DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

December 20, 2018

Ms. Valerie Smith, Board Chair
Mary McLeod Bethune Day Academy Public Charter School
1404 Jackson Street NE
Washington, DC 20017

Dear Ms. Smith:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, DC PCSB shall monitor the progress of each school in meeting the goals and student academic achievement expectations specified in the school's charter. Your school was selected to undergo a Qualitative Site Review during the 2018-19 school year for the following reason(s):

- School eligible to petition for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2019-20 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report
A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Mary McLeod Bethune Day Academy Public Charter School (MM Bethune PCS) between October 22 – November 2, 2018. Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report focuses primarily on the following areas: classroom environment and instruction.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at MM Bethune PCS

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Dr. Linda McKay, Executive Director

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: December 20, 2018

Campus Information

Campus Name: Mary McLeod Bethune Day Academy Public Charter School (MM Bethune PCS)
Ward: 5
Grade levels: Prekindergarten-3 (PK3) through eighth

Qualitative Site Review (QSR) Information

Reason for Visit: School eligible to petition for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2019-20 school year
Two-week Window: October 22, 2018 – November 2, 2018
QSR Team Members: Two DC PCSB staff members and four consultants including one special education (SPED) specialist and one English Learner (EL) specialist
Number of Observations: 27
Total Enrollment: 402
Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 32
English Language Learners Enrollment: 60
In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:
Visit 1: October 22, 2018 – 87.8%
Visit 2: October 24, 2018 – 95.1%
Visit 3: October 25, 2018 – 86.8%
Visit 4: October 29, 2018 – 91.2%
Visit 5: November 1, 2018 – 94.6%

Summary

MM Bethune PCS's mission is "to provide kindergarten through eighth-grade students with a challenging academic program in a supportive learning environment to prepare them for academic success and positive social development." The school serves grades PK3 through eighth-grade students at two sites located in Ward 5. The school's campus at 1404 Jackson Street NE serves grades PK3 through eighth-grade, and its second campus at 5413 16th Street NW serves grades PK3 through second-grade. During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine Classroom Environment and Instruction (see Appendix I and II) at both sites.

The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team observed moderate evidence of a supportive learning environment and preparation for positive social development, with 68% of observations scored as proficient or above in the Classroom Environment domain. Students demonstrated high levels of social development through their respect for

peers and teachers, with 67% of observations scored as proficient or distinguished in *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport*. Students said “please” and thank you" to each other and teachers. They respectfully corrected one another when needed, asking classmates politely to move from their spot on the carpet. Teachers called students "scholars" and "friends." Students contributed to the creation of classroom rules, and teachers demonstrated caring for students outside of the classroom, greeting parents and guardians in their home language and remembering what students did over the weekend. Multiple classes had routines where students freely shared their feelings and affirmed their friends’ contributions.

However, the QSR team observed weak evidence of a challenging academic program that is preparing students for academic success, with just 42% of observations scored as proficient or distinguished in the Instruction domain. Most questions and discussion followed a single path of inquiry, as reflected in the low (33%) percentage of observations scored as proficient and none as distinguished in *Questioning and Discussion* techniques. Students in the majority of observation had few opportunities for genuine discussion with each other. While most content was grade-appropriate, observers saw little evidence of challenging learning tasks. In *Engaging Students in Learning*, 37% of classrooms were scored proficient or distinguished, with learning tasks in the vast majority of observations requiring recall of facts or following a procedure and no choice in how students complete the tasks.

Governance

Valerie Smith has chaired the MM Bethune PCS Board of Trustees since school year 2011-12. The board meets quarterly. The School Reform Act[1] requires public charter schools to have two parents and a majority of DC residents on the board, a requirement MM Bethune PCS has been compliant with for the past five years. On November 13, 2018, DC PCSB Executive Director Scott Pearson met with MM Bethune PCS' Board Chair, Ms. Valerie Smith and Executive Director, Dr. Linda McKay, to discuss the school's academic performance ahead of its scheduled fifteen-year year charter renewal in school year 2019-20.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

DC PCSB scored 75% of the school’s SPED observations as proficient or distinguished in the Classroom Environment, while only 17% of SPED observations scored proficient or distinguished in the Instruction domain. Prior to the two-week window, MM Bethune PCS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). Reviewers looked for evidence of the school’s articulated program. Overall, the school’s program unevenly implemented accommodations which

[1] https://www.dcpcsb.org/policy/school-reform-act

included offering different modes of presentation, multiple co-teaching models, and instructional technology for instruction and assessment to support the learning of SWDs.

