



April 7, 2017

Mr. Donald Hense, Board Chair
Friendship PCS – Online
1351 Nicholson Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Hense:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, DC PCSB shall monitor the progress of each school in meeting the goals and student academic achievement expectations specified in the school's charter. Your school was selected to undergo a Qualitative Site Review during the 2016-17 school year for the following reason:

- School will undergo 20-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Friendship PCS-Online between February 6, 2017 and February 16, 2017. Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review report focuses primarily on the following areas: charter mission and goals, classroom environments, and instruction.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at Friendship PCS – Online.

Sincerely,



Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: School Leader

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: April 7, 2017

Campus Information

Campus Name: Friendship PCS – Online

Ward: n/a

Grade levels: K-8

Qualitative Site Review Information

Reason for visit: School will undergo 20-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year

Two-week window: February 6, 2017 – February 16, 2017

QSR team members: 2 DC PCSB staff including one SPED specialist, 1 consultant specializing in Online Learning

Number of observations: 14

Total enrollment: 147

Students with Disabilities enrollment: 21

English Language Learners enrollment: 0

In-seat attendance on the days the QSR team conducted observations:

Visit 1: February 7, 2017 – 100%

Visit 2: February 8, 2017 – 100%

Visit 3: February 9, 2017 – 100%

Visit 4: February 21, 2017 – 100%

Summary

The mission of Friendship PCS – Online is to provide a world-class education that motivates students to achieve high academic standards, enjoy learning, and develop as ethical, literate, well-rounded, and self-sufficient citizens who contribute actively to their communities.

Friendship PCS – Online is a virtual school powered by K12¹. K12 provides the online learning platform for the school. Students of the online school attend virtual classes four days a week. Teachers instruct from an actual classroom and each student participates from a remote location by computer. Using extensive technology students can fully participate in a rigorous academic program. Teachers and students log into the K12 platform and are able to see each other's screens and hear each other. Teachers use PowerPoints and other visuals to guide Common Core-aligned instruction. Teachers and students have the ability to draw and write so that others can see their work. They communicate using microphones or chat pods. Much like in a traditional educational setting, teachers used the technology to allow for flexible grouping and close monitoring of student progress. In "break-out" rooms students worked together in small groups to

¹ www.k12.com

solve problems or discuss an issue. Teachers created virtual break-out rooms for small group work and put certain students in each one. While in these break-out rooms the students worked together using the computer to communicate. Teachers went in and out of these break-out rooms virtually to monitor student progress and give feedback. Students were able to share their work with the whole group after the break-out room sessions. The online instruction specialist commented that the teachers were very skillful at using break-out rooms and using multiple means for assessing students.

Once a week teachers and students meet face-to-face in a brick and mortar school located at 1351 Nicholson Street, NW. In addition to conducting online observations, DC PCSB also observed face-to-face instruction. On this day teachers reviewed content and conducted small group instruction. Students worked well together and the high-level of rapport between the teachers and students stood out during the observations. Teachers had well-established routines that enabled students to be in charge of many of the classroom operations including the distribution of materials. On the face-to-face instruction days, the school had learning and socializing space for parents while the students are in the classroom. A leader talks to parents about how to support their student's learning at home. Regarding the facility itself one observer spotted a few dead cockroaches in a classroom. The school leadership has been made aware of this and mentioned that an exterminator had come before the QSR team's visit.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environments and instructional delivery (see Appendix I). The QSR team scored an impressive 89% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. In the component of *Managing Classroom Behavior* the QSR team scored a remarkable 100% of observations as proficient. These observations (both virtual and face-to-face classes) had almost no instances of off-task behavior and in the few observations when students needed behavior reminders teachers were effective and the behaviors were not repeated. For each of the other three components in the Classroom Environment domain, the QSR team scored 86% of observations as distinguished or proficient. Overall students and teachers demonstrated a strong commitment to their work and maximized instructional time with established and followed procedures and routines.

The QSR team scored an equally high 89% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. In the component of *Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques* the QSR team scored 100% of observations as proficient. Teachers posed open-ended questions and students actively participated in discussions. For each of the other three components in the Instruction domain the QSR team scored 86% of observations as distinguished or proficient. Instruction was strong school wide and teachers used a variety of high-leverage instructional strategies to engage all students.

These results are among the highest of any QSRs conducted to date by DC PCSB.

Governance

DC PCSB reviewed Friendship PCS' October board meeting minutes. A quorum was present. The Finance Committee approved the LEA's clean audit and discussed the net income and enrollment trends. The School Performance Committee reviewed academic data from each campus. The Board discussed the LEA's upcoming charter review.

Friendship PCS informed DC PCSB that they were only having an executive session when a staff member tried to observe the December 2016 meeting.

A DC PCSB staff member observed part of the Friendship Public Charter School Board of Trustees meeting on March 30, 2017 after the executive session portion. A quorum was present. During the meeting the Board discussed a Finance Committee report in which the Head of the Finance Committee proposed a new investment policy. The Board agreed to vote on at the next Board of Trustees meeting. The Board then discussed its focus on college success as context for its School Performance Report. The Board reviewed NWEA MAP academic results and discussed best practices from two campuses that had particularly strong results.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, Friendship PCS – Online provided answers to specific questions posed by DC PCSB regarding the provision of instruction to students with disabilities. Though special education services are also provided through virtual instruction, the reviewer who conducted special education-specific observations noted the following evidence during a face-to-face instruction day:

- The school described providing various supports within the classroom in efforts to effectively differentiate lessons: providing the student with additional prompts, fewer problems, or other appropriate modifications. Also, for responses the teacher may differentiate a lesson to include having an open choice answer versus a multiple-choice answer selection depending on the student’s ability and needs. Teachers scaffold instruction, using the “I do, We do, You do” method.
 - The observer noted seeing all the described methods of differentiating lessons as described above. The observer saw scaffolded instruction using “I do, we do, you do” methods throughout small group instruction (reading analog clocks, visualizing and verbalizing from a text read-aloud by the teacher). The teachers also used open choice answers when asking students to write a sentence summarizing what the students heard when the teacher read a few sentences from a text during visualize and verbalize in a small group. The observer saw students receiving additional prompts when working through a worksheet with reading time on analog clocks for those students that required additional support. One teacher said, "Ok can you tell me what the hour is here? Perfect - can you show me another hour? What time do you think it is hour-wise if it's between two numbers? Hasn't gotten all the way to the 11 yet?"
- The school stated the teachers use the following methods to gauge student understanding: small group sessions, classroom work and quick checks to help gauge student understanding. Also, the special education and general education teachers are using the Online Learning School to determine if the student is demonstrating mastery for each lesson. As part of our instructional calendar, they have quarterly benchmarks that determine if students are on track with Common Core State standards.
 - During the face-to-face pull-out sessions, the observer noted seeing the effective small group sessions where related service providers (Speech and

Language pathologist) and the special education teachers were working with groups of 3-4 students on assigned activities. Written on the board were the station assignments: Rotation 1 - Station 1: Telling time matchup, Station 2: Money War, Station 3 - Visualizing & Verbalizing, Edit Chart."

- The observer noted seeing the special educators frequently gauging student understanding through posing questions to elicit student understanding and circulating to each student in a small group and providing direct feedback.
- The school also described the use of a variety of assistive technology that they implement for students with special needs and referenced an Assistive Technology Manual. While the observer did see the use of several manipulatives (large clocks to teach time, Versa Tiles to record responses from worksheets) and games to support the teaching of content (Battleship to support student understanding of coordinates on a graph, "Money War" to teach students about the value of coins), it is unclear if the teacher used any of the required Assistive Technology devices during the in-class observations.
- The school described the inclusion supports in the general education classroom: small group/individual instruction by curriculum level and alternative curriculum students, differentiated curriculum called Unique Learning Systems which align with the Common Core State Standards to meet the student's needs in reading and math, alternative curriculum students receive individual instruction from the special education teacher. All of teachers work together to create a cohesive educational plan to ensure success for all of our students. The school provided tutors who worked on-on-one with students on the face-to-face day. The QSR team also saw evidence of differentiated instruction in online breakout rooms.

CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

This table summarizes qualitative evidence related to the goals and academic achievement expectations as detailed in the school’s charter and subsequent charter amendments. Some charter goals can only be measured quantitatively. The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team recorded evidence of what the school is doing on the ground to meet these quantitative goals. During the 5-year charter review, 10-year charter review, or 15-year charter renewal process, DC PCSB staff will use quantitative data to assess whether the school met those goals.

