DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

March 5, 2014

Sterling Ward, Board Chair
Paul Public Charter School
5800 8th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Ward:

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 is eligible to petition for 15-year Charter Renewal during the 2014-15 school year.

Qualitative Site Review Report
A QSR team conducted on-site review visits of Paul Public Charter School between January 13 and January 24, 2014. 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. We also visited a board meeting in order to observe the school's governance as it relates to fulfilling its mission, and charter goals.

Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review report focuses primarily on the following areas: charter mission and goals, classroom environments, and instructional delivery.

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

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: School Leader

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Paul Public Charter School ("Paul PCS") serves students in grade six through eight at its Middle School campus and grades nine and ten at its International High School campus, both located at 5800 8th Street, NW. The school serves 662 students LEA-wide, 412 students at its Middle School Campus and 250 students at its International High School Campus. DC Public Charter School Board ("PCSB") conducted a QSR at both campuses in January 2014 because Paul PCS is eligible for 15-year Charter Renewal during the 2014-15 school year. Paul PCS had been a junior high school, serving grades 6-9. In 2013 the school applied for and was approved to operate a high school and the 2013-14 school year is the first year that it is operating its high school, with grades 9 and 10 only. At full capacity, the LEA will serve grades 6-12.

PCSB conducted observations over a two-week window, from January 13 through January 24, 2014. A team of three PCSB staff members and three consultants (including a Special Education Consultant) conducted observations of 30 classrooms (18 middle school classrooms and 12 high school classrooms), including classrooms where more than one teacher was present. The spirit of the QSR process is to identify the educational experience for all students, inclusive of students with disabilities, at a particular school. The results of this QSR reflect what the QSR team observed in all learning environments within your school, including the six Special Education classroom observations in inclusion, co-teaching, and pull-out settings. Observers visited the school on multiple days throughout this two-week window and saw classes in the morning and in the afternoon, with some observers spending almost entire days at the school. In some instances, the review team may have observed one teacher twice. In addition to this two-week window, PCSB also attended a Board of Trustees meeting to observe the school's governance as it relates to fulfilling its mission and charter goals.

Paul PCS is making progress towards meeting the goals of the Performance Management Framework in diverse ways. In English Language Arts classes, teachers explicitly taught vocabulary development by focusing on prefixes and root words, students read and analyzed poetry, and wrote essays. In math classes, students learned procedures for solving quadratic equations and algebraic expressions and were able to explain their strategies to fellow classmates. Teachers promoted 8th grade math proficiency by explicitly teaching the procedure for solving problems and by modeling strategies for students to practice on their own. Teachers assessed student understanding mainly through whole-class questioning. Teachers created supportive learning environments by greeting students in warm and welcoming ways, asking students about their well-being, and offering individual support as needed.

Across the middle and high schools observers rated 73% of classrooms as proficient or above in the Classroom Environment domain. Observers rated 67% of middle school observations as proficient or above in the domain of Classroom Environment. The highest rated element within the Classroom Environment domain in middle school was Managing Student Behavior with 83% of classroom observations rated as proficient or

exemplary. Throughout classroom observations, student behavior was generally appropriate. Teachers addressed rare instances of misbehavior in effective ways by talking to students individually, gestures, narration of positive behavior, and by pre-empting misbehavior through proximity. Observers rated high school classrooms higher, with 81% of observations as proficient or above in the domain of Classroom Environment. The highest rated element within this domain in high school were Establishing a Culture for Learning, with 92% of classrooms rated as proficient or above. Teachers generally recognized the efforts of students and encouraged students to recognize the efforts of their peers. Students generally put forth good effort to complete high quality work products.

Across the middle and high schools, observers rated 56% of classrooms as proficient or above in the Instructional Delivery domain, with the middle school scoring lower than the high school. Observers rated only 43% of middle school observations as proficient or above in the domain of Instructional Delivery, which is low for a school going into its 15th year. The highest rated elements within the Instructional Delivery domain in middle school classrooms was Engaging Students in Learning with 50% of classroom observations rated as proficient or exemplary. In about half of the middle school classrooms, student engagement was high as students participated in activities aligned with learning objectives and showed enthusiasm for activities by asking academically focused questions. The review team rated Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques and Using Assessment in Instruction the lowest, with under half of the classrooms in middle school (39%) scoring proficient or exemplary. Questioning seemed to consist mainly of those requiring pre-determined, one word answers, as opposed to open-ended questions requiring deeper thinking. Observers rated high school classrooms higher in the domain of Instructional Delivery, with 75% of classrooms rated as proficient or above. The highest rated element within this domain was Communicating with Students, with 92% of high school classrooms rated as proficient or above. Teachers presented content in clear ways, often modeling the procedure for students to practice and by inviting students to explain their thinking. Like in the middle school classrooms, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques was the lowest rated element, with 42% of observations rated as proficient or above. As observed in middle school, questioning consisted mainly of those requiring pre-determined answers.

CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS, AND BOARD GOVERNANCE

This table summarizes Paul PCS 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. Paul PCS adopted the goals of the Performance Management Framework for school year 2013-2014.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
Mission: The mission of Paul PCS is to offer all students a quality academic education, which will enable them to become responsible and productive individuals, critical and independent thinkers, cooperative team players and outstanding community leaders.	The review team observed various ways in which Paul PCS is making progress on fulfilling its mission. With regard to the quality of instruction, the review team rated nearly two-thirds of observations as proficient or above in the elements of Communicating with Students and Engaging Students in Learning. The review team generally saw clear presentations of content, with teachers often modeling the process before requiring students to do them independently. Students had the opportunity to participate in content delivery, particularly in math classes as they described their strategies for solving particular problems. In most classrooms, students remained highly engaged in learning activities aligned to learning objectives. However, the review team rated only 40% of observations as proficient or above in Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques. Questions generally required only recall of facts or procedures, and opportunities for students to engage in discussion directly with each other were inconsistent. For further information on the quality of the academic program, please see the elements under the Instructional Delivery domain. The review team observed limited evidence of teachers fostering independent thinking. The domain of the Danielson Framework correlating with independent thinking, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, received the lowest ratings, with just 40% (overall) of the classrooms scoring proficient or exemplary. In those classrooms that were proficient students completed independent work such as essays and graphic organizers. In one observation, students completed math problems individually on the board and teachers

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	invited fellow classmates to provide feedback. In others, students read independently, analyzed poetry, and completed essays incorporating feedback from their instructors. The school promoted the development of cooperative team players through small group and pair work. Students worked in pairs to complete technology activities using computers, finish graphic organizers about early humans, and analyze poetry. Students shared research resources with each other in a history class in order to complete projects. In most classrooms, however, observers saw only teacher-student interaction, with limited or no cooperative work. The review team saw a couple of examples of the development of students as community members. However evidence of this was not widespread throughout the school. One member of the review team spoke to students in the student government. The students explained that the school gave them autonomy to design activities for Black History Month. In a French class, the teacher promoted leadership by appointing student leaders at learning stations; these group leaders were those students who could provide language support to the other students.
PMF Goal #1: Student Progress – Academic improvement over time *Effective instruction supporting student academic progress and achievement in reading.*	In about half of the English Language Arts classes the review team observed instructional strategies and activities to improve academic achievement over time (PMF Goal #1). Teachers focused on language development through discussions on prefixes, roots of words, and idioms. Students read and analyzed literature and poetry. Students also read stories together in a class for English language learners and wrote essays incorporating teacher feedback. Students in one class read articles and answered questions about inventions that would most improve human life.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
PMF Goal #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards *Moving students to advanced levels of proficiency in reading*	With regard to meeting or exceeding academic standards in English Language Arts (PMF Goal #2), observers noted limited evidence of differentiated activities. Most observers recorded the entire class participating in the same activity with little choice or differentiation in the process of the learning activity; students read the same piece (short story, poem, or articles) and answered questions requiring one-word, seemingly predetermined answers. The review team saw some examples of differentiation in product, as when students completed graphic organizers and wrote essays. The lack of differentiating that would allow students to move to advanced levels of reading appears to stem from the lack of informally assessing students. While the review team noted that one classroom was taking a formal language assessment, teachers, when they assessed for understanding, used whole-group questioning.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
PMF Goal #1: Student Progress – Academic improvement over time *Effective instruction supporting student academic progress and achievement in math* **PMF Goal #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards** *Moving students to advanced levels of proficiency in math*	The review team observed widespread instructional strategies throughout math classes to improve academic achievement over time (PMF Goal #1). In most math classes students completed math problems on the board, explained how they solved the problem to the rest of the class, while their classmates critiqued the solution.. With regard to meeting or exceeding academic standards in math (PMF Goal #2), the review team found limited evidence of differentiation in math, either in process or product. As described above, students completed algebraic expressions as a class, with seemingly predetermined steps, as teachers asked questions like, "What are the first three steps to completing this problem?" Teachers assessed student understanding predominantly through one method, by asking for student volunteers to explain answers or give the solution, though in some classrooms students provided feedback directly to each other. In many observations, teachers asked for a "thumbs up" if students understood without gathering evidence (beyond self-reported evidence) of student understanding.
PMF Goal #3: Gateway – Outcomes in key subjects that predict future educational success *Promotion of reading proficiency by third grade and math proficiency by eighth grade*	Teachers promoted math proficiency by 8th grade at Paul PCS. As described above, teachers explicitly taught and asked students to memorize the strategy for approaching math problems. Students practiced explaining their approach to fellow classmates. Teachers also modeled how to solve problems for students. The review team heard references to and saw evidence on data walls of Achievement Network ("ANet") testing throughout the school.
PMF Goal #4: Leading Indicators – Predictors of future student progress and achievement	Most teachers were warm and supportive towards students, as described in detail in the Classroom Environment element of Creating