- To demonstrate that co-planning occurred, the school explained that various models of co-teaching would be evident. The school stated that observers might see lesson plans with clearly defined roles for each teacher. The QSR team observed this in only one classroom. The assistant teacher passed out laptops while the other teacher administered ClassDojo points[2]. The school also stated that all instructional staff would provide feedback and differentiation to students. In all of the SPED observations, there was little evidence of differentiation as the students received the same materials, objectives, and content. Only individual student support provided by the classroom teacher was differentiated, with some students working directly with the teacher and other students working independently. Observers did not see any differentiation for SWDs regarding access to support staff and materials. There was little feedback offered other than “good job” or comments on student behavior such as “I see that Student X is working… I need all eyes on me… Have a seat and let’s get back to work” or “I need zero level voices.”
- To support the learning of SWD, the school reported that they offer resources such as highly qualified personnel and technological resources which collect student formative assessment data on iReady[3]. In all of the SPED observations, teachers referenced the iReady platform saying, “Remember this for when you go on iReady.” In one classroom the students were engaged in the iReady platform for the entire period. As referenced in the school’s SPED Questionnaire as a resource for supporting SWDs, all of the classrooms engaged in the school-wide behavioral system with "dojo points" to manage behavior.
- As a program that uses co-teaching, the school said reviewers would observe One Teach, One Observe, Station Teaching, Parallel Teaching, Alternative Teaching, Teaming, and One Teach, One Assist. The SPED specialist on the QSR team observed the following models: One Teach, One Assist; One Teach, One Observe; and Station Teaching. The school stated that all general education teachers are paired with a grade level SPED teacher and that all classrooms would have one teacher of record and one Instructional Assistant and/or SPED co-teacher. However, only two of the classes followed this model out of the four SPED observations. In one of the classrooms, a Spanish teacher

[2] Classdojo.com: ClassDojo is a classroom communication app used to share reports between parents and teachers. Teachers track student behavior and upload photos or videos
[3] https://www.curriculumassociates.com/Products/i-Ready

assisted the SPED teacher, and in another classroom the SPED teacher taught alone.

- To provide accommodations according to the Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) of SWD, the school stated that students receive accommodations that are categorized by presentation, response, setting, and timing. In one of the observations, the teacher differentiated instruction and provided accommodations through their introduction of the material. The teacher wrote on the board, explained, and modeled the procedure. The observation team did not observe accommodations in response or setting; in two of the observations, students spent the majority of their instructional time working on their laptops with no flexibility in their response or setting.
- To provide modifications according to the IEPs of SWD, the school wrote that the SPED observers should be able to see modified assignments, assessments, workload, homework, grading scale, alternative books, shortened assignments, multimedia presentation of content, and use of instructional technology as well as behavioral modifications. Instructional technology played a significant role in the instruction and delivery of content and assessment. In two of the four SPED observations, the students spent the entire 50-minute period on the iReady platform with very little teacher interaction or support. In all four of the observations, the teachers referenced iReady as a significant part of the curriculum. The worksheets and materials that were used with the students were identical. In one classroom the teacher used multiple modes of presentation by drawing a model on the board and using the projector to model the procedure for the students. There was consistent reference and use of the school-wide behavior system, ClassDojo points[4]. The students' responses to the use of ClassDojo points was mixed: some students responded immediately to the threat of losing ClassDojo points, while the points seemed to have no effect on others.

Specialized Instruction for English Learners (ELs)

Prior to the two-week window, MM Bethune PCS outlined their model of instruction for ELs. The school explained that it uses three English language learner models, depending on the students' grade and English language proficiency level: 1) the Two-Way/Dual Language Bilingual Program for students in prekindergarten through second grade, 2) the Inclusion/Collaborative Model, and 3) the Content-Based EL approach. The school noted that observers may see the following instructional resources: picture cards, modified instructional plans, read-alouds, computer-assisted instruction, pairing with English-speaking students, alphabetic

and phonetic cards, Know/Want to know/Learn (K/W/L) charts, assisted cloze reading (an instructional strategy asking the user to fill in the blanks within a text with correct words from a word bank), and prediction diagrams. During two half days of observation, the EL specialist observed one pull-out and four push-in sessions. Overall, the school implemented some elements of the Two-Way/Dual Language Bilingual Program and the Content-Based EL approach.