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|---|--|
| <p>Mission:</p> <p>The mission of Friendship Public Charter School is to provide a world-class education that motivates students to achieve high academic standards, enjoy learning, and develop as ethical, literate, well-rounded, and self-sufficient citizens who contribute actively to their communities.</p> | <p>The QSR team saw strong evidence that the Friendship PCS – Online is meeting its mission. During online learning and face-to-face instruction, students and teachers focused on content and expressed excitement about learning. Teachers encouraged students to take academic risks and students did so without hesitation. Teachers scaffolded material when needed by explaining the material step by step and having the students take the lead when they were ready. Students actively participated in whole group lessons, break out rooms online, small group work during the face-to-face days, and individual review with tutors. Students worked together to analyze data, use graphic organizers and construct thesis statements.</p> <p>Online Instruction</p> <p>Students and teachers had strong relationships during online instruction and in the classroom. Students used chat pods and microphones to communicate with each other online. There was strong evidence of positive classroom community in all classes at Friendship PCS – Online.</p> <p>The online platform allowed students to raise their hands by clicking the “raise hand” button and share their work by clicking a button to display the screen. Teachers moved through the break-out rooms to see how the small groups comprehended the material and gave</p> |

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|--|---|
| | <p>specific feedback to help students master the content. Students asked questions and explained their thinking.</p> <p>Face-to-face Instruction During the face-to-face instruction, the special education specialist noted that the special education teacher had extremely strong rapport with all the students in the classroom (called them "hard workers") and students were smiling and engaged in small group pull-out lessons.</p> |
| Goals: | |
| <p>PMF Indicator #1: Student Progress – Academic Improvement over time</p> <p><i>Effective instruction supporting student academic progress in reading</i></p> <p>PMF Indicator #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards</p> <p><i>Moving students to proficient and advanced levels in reading</i></p> | <p>DC PSCB observed strong instruction in literacy. According to the Friendship-Online goals questionnaire completed prior to the observation, "[the] school is adapted to meet students at their academic level."</p> <p>Online Instruction In observations of online instruction, teachers frequently used break-out rooms for flexible grouping. During virtual instruction, teachers put students into break-out rooms that they have created for small group work. Teachers monitored these rooms and gave specific and timely feedback to students about their literacy work. Teachers asked open-ended comprehension questions and students eagerly shared connections they had to the readings. Readings and other materials were engaging and easily accessible to all students. In one online observation the teacher referenced the PARCC test and discussed how the learning they did in class would help them perform well on the test. Additionally, posters with strategies for writing, reading, proofreading were posted on the walls in the school building.</p> <p>Face-to-face Instruction The face-to-face instructional day appeared to be well attended and teachers used this</p> |

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|--|---|
| | <p>time to individually conference with students. A teacher in an ELA class facilitated a discussion about a poem. Students easily engaged in the topic and discussed the point of view of different speakers in the poem. Students had the opportunity to go up to the board and write their thoughts about what the characters were saying and how their points of view were the same and different. Another teacher introduced the idea of reading and writing personal accounts. The teacher asked the students to define an account and to give examples of personal accounts. Students also worked together to bridge ideas to a thesis statement.</p> <p>In all of the face-to-face observations, students were eager to raise their hands and respond to each other during the discussions. In one observation the teacher used a strategy called, “visualize and verbalize” in small group instruction as a way to reinforce students summarizing a text that is read-aloud. The teacher would read a few sentences from the text and then ask students to describe what they heard. Students would say their responses out loud and then record it on a sheet of paper.</p> |
| <p>PMF Indicator #1: Student Progress – Academic Improvement over time</p> <p><i>Effective instruction supporting student academic progress in math</i></p> <p>PMF Indicator #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards</p> <p><i>Moving students to proficient and advanced levels in math</i></p> | <p>The DC PCSB team also observed strong and differentiated math instruction.</p> <p>Online Instruction</p> <p>Teachers modeled problem solving and utilized small groups learning in break-out rooms to give students opportunities to work together and explain their thinking. Teachers clearly explained procedures related to math problem solving and gave frequent feedback. Additionally, aligned to what the school stated the team would observe, teachers used effective questioning during math instruction. One teacher asked, “How about the decimals?”</p> |