Mission and Goals	Evidence
Culture of learning and support in the classrooms	an Environment of Respect and Rapport. Most teachers addressed occasions of disrespect in a way that maintained student dignity, by counseling them privately. In one observation students appeared unfocused at the beginning of class, and the teacher responded by saying, "I'll give you time to settle down." Teachers talked about offering after-school tutoring (which no one observed), and opportunities to talk to students after school about their grades. The review team observed special education students supported through co-teaching and inclusion settings. . Special education teachers also worked with individuals in pull-out settings. In some observations where more than one teacher was present, the review team concluded that teachers must have jointly planned lessons, as teachers alternated presentations of content throughout the instructional period, and it was difficult for them to confirm who the "lead" teacher was and who the special education teacher was.
Board Governance	A member of the PCSB staff attended the Paul PCS Board of Trustees meeting on January 28, 2014. A quorum was present. After the approval of the last meeting minutes, the board discussed potential new members. These included Melissa Kim from the New Schools Venture Fund, Pamela Long who has experience in marketing and communications, and Richard Rome who has a background in real estate. The board approved membership of all candidates. The board discussed building expansion, finances, and enrollment. The CEO then shared a report on the school's preparation for renewal and the Qualitative Site Review. The school is working on developing a new curriculum for 11th grade with support from Trustee Albright, New Schools Venture Fund, and Principal Wilson. The CEO also discussed mid-year surveys administered to stakeholders (teachers, parents, staff and students), visits to high performing schools, ANet rescheduling, searching for additional instructional staff for SY 14-15, academic intervention on "Smart Sundays," and the arrival of Japanese exchange

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	students. The meeting concluded with a presentation by the Development Director.

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, 73% of classroom observations received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Classroom Environment domain. In middle school, observers rated 67% of observations as proficient or above. In high school, observers rated 81% of observations as proficient or above.

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	Overall	Middle School	High School
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Observers rated 77% of the observations as proficient or exemplary in Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport. In these classrooms, interactions between teachers and students were respectful and positive. Teachers encouraged support among classmates by asking students to "clap it up" or "stomp it up" to congratulate each other for high quality responses to questions. Teachers responded to students' incorrect responses respectfully. In another observation, the teacher sat beside a student to help with the assignment. Teachers asked students about their well-being, with questions such as, "How are you feeling today?" and "What happened today?" The review team rated about one quarter of the observations as below proficient. Interactions in these classrooms were not	Limited	3%	6%	0%
		Satisfactory	20%	22%	17%
		Proficient	67%	61%	75%

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

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	Overall	Middle School	High School
	always respectful, with teachers attempting to respond to disrespectful behavior among students with inconsistent results. Students sometimes demonstrated disrespect for the teacher by talking back, refusing to follow the teacher's directions, or failing to quiet down as fellow classmates shared responses. In some observations, teachers did not address students' disrespectful behavior. One teacher did not address a student asleep on their desk and another teacher did not correct a student who was shooting paper into a trashcan.	Exemplary	10%	11%	8%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	Observers rated 60% of the observations as proficient or exemplary in Establishing a Culture for Learning. In these classrooms student questions and comments demonstrated a desire to understand the content, such as in one classroom where the teacher asked students to share their strategy for arriving at a math problem's solution and students self-corrected as they narrated their approach. Teachers in these classrooms demonstrated a high regard for student abilities. In one observation the teacher began a question with, "What super smart scholar can…" In another observation, the teacher complimented the student's specific academic behavior by saying, "I like the language you used when you said, 'we must substitute what's in the parenthesis for an equivalent.'" The teacher in another observation commended student effort, "As long as we're showing progress, I'm satisfied." Students cheered for each other after whole-class presentations in one observation, and the teacher asked students to, "Clap your hands for the two	Limited	7%	11%	0%
		Satisfactory	33%	50%	8%