Overall, the school's implementation of the EL program outlined in its questionnaire was mixed. In some settings students received effective supports, but the EL observer saw little evidence of the school's use of instructional resources and no evidence of the Inclusion/Collaborative model as described by the school.

The school stated that observers may see Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in the mainstream classroom with the EL teacher functioning as a resource instructor or co-teaching a lesson. In the first push-in observation, the EL teacher circulated the classroom to monitor four ELs, looking at their work and reiterating or clarifying the learning task ("predict what will happen next in the story" or "read off the projector") in both English and Spanish. He encouraged students to write more in response to prompts and to share their answers out loud. Students did not have additional resources to respond to the learning task, such as individual texts, vocabulary lists, or word banks. The EL specialist did not see the EL teacher co-teaching lessons.

According to the school, students in the Two-Way Dual Language Bilingual Program develop communication and literacy skills in their native language (Spanish) while learning a second language (English). Students master academic content and writing in both languages. During the pull-out session, the EL specialist observed the EL teacher working on the development of literacy skills in the first-grade student's native language (Spanish) while helping him learn English by reinforcing a Spanish lesson on C words. The EL teacher began by assessing what the student already knew, asking "How many words do you know with the letter C?" The student hesitated and the teacher offered some examples in English and Spanish (car, cama (bed), camisa (shirt), casa (house) and centro (center)). The EL teacher used objects already in the room as tangible examples of C words, as when he showed the student what the "center" was by putting his hand in the middle of a book. Neither the teacher nor the student had anything to write with or on. The student demonstrated understanding by mentioning a couple of C words in both English and Spanish. The EL specialist did not observe any of the instructional materials listed above (alphabetic and phonetic cards, K/W/L charts, cloze reading, picture cards, etc.).

When Spanish or English is not the student's home language, and for students in third through eighth grade, the school primarily uses the Content-Based EL approach to deliver both academic content and English language skills. The EL specialist observed the Content-Based EL approach as the EL teacher worked with both a non-Spanish speaking second grade EL and a Spanish-speaking EL in a small group in the general education setting. The academic task was to measure non-standard objects (an envelope and an index card) with non-standard objects (circles and centimeter cubes). The EL teacher explained the task by using real objects and modeling the process. He asked students to repeat the vocabulary associated with the task, such as measure, ruler, and yardstick. When the general education teacher posed a question to the larger group, the EL specialist provided additional written support, as when she asked how much bigger one item was from the other, and the EL teacher wrote a subtraction problem to show that one item was many units larger than the other. ELs did not have any additional instructional resources (as described above). While students learned English vocabulary within the context of the learning task, they did not have or keep vocabulary lists or picture cards to reinforce content-based vocabulary.

The EL specialist also observed the Content-Based EL approach in two additional observations with a seventh grade EL (same student in both observations). In the first observation, the general education teacher reviewed parts of a cell in preparation for a test while the EL teacher sat next to the student taking notes related to cell parts using his computer. The EL teacher discussed cell parts in both English and Spanish with the student, providing additional explanations and showing the student pictures online that corresponded to the cell parts. The student showed she understood the lesson by likening a cell part to a part of her body that is compromised because of a health condition, and by writing Spanish equivalents of cell parts and descriptions of cell part functions on her study guide. In an English observation where students discussed themes of a book, a co-teacher provided one-on-one support to the EL by sitting with her as she completed the learning task, ensuring she understood the directions, modifying the tasks so that she had to think of two themes instead of three (as the rest of the class had to do), and by providing some Spanish translations of words related to the task (theme and challenge). In both the science and English observations, the student learned content-related vocabulary in the context of the learning tasks.