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|-------------------|---|
| | <p data-bbox="919 233 1516 268">Do you see how they are like fractions?"</p> <p data-bbox="919 306 1576 869">Another teacher asked students to make comparisons. In a middle school online math course a math teacher explained new concepts to the whole group and worked with students in breakout rooms as they applied the new concepts to the math problems. Students defined terms, worked out problems and explained their work. When a student got a problem wrong, the teacher asked questions about the work and had the student explain his/her thinking. Eventually the student worked toward and got the correct answer. The group met as a whole again and volunteers explained solutions to problems and had the opportunity to ask questions.</p> <p data-bbox="919 907 1321 942">Face-to-face Instruction</p> <p data-bbox="919 942 1576 1577">Teachers used a variety of instructional materials to help students understand new concepts. During the face-to-face day of instruction, one teacher had students measure their feet with a ruler to gather data. The students were excited to write the measurements on the board. They asked the teacher to measure her foot and add her size to the data and she agreed. The students worked in small groups to represent the data in a bar graph, find the mean, and find the median. In another observation the teacher showed students how to play the game Battleship to teach students how to use coordinates on a graph. Students counted across the x and y axis and recorded coordinates with the pegs on their game board.</p> <p data-bbox="919 1614 1572 1898">The school stated that the team would observe tutors supporting individual learners. The QSR team saw strong evidence of this intervention. When students were not in class they worked with tutors. The tutors worked individually with students while the rest of the students worked on a group assignment. Students</p> |

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|---|---|
| | <p>were engaged during the period and often helped each with problems. Tutors discussed past work with students and students asked questions about the content.</p> |
| <p>PMF Indicator # 3: Gateway – Outcomes in key subjects that predict future educational success</p> <p><i>Promotion of reading proficiency by third grade and math proficiency by eighth grade</i></p> | <p>The QSR team observed evidence that Friendship – Online is on-track to meet this goal. In the <u>Instruction</u> domain of the Danielson rubric, 89% of observations were scored as distinguished or proficient. In this domain within the component of <i>Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques</i> 100% of the observations received a proficient rating.</p> <p>Online and Face-to-Face Instruction</p> <p>Teachers across all content areas used sophisticated questions to engage all students in academic discussions. No instructional time was lost due to student misbehavior during the face-to-face day. Students also actively participated in group discussions and classwork.</p> <p>As described above both reading and math content was strong. In each content area students requiring additional academic support were provided with individual tutors or small group tutoring. Student incentives are provided to encourage students to achieve academic expectations.</p> |
| <p>PMF Indicator #4: School Environment – Predictors of future student progress and achievement</p> <p><i>Culture of learning and support in the classrooms</i></p> | <p>DC PCSB measures attendance to evaluate the climate of a school. DC PCSB believes that if students are not in school, they lose opportunities for learning.</p> <p>The attendance was above 85% for each day, which is the floor of the Performance Management Framework.</p> <p>In-seat attendance on the days the</p> |

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|--------------------------|--|
| | QSR team conducted observations: Visit 1: February 7, 2017 – 100% Visit 2: February 8, 2017 – 100% Visit 3: February 9, 2017 – 100% Visit 4: February 21, 2017 – 100% |

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT²

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Classroom Environments domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of “distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” and “unsatisfactory” are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 89% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain.

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|--|--|--------------------|-----|
| <p>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</p> | <p>The QSR team scored 86% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations interactions were warm and polite during online and face-to-face instruction.</p> <p>In a face-to-face observation, teachers greeted students by name as they entered the room and students demonstrated interest in the teachers’ lives. In one observation students asked the teacher questions about their life outside of school such as: “How long does it take you to get to work?” and “What do your sons like to eat for breakfast.” Additionally students shared stories and added personal details to the</p> | Distinguished | 14% |

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

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|-----|
| | <p>discussions. One student said, "I like February because a lot of my family members have birthdays." Students in these observations laughed and talked respectfully to each other during class time and snack time.</p> <p>In another face-to-face observation, a student entered late and another student, after a handshake, states, "You can be my partner!" One student was complimentary to a teacher about a poster she made. The teacher asked, "How do you like the poster I made?" A Student quickly answered, "It looks awesome." and the teacher said, "Thank you.</p> <p>In online observations teachers kindly helped students solve problems and did so with dignity. In one observation when the teacher asked, "What happened Student X? Did you turn in your work sample for January?" The student responded, "I think." and the teacher followed up with "Ok let me help you find it."</p> | Proficient | 72% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as basic in this component. In these online observations students and teachers did not demonstrate the same level of comfort and warmth as in the proficient observations. In one observation a student was spamming the chat pod. Meaning that the student was writing nonsense in the supervised chat that all of the students and the teacher could see. The teacher ignored this behavior but disciplined another student who was drawing a picture on the white board, or virtual chalkboard, at the same time.</p> | Basic | 14% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p> | Unsatisfactory | 0% |