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	Overall	Middle School	High School
	students who were brave enough to try a problem that they were not sure how to do." The review team noted the character trait of the month, which was self-discipline, posted on boards in multiple classrooms; many classrooms had posted student work about the trait, including word associations. However, in 40% of the observations students appeared to work on tasks out of compliance, not self-motivation with some students only engaging in work when the teacher stood next to them. Teachers' energy appeared neutral in some observations, as demonstrated in one observation where the teacher only asked low-level questions geared toward task completion and in another classroom where a student requested specific feedback and the teacher did not respond. In another observation, the teacher's response to a student's incorrect answer was to tell the student to write the correct answer down, without the opportunity to think through the problem or strategy. In some observations, teachers emphasized only external rewards for completing learning tasks, such as candy or field trips.	Proficient	53%	33%	83%
		Exemplary	7%	6%	8%
Managing Classroom Procedures	Observers rated 73% of the observations as proficient or exemplary in Managing Classroom Procedures. In most observations, classrooms had specific procedures in place and students knew what they were supposed to do. Students knew to raise their hands when they had something to say. In many classrooms, students immediately came into the class, took out their homework and completed the Do Now without prompting	Limited	0%	0%	0%

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	Overall	Middle School	High School
	by the teacher. Teachers across classroom observations directed students to read from their books when they finished the required learning task, ensuring students were involved in productive work at all times. Transitions between group activities and independent work were smooth, with little loss of instructional time. Students in some classrooms participated in routines and procedures; in one classroom a student was responsible for keeping track of the bathroom pass and in other classrooms students passed out materials and took attendance. Teachers across a few classrooms used the "first five" system where they celebrated the first five students to get to class. The review team rated about one quarter of classroom observations as below proficient with no classrooms rated as limited. In these observations small groups were only partially engaged, especially if the teacher was working with a different group. In one observation one group of students was shooting paper into trash bins, while another group was sitting idle after finishing their task without moving on to their next station. In another observation, the teacher continued to repeat expectations with inconsistent results as students socialized instead of completing the Do Nows. In some observations the class lost instructional time as students were either unaware of or ignored classroom routines for beginning their learning tasks. Teachers ignored off-task behavior in some classrooms.	Satisfactory	27%	33%	25%
		Proficient	70%	67%	75%
		Exemplary	3%	6%	0%

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	Overall	Middle School	High School
Managing Student Behavior	Observers rated 80% of the observations as proficient or exemplary in Managing Student Behavior. Teachers had established standards of conduct and posted these in many classrooms, with signs across classrooms saying, "Be respectful, responsible, and ready." Teachers waited for compliance with expectations before continuing on with the learning activity. Behavior across classrooms was generally appropriate. Teachers monitored and tracked student behavior through a point system in many classrooms. Teachers responded to student misbehavior with little lesson disruption, with looks, proximity, pauses, gestures, or by asking students academically-focused questions. In one observation, the teacher effectively refocused a student's negative behavior by asking the student to be the class timekeeper. Teachers acknowledged good behavior by narrating the specific behaviors they wanted to see and through encouraging words such as, "Good job, Table One!" and "You're right on target!" In 20% of the observations teacher responses to off-task behavior were inconsistent, such as in one classroom where a student was asleep on the desk without acknowledgement while the teacher told another student who requested to go to the bathroom to wait for a more appropriate time. The teachers in a couple of observations struggled to maintain order and had to continue giving warnings and discussing expectations with inconsistent results.	Limited	3%	6%	0%
		Satisfactory	17%	11%	25%
		Proficient	77%	78%	75%
		Exemplary	3%	6%	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, just over half (56%) of classroom observations received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Instructional Delivery domain. This is low for a school going into its 15th year of operation. In middle school, observers rated only 43% of classroom observations as proficient or above. In high school, observers rated classrooms higher, with 75% of observations rated as proficient or above.