The EL specialist did not observe any evidence of the Inclusion/Collaborative model, whereby the EL teacher collaborates with the general education teacher to plan instruction, which usually happens within the general education classroom. Throughout EL observations, the EL teacher provided accommodations on an as-needed basis after listening to a student's lesson and assessing the student's understanding, either verbally or by reading his or her written responses. Lessons did

not include any of the following additional resources for ELs as described above: picture cards, pairing with English-speaking students, alphabetic and phonetic cards, Know/Want to know/Learn (K/W/L) charts, assisted cloze reading, and prediction diagrams. The EL specialist observed one read-aloud, though ELs did not have their text to follow along with and keep notes. Lastly, the EL specialist saw one modification to instructional plans as an EL had to think of two themes from a text instead of three (described above). Note that the EL specialist saw one EL using the computer during the two half-days of observation, but did not spend time observing the student as the EL teacher was on his way to support another EL student.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[5]

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Classroom Environment domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" are those from the Danielson framework. Overall, the QSR team scored 68% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Classroom Environment domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	The QSR team scored 67% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In distinguished observations interactions between the teacher and students was highly respectful, reflecting genuine caring and knowledge of students' lives outside of the classroom. Teachers kindly spoke with a few unhappy students by offering encouraging words. They acknowledged birthdays and special visitors at students' homes, and recognized students' favorite activities, saying "Good cutting! I know you love cutting at home- that's what your mom said!" Teachers also greeted family members in Spanish or English, depending on their home language. Students respectfully corrected each other, asking one another to move spots during circle time, reminding each other to write their names on their papers, and asking each other to share saying "please." In proficient observations teachers demonstrated warmth with students, using special handshakes and endearing terms like "buddy." Students demonstrated respect for each other and teachers by saying "please" and "thank you." Teachers actively promoted a respectful environment. In one classroom where a teacher explained to the class, "Let's remember to use kind words with each other." In another observation the teacher gently reminded students to share. Teachers showed genuine care for students as in a few classrooms where they greeted students with hugs and ensured they had breakfast as they came in late. Students felt secure throughout classes as they	Distinguished	30%

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

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	enthusiastically offered responses to questions and classmates listened.	Proficient	37%
	The QSR team scored 26% of the observations as basic in this component. Talk between the teacher and students was generally appropriate with occasional inconsistencies. In one observation the teacher asked a student to respond but faced away from her, took attendance, and spoke to another teacher causing the student to stop sharing. Teachers spoke to students harshly at times, saying "Does raising your hand and asking for something *ever* work with me? Yeah, that's what I thought." Students occasionally disrespected their teacher with off-task behavior.	Basic	26%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	7%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team scored 67% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In distinguished observations teachers communicated a genuine passion for their subjects, modeling enthusiasm for a read-aloud by reading in different voices as students listened intently, saying "I love that we're becoming better writers together!" as students learned about writing mechanics. In proficient observations teachers conveyed high regard for students' abilities, expecting and recognizing student effort. Teachers told students "I knew you could do this," as they walked around and checked student work and, "Try your best. I am here for you," as a student expressed fear in trying a new skill. Teachers expected all students to participate saying, "I need to see more hands!" and "Be ready friends because everyone is going to have to come up soon. Everyone is going to have a chance so keep thinking, keep those wheels turning." Students expressed pride in their work saying things like "I did it!" and "I get it now."	Distinguished	11%
		Proficient	56%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 30% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers emphasized task completion as they gave students no indication of the quality of their work, asking rapid-fire questions without reacting to student responses. One teacher rushed through a review without providing enough time for all students to follow along, saying, “I don’t want to spend too much time going over this.” Another teacher demonstrated a learning task on the carpet without ensuring all students could see, as many students were left behind at their desks. Students complied with teachers' expectations but did not indicate a commitment to high-quality work, as when the teacher used a checklist for their task at the beginning of class but students did not refer to it and teachers did not reinforce it during work time.	Basic	30%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	4%
Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team scored 63% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In distinguished observations instructional time was maximized due to effective classroom routines and procedures with students working independently and transitioning seamlessly to whole-group share-outs when an alarm rang. In proficient observations students were productively engaged during both small group and independent work. Students knew where to find materials when entering the class and knew how to access Chromebooks and headphones without talking to their neighbors. Students responded quickly to countdowns, clapping routines, and chants such as “Criss-cross applesauce” and “Got it, got it” to transition, prepare for the lesson, and refocus. Co-teachers expertly team-taught to maximize learning time. While one teacher led a whole class mini-lesson on the rug or gave the entire class directions, a second teacher prepared each student's independent space with necessary materials or	Distinguished	7%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	walked around to ensure students understood the learning task. With minimal prompting, students followed established routines, as when one center was full, and the teacher suggested another center for a student who complied immediately and without incident.	Proficient	56%
	The QSR team scored 26% of the observations as basic in this component. Instructional time was lost because teachers did not have the necessary materials or could not activate technology. Inconsistent procedures led to lost instructional time. Transitions were inefficient, with students requiring frequent reminders of instructions and how to move from center to center.	Basic	26%
	The QSR team scored 11% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Procedures were chaotic at times. In one observation it took over seven minutes to get students lined up, and the teacher spent the remainder of the class time signing computers out to students. In another observation the teacher abruptly stopped the lesson to have students practice transitions from reading to the carpet three times, resulting in a significant loss of instructional time.	Unsatisfactory	11%
Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 74% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In distinguished observations student behavior was entirely appropriate. Co-teachers monitored and preempted negative behavior subtly by circulating the classroom while another teacher-led instruction. One teacher successfully prevented disruption by whispering a quiet comment as students crowded around a play refrigerator in one observation. In proficient observations teachers' redirection was effective, as when teachers reminded students to raise their hands, take turns, stay in their centers, and complete their work before moving on to play. Teachers effectively dealt with minor misbehavior when they knelt at students' levels to quietly redirect and used “dojo” points to reward and track behavior.	Distinguished	15%
		Proficient	59%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 19% of observations as basic in this component. Standards of conduct appeared to have been established, but their implementation was inconsistent. Students not working directly with a teacher were disruptive, threw blocks, fought over materials, or making loud noises, though they acted appropriately when a teacher intervened. Teachers attempted to maintain order, repeatedly telling students to "Get to work," and referring to lost ClassDojo points with uneven success. At times teachers ignored off-task behavior, as when students engaged in horseplay while the teacher was modeling or chatted with peers instead of completing their independent work on computers.	Basic	19%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	7%

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" are those from the Danielson framework. Overall, the QSR team scored 42% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Instruction domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Communicating with Students	The QSR team scored 60% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation the teacher explained content thoroughly and clearly, using rich language and inviting students to explain prior learning about inferences to classmates. Teachers in proficient observations gave clear instructions for learning tasks, at times guiding students in the process. One teacher placed her hand over a child's to show him how to cut with scissors and modeled how to find names on a sentence strip. Students demonstrated they understood directions by immediately engaging with learning tasks after hearing directions. Teachers used grade- and content-appropriate vocabulary and analogies in explanations, reminding students to use the proper math terms like "place value," explaining parts of a cell by comparing them to body parts and functions, and asking students to give examples of words like "ratio." Teachers clearly stated lesson objectives, writing them on the board in student-friendly language and referred to them throughout lessons. One teacher pretended a paper octopus on her shoulder tickled her every time the student correctly used the O sound.	Distinguished	4%
		Proficient	56%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated 37% of observations as basic in this component. Teachers' explanations of content and learning tasks were confusing and had to be clarified throughout lessons. In one observation students copied words from the board for several minutes rather than writing their predictions for the end of a story (which was the learning task). Explanations of content were purely procedural. For example a teacher attempted to get students engaged in a discussion about non-standard measurements, but students ended up recalling results (one word, number responses).	Basic	37%
	The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	4%
Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques	The QSR team scored just 33% of observations as proficient in this component. Teachers asked a mix of low-level and high-level questions, generating a genuine discussion among students. Teachers asked students to make comparisons between cell parts and body parts, think of other ways to solve math problems, and to consider why they solved a problem in a particular way. Teachers ensured that most students were involved in class discussions, making inferences based on a variety of prompts and saying things like, "I need to see more hands!" Teachers encouraged students to respond to each other, telling them "Talk and communicate!" as they worked to come up with themes from a text, and asked them to listen to each other's responses.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	33%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 52% of observations as basic in this component. Questions led students on a single path of inquiry, as when teachers asked students to report on results from a measuring task and translate words from English to Spanish and vice versa. Attempts to engage all students in the discussion had uneven results. Teachers' efforts to generate discussions over questions such as what might happen in a scientific experiment with different variables fell flat as students continued to give one-word answers. In various classrooms students offered ideas in rapid succession with no response from the teacher and no opportunities to respond directly to one another's ideas.	Basic	52%
	The QSR team rated 15% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Questions, like those asking about the plot of a book and asking about a design students made with blocks, were rapid-fire and convergent with single correct answers.	Unsatisfactory	15%
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team scored just 37% of observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. Most students were intellectually engaged, trying to guess cell parts described by the teacher, working as a group to come up with themes from a reading, solving math problems in pairs, responding to writing prompts, and using songs and hand motions to practice words in Spanish. Resources and materials allowed students to be intellectually engaged, as teachers positioned themselves at tables to support students in small groups and gave students musical instruments to demonstrate "in front," "behind" and "down" in Spanish. Groupings were suitable to lesson activities. In one observation, teachers provided individual support to small groups at tables as students wrote their names and drew pictures	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	while other groups were engaged in productive free play. In another observation the teacher worked with just two students at the table so that she could ensure tracing, cutting, and gluing were correctly done.	Proficient	37%
	The QSR team scored 48% of the observations as basic in this component. The pacing of lessons was uneven, as students in some observations had nothing to do once they finished the academic task at hand. Students lost focus because the class had insufficient materials (whiteboards) for all students to participate at the same time, or because students did not have extra homework sheets or exit tickets for their review after having forgotten theirs at home. Some students were intellectually engaged, and others were off task, as in a class with centers where some students focused on drawing objects that started with "m" while others were disruptive, throwing blocks. Many learning tasks required only recall of procedures or facts, like completing word problems, thinking of “c” words, and recalling the definition of text features and details.	Basic	48%
	The QSR team scored 15% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Few students were intellectually engaged in lessons; instead students talked and wandered around the class. Activities required only rote tasks.	Unsatisfactory	15%
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team scored just 36% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. Teachers used assessment throughout lessons. Teachers circulated classrooms, reading students' written responses and providing specific feedback, like "What's the challenge of that? You have to write why,” and asking individual students to explain math answers. Feedback allowed students to immediately adjust work and responses, saying “Try again. You told me the correct word, but made a different sound," and correcting students' method of measuring. Teachers made students aware of what high-quality work	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	looked like through modeling and by writing expectations for responses on the board (full sentences, capitalize the first word, etc.). Students had opportunities to assess their work and classmates' work, solving math problems in small groups then discussing and providing feedback on solutions as a whole class, and offering feedback to peers and assigning points based on how complete classmates' answers were.	Proficient	36%
	The QSR team scored 56% of the observations as basic in this component. Feedback to students was general as teachers tell students “I need more from you,” and “Very good!” Teachers did not ensure that all students understood instruction, asking for global indications of learning with students responding in unison, relying on students to volunteer answers, and waiting for students to come to the board to show their work. Teachers did not provide clear expectations for student work, switching abruptly from one learning task to the next without asking students for evidence of learning or reviewing their work. There were limited attempts to self or peer assessment.	Basic	56%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	8%

APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

The Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are harmful 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 a passionate commitment to the subject.
Managing Classroom Procedures	Classroom routines and procedures are either nonexistent or inefficient, resulting in the loss of much instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures have been established but function unevenly or inconsistently, with some loss of instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures have been established and function smoothly for the most part, with little loss of instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures are seamless in their operation, and students assume considerable responsibility for their smooth functioning.
Managing Student Behavior	Student behavior is poor, with no clear expectations, no monitoring of student behavior, and inappropriate response to student misbehavior.	Teacher makes an effort to establish standards of conduct for students, monitor student behavior, and respond to student misbehavior, but these efforts are not always successful.	Teacher is aware of student behavior, has established clear standards of conduct, and responds to student misbehavior in ways that are appropriate and respectful of the students.	Student behavior is entirely appropriate, with evidence of student participation in setting expectations and monitoring behavior. Teacher's monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive, and teachers' response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs.

APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION RUBRIC

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

APPENDIX III: SCORE BREAKDOWN BY COMPONENT

Percent of:	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	7%	4%	11%	7%	4%	15%	15%	8%
Basic	26%	30%	26%	19%	37%	52%	48%	56%
Proficient	37%	56%	56%	59%	56%	33%	37%	36%
Distinguished	30%	11%	7%	15%	4%	0%	0%	0%
Subdomain Average	**2.89**	**2.74**	**2.59**	**2.81**	**2.59**	**2.19**	**2.22**	**2.28**

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	68%	42%
Domain Averages	**2.76**	**2.32**