



June 7, 2017

Mr. Thomas O'Hara, Board Chair  
Center City PCS – Petworth Campus  
510 Webster Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20003

Dear Mr. O'Hara:

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 eligible for 10-year Charter Review during 2017-2018 school year

**Qualitative Site Review Report**

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Center City PCS – Petworth between March 27, 2017 and April 7, 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 instructional delivery.

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

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux  
Deputy Director

Enclosures  
cc: School Leader

# Qualitative Site Review Report

**Date:** June 7, 2017

## **Campus Information**

**Campus Name:** Center City PCS – Petworth

**Ward:** 4

**Grade levels:** PreK3 – 8<sup>th</sup> grade

## **Qualitative Site Review Information**

**Reason for visit:** School eligible for 10-year Charter Review during 2017-2018 school year

**Two-week window:** March 27, 2017 and April 7, 2017

**QSR team members:** 1 DC PCSB staff and 2 consultants including one special education specialist and one English Language Learner (ELL) specialist

**Number of observations:** 14

**Total enrollment:** 257

**Students with Disabilities enrollment:** 31

**English Language Learners enrollment:** 45

**In-seat attendance<sup>1</sup> during the two-week window:**

**Visit 1:** March 30, 2017 - 94.0%

**Visit 2:** March 30, 2017 - 94.0%

**Visit 3:** April 4, 2017 - 92.8%

## **Summary**

The mission of Center City PCS – Petworth is to empower our children for success through a rigorous academic program and strong character education while challenging students to pursue personal excellence in character, conduct, and scholarship in order to develop the skills necessary to both serve and lead others in the 21st century.

Center City PCS – Petworth offers a robust education to PK3 through eighth grade students. Students benefit from multiple opