scantron Achievement Series for quarterly exams as well as at least on other time per quarter for some other sort of assessment. In addition, all teachers will utilize alternative assessments at least twice per quarter.</p> <p>An accurate record of all of these assessments will be maintained by every teacher in PowerTeacher.</p> <p>The Dean of Academics will monitor Powerteacher twice a month to ensure this plan is met.</p> | |
| School Leadership and Decision-Making: Recruiting, evaluating, rewarding, and replacing staff | IG12: The LEA/School assesses the evaluation process periodically to gauge its quality and utility. | All administrators and teachers will receive training in the Danielson framework of teacher evaluation in summer 2013. Administrators and the Director of Academics will use TeachScape as a tool to record observations. Teachers will receive a minimum of two evaluations per year. | While PCSB did not observe training in the Danielson framework of teacher evaluations in summer 2013, there was little evidence that teachers were using the training to improve their instructional delivery. Only 17% of all teachers scored proficient or exemplary in this domain. |
| Classroom Instruction: Expecting and monitoring sound classroom management | IIC14: The school uses relevant data to inform appropriate actions for continually improving the | <p><u>Full Implementation:</u></p> <p>Quarterly data talks</p> <p>Monthly attendance validation</p> <p>PBIS training by CPI</p> <p>Revision of the Code of Conduct</p> <p>Revision of the attendance policy</p> <p>Re-activate the discipline committee</p> <p>Enhanced training for counseling interns</p> | <p>PCSB did not observe quarterly data talks or any of the other items that appear in the full implementation column.</p> <p>However, only 14% of the teachers scored proficient or exemplary in using assessments to check for understanding.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | climate and culture of the school | Enhancements to the SSST process Increased synergy between the Maya Angelou Academy and the Young Adult Learning Center | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|