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|--|---|--------------------|-----|
| Establishing a Culture for Learning | <p>The QSR team scored 86% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers and students demonstrated a shared commitment to the learning process and students were comfortable taking intellectual risks. Teachers consistently maintained high expectations of all students. In one observation a teacher said, "You're going to stay here for the 2nd group. You came a little bit late today, so I'm going to work on the money thing with you, ok?" demonstrating the belief that all students can be successful. In other observations teachers were excited about the material and praised students for good effort as well as for correct answers.</p> | Distinguished | 0% |
| | <p>In one face-to-face observation the teacher said, "I love the way you're writing, and I love the way you're working" and in another "I loved your answer – do you remember what you wrote?" Students in online and face-to-face observations took frequent intellectual risks sharing thoughts and asking questions. Teachers pointed out students for what they did correctly. One teacher said to a group of students during online instruction, "Ok so how are these hard workers doing?" Additionally teachers energetically took initiative to create online classrooms as a place where learning is valued and conveyed enthusiasm for digital age resources and instruction.</p> | Proficient | 86% |

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|-----|
| | <p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as basic in this component. In a few observations of online instruction, the teachers conveyed a negative attitude and demeanor for digital age resources and content integration. There were several times when the teachers demonstrated frustration after students lost internet connections or the teacher could not find the whiteboard tools.</p> <p>Teachers did not hold student accountable for understanding their role as learners and therefore there was no evidence that students take pride in their work or that the teacher believes in their potential.</p> | Basic | 14% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p> | Unsatisfactory | 14% |
| Managing Classroom Procedures | <p>The QSR team scored 86% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations face-to-face classroom routines and procedures were smooth with little to no lost instructional time. Students also demonstrated understanding of online classroom expectations and in many instances students actively participated in routines and procedures. Online content and resources were readily accessible to students in a consistent format and students easily retrieved learning materials when needed.</p> | Distinguished | 0% |

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------|-----|
| | <p>Teachers in these observations gave verbal reminders of time remaining during learning tasks and students quickly transitioned between activities.</p> <p>Even though the teachers and students only meet face-to-face once a week, in-person classroom routines were well established and students followed procedures with ease. In these observations students passed out collected materials and snacks. Students easily followed directions and quietly talked to each other during snack breaks.</p> | Proficient | 86% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations some online instructional time was lost due to inefficient or ineffective routines, procedures, or expectations. In one observation the teacher struggled with the online technology, frequently losing track of her whiteboard tools. Students in these observations had a difficult time obtaining the necessary materials for the lesson because they did not have access to them.</p> | Basic | 14% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p> | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| Managing Student Behavior | <p>The QSR team scored 100% of the observations as proficient in this component. Students in most observations of Friendship PCS - Online demonstrated appropriate behavior. Teachers reinforced positive behavior by pointing it out and praising students. In one face-to-face observation the teacher said, "I really like those nice manners – it always wins in my book!" and in another observation the teacher said, "I love that Student X is standing in line and ready."</p> <p>Teachers monitored student behavior when</p> | Distinguished | 0% |

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|------|
| | <p>needed and gave quick reminders about expected norms. In one face-to-face observation the teacher said, "Do you need to move yourself away from Student X? This is a one warning type of situation. You need to work on your own, not with Student X. You are collecting the research on your topic." The student immediately moved and follows teacher to another desk.</p> <p>Additionally students lined up without incident and had everything ready to move to the next class.</p> | Proficient | 100% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as basic or unsatisfactory in this component.</p> | Basic | 0% |
| | | Unsatisfactory | 0% |

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of “distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” and “unsatisfactory” are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 89% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Instruction domain.