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	Overall	Middle School	High School
Communicating with Students	Observers rated 63% of the observations as proficient in Communicating with Students, with none scoring exemplary. In these classrooms observers saw teachers modeling learning tasks, explaining specific vocabulary words and phrases, and showed students how to explain their strategies for solving math problems. In math classes students put their math problems on the board and fellow students provided feedback as to the parts of the solution they supported and other parts with which they disagreed. In another classroom focused on English Language Arts students explained their analysis of a poem. In several classrooms across subject areas, teachers communicated how lessons fit into the broader content unit. Teachers generally communicated directions and activities clearly, particularly by writing the learning tasks on the board.	Limited	7%	6%	8%
		Satisfactory	30%	50%	0%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	Overall	Middle School	High School
	In the remaining 37% of the observations, teachers' explanation of content did not invite students to actively engage, resulting in unclear directions and understanding. In one observation the teacher attempted to tell students how to refer to evidence in the text for strong constructed responses. However, when the teacher was finished the students asked many questions indicating that they did not fully understand and resulting in the lesson taking longer than necessary. Students in another classroom appeared to be confused about the learning task, as they continued to ask the teacher clarifying questions and directions. In another observation the teacher asked students to copy down what was on the board, which contained several errors. In a math class observation the teacher made a content error and did not address it throughout the observation period.	Proficient	63%	44%	92%
		Exemplary	0%	0%	0%
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	Observers rated under half (40%) of the observations as proficient in Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, with none scoring exemplary. In these observations, teachers facilitated discussion among students. In one math class, students provided feedback on parts of their fellow classmates' math solutions. In a social studies class, students compared their graphic organizers in pairs. In several	Limited	10%	17%	0%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	Overall	Middle School	High School
	observations, teachers asked students to call on peers for additional responses to questions. Teachers in other math classes asked students probing questions to get students to talk through their solutions. While some teachers began by asking questions requiring one-word answers, they followed up with questions such as "Why?" and "How do you know?" In other observations, teachers asked students more open-ended questions, such as "Can religion cause war?" and asked students to explain their answers. The review team rated over half of the observations (60%) as below proficient. Questioning was generally low-level, and required pre-determined, one word answers with no follow-up from the teacher to extend learning or probe thinking. One math class focused on measurements and conversions and another focused on one-word answer without explanation on a worksheet. Questions and discussions mainly required the recall of procedures. For example, teachers asked students to state the first steps in approaching math problems. Student participation in discussions and questioning was uneven with some teachers relying only on student volunteers to answer questions without ensuring all students participated. In many observations discussion consisted mainly of teacher-to-student interaction as in a classroom where students read a story aloud and the teacher asked low-level comprehension questions to individual students without giving the students any opportunity to talk to each other about the story.	Satisfactory	50%	44%	58%
		Proficient	40%	39%	42%
		Exemplary	0%	0%	0%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	Overall	Middle School	High School
Engaging Students in Learning	Observers rated two-thirds of the observations as proficient in Engaging Students in Learning, with none scoring exemplary. In these classrooms, students were engaged in the learning activities and tasks were generally aligned with objectives written on the board. Students indicated engagement through academically focused questions. Instructional activities in many classrooms consisted of teachers and students working together, students working in pairs, or teachers presenting content in engaging ways. For example, in one class for English language learners the teacher acted out new vocabulary. Pacing in most classrooms was appropriate, with the teacher telling students the amount of time to spend on particular activities and using timers to signal transition to other learning tasks. In one-third of the observations, however, intellectual engagement appeared to be inconsistent. Some students independently read with no actual deliverable beyond logging what pages they had read to. The teacher did not intervene as	Limited	13%	17%	8%
		Satisfactory	23%	33%	8%
		Proficient	63%	50%	83%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	Overall	Middle School	High School
	long as students were quiet, even when students were off-task. In a math classroom students spent the entire class period sorting through past work with no indication of the instructional outcome. Pacing seemed ineffective in some observations, as students worked in centers but seemed to devote more time to socializing rather than academically focused tasks. In another classroom the entire lesson consisted of a presentation by the teacher at the board, and students increasingly lost focus towards the end of the lesson. In some observations, classroom activities provided little to no choice in process or product for students.	Exemplary	0%	0%	0%
Using Assessment in Instruction	Observers rated 57% of the observations as proficient in Using Assessment in Instruction, with none scoring exemplary. In these observations, teachers circulated throughout classrooms to monitor student learning, either asking comprehension questions or by looking at student homework. In one classroom the teacher asked students at the end of the class to reread the lesson's aim (which was on the board) and assess whether or not they met that aim. In another classroom the teacher gauged understanding using exit tickets on which students had to choose a character and extract evidence of the character's traits from a paragraph and explain their answers. Teachers in some classrooms provided individual feedback to students, as in an English language	Limited	3%	6%	0%
		Satisfactory	40%	56%	17%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	Overall	Middle School	High School
	learner class where students wrote short essays and the teacher provided suggestions for improvement on the students' next draft. Feedback in 43% of the observations was often universal rather than individualized, unless students took the initiative to ask questions about their own work. Teachers primarily assessed student learning through whole-class questioning. Some teachers were seen quickly checking homework while circulating through the room. These teachers did not ensure that all students understood the content. In a few classrooms, the review team observed no assessment of understanding. The review team did not see any evidence of teachers assessing students' understanding in a few of the classrooms.	Proficient	57%	39%	83%
		Exemplary	0%	0%	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.