| Instruction | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|--------------------|-----|
| <p>Communicating with Students</p> | <p>The QSR team scored 86% of the observations as proficient in this component. Teachers in these observations clearly stated lesson objectives and used vocabulary and language appropriately and accurately. Explanations of content, directions, and expectations were shared with students using clear and concise language. In one observation the teacher said, “Today what we’re going to do is a little more comparing and contrasting - today we’re going to talk about something a little different: first hand vs. second hand accounts.”</p> | Distinguished | 0% |
| | <p>In a face-to-face observation after students collected data with a ruler, the teacher shared, “Before we do any work, we’re going to look at our data and hypothesize.” Teacher’s explanations were clear and emphasized procedures that support successfully completing the learning task. Students demonstrated understanding of teacher instructions as they quickly started to complete the assignment when instructed without the need for clarification from the teacher. Additionally, teachers constantly connected learning to past lessons often saying, “remember when we did this...during instruction.”</p> | Proficient | 86% |

| Instruction | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|---|--|--------------------|-----|
| | <p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations the teacher attempted to explain the lesson's purpose with minimal success. Additionally the teacher's explanations of content frequently used vocabulary and language that appeared to be above or below grade level. Teacher's explanations of procedures were unclear or incomplete which prevented students from successfully completing the learning task.</p> | Basic | 14% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p> | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| <p>Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques</p> | <p>The QSR team scored 100% of the observations as proficient in this component. Teachers across all classrooms used open-ended questions to thoughtfully engage students in discussions and gauge student understanding.</p> <p>In one face-to-face observation students pointed to an incorrect clock (one that said 4:50 instead of 10:20). The teacher said, "Ok let's look at this. They look the same but something is different. Why is this one not right?" Many students shared their thinking about why the clock was not right and the teacher followed up with, "How do you know?"</p> <p>Questions invited students to think and frequently teachers encouraged multiple possible answers. In an online observation a teacher asked students working in a small group comprehension questions after</p> | Distinguished | 0% |

| Instruction | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|------|
| | <p>reading a text. The teacher asked, "What did you picture the cat chasing?" and "Why do you think the cat said 'Oh, no!'" Teachers called on students who did not put their hands up and successfully engaged them in conversations about the material.</p> <p>In ELA online observations students shared opinions and thoughts. Students in one observation worked on composing a thesis statement. The teacher did not have to do much to facilitate the discussion because the students were responding to each other without prompting and moving the conversation forward. Teachers provided ample wait time for students to respond to questions and to promote deeper thinking. Teachers created discussion group assignments that required students to meet synchronously and be actively involved by posting comments and responding to others.</p> | Proficient | 100% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as basic or unsatisfactory in this component. | Basic | 0% |
| | | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| Engaging Students in Learning | <p>The QSR team scored 86% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations students actively participated in learning tasks and appeared cognitively engaged. Teachers used a variety of flexible instructional groupings for students enabling them to meet learning targets. Teachers delivered content through whole group instruction and provided time for small group work and individual conferences. In addition the pacing and structure of the lesson was flexible, individualized, and provided opportunities</p> | Distinguished | 0% |

| Instruction | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|-------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| | <p>for student choice while maintaining lesson goals. Lesson materials consistently aligned with learning targets and supported students as they engaged in challenging tasks. Students played Battleship to discuss plotting coordinated on a graph, manipulated small clocks to study time, completed graphic organizers to compare and contrast and effectively navigated online learning tools. In online and face-to-face instruction, students appeared highly motivated and asked teachers questions instead of giving up on problems.</p> <p>In face-to-face observations tutors worked individually with students. While students worked with tutors, the rest of the students in the class completed written assignments even when not in the direct presence of the teachers.</p> | Proficient | 86% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations student engagement was inconsistent. Pacing of the lessons offered limited structure with some students completing tasks early and some unable to complete the same task in the allotted time.</p> <p>In a few online observations, the students who completed work in a break-out room frequently sat without any additional direction and waited to the rest of the students to finish before coming back together as a group. There was little evidence of differentiation or flexibility with most students working on one task independently with little choice in how to complete their work. Students in these observations appeared to be passive participants in the learning and did not ask questions or elicit additional information from the teachers.</p> | Basic | 14% |

| Instruction | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|--|---|--------------------|-----|
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| Using Assessment in Instruction | The QSR team scored 86% of the observations as proficient in this component. Teachers in these observations frequently monitored student learning by walking around the room, viewing student work online or conferencing with individual students. In one observation the teacher said, "Good work! I like that and that too (while pointing at the student's paper). Everybody was getting tricked on that one." Teachers asked questions to probe understanding and insisted that students explain their thinking. | Distinguished | 0% |
| | Feedback was timely, specific and provided prior to advancing additional learning targets. In one observation the teacher checked for understanding individually with students before giving a math assignment. The teacher asked, "What is the mode?" and the student answered, "The number that pops up the most." Students appeared to have a clear understanding of the criteria associated with how their learning would be assessed in an online environment. Teacher feedback was timely, specific and provided prior to advancing additional learning targets. Students in a few observations used peer and self-assessments to monitor progress toward learning targets. | Proficient | 86% |

| Instruction | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|-------------|--|--------------------|-----|
| | <p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as basic in this component. In an online observation the teacher did not provide clear information about how the students would be assessed. A few teachers did not frequently monitor student work time during online instruction. As a result feedback was delayed, inconsistent, and did not address improvements in learning targets.</p> | Basic | 14% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p> | Unsatisfactory | 0% |

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

| The Classroom Environment | Unsatisfactory | Basic | Proficient | Distinguished |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport | Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are negative or inappropriate and characterized by sarcasm, putdowns, or conflict. | Classroom interactions are generally appropriate and free from conflict but may be characterized by occasional displays of insensitivity. | Classroom interactions reflect general warmth and caring, and are respectful of the cultural and developmental differences among groups of students. | Classroom interactions are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring toward individuals. Students themselves ensure maintenance of high levels of civility among member of the class. |
| Establishing a Culture for Learning | The classroom does not represent a culture for learning and is characterized by low teacher commitment to the subject, low expectations for student achievement, and little student pride in work. | The classroom environment reflects only a minimal culture for learning, with only modest or inconsistent expectations for student achievement, little teacher commitment to the subject, and little student pride in work. Both teacher and students are performing at the minimal level to "get by." | The classroom environment represents a genuine culture for learning, with commitment to the subject on the part of both teacher and students, high expectations for student achievement, and student pride in work. | Students assumes much of the responsibility for establishing a culture for learning in the classroom by taking pride in their work, initiating improvements to their products, and holding the work to the highest standard. Teacher demonstrates as passionate commitment to the subject. |
| Managing Classroom Procedures | Classroom routines and procedures are either nonexistent or inefficient, resulting in the loss of much instruction time. | Classroom routines and procedures have been established but function unevenly or inconsistently, with some loss of instruction time. | Classroom routines and procedures have been established and function smoothly for the most part, with little loss of instruction time. | Classroom routines and procedures are seamless in their operation, and students assume considerable responsibility for their smooth functioning. |
| Managing Student Behavior | Student behavior is poor, with no clear expectations, no monitoring of student behavior, and inappropriate response to student misbehavior. | Teacher makes an effort to establish standards of conduct for students, monitor student behavior, and respond to student misbehavior, but these efforts are not always successful. | Teacher is aware of student behavior, has established clear standards of conduct, and responds to student misbehavior in ways that are appropriate and respectful of the students. | Student behavior is entirely appropriate, with evidence of student participation in setting expectations and monitoring behavior. Teacher's monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive, and teachers' response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs. |

APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC

| Instruction | Unsatisfactory | Basic | Proficient | Distinguished |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Communicating with Students | Teacher's oral and written communication contains errors or is unclear or inappropriate to students. Teacher's purpose in a lesson or unit is unclear to students. Teacher's explanation of the content is unclear or confusing or uses inappropriate language. | Teacher's oral and written communication contains no errors, but may not be completely appropriate or may require further explanations to avoid confusion. Teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose, with limited success. Teacher's explanation of the content is uneven; some is done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow. | Teacher communicates clearly and accurately to students both orally and in writing. Teacher's purpose for the lesson or unit is clear, including where it is situation within broader learning. Teacher's explanation of content is appropriate and connects with students' knowledge and experience. | Teacher's oral and written communication is clear and expressive, anticipating possible student misconceptions. Makes the purpose of the lesson or unit clear, including where it is situated within broader learning, linking purpose to student interests. Explanation of content is imaginative, and connects with students' knowledge and experience. Students contribute to explaining concepts to their peers. |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques | Teacher makes poor use of questioning and discussion techniques, with low-level questions, limited student participation, and little true discussion. | Teacher's use of questioning and discussion techniques is uneven with some high-level question; attempts at true discussion; moderate student participation. | Teacher's use of questioning and discussion techniques reflects high-level questions, true discussion, and full participation by all students. | Students formulate 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. |
| 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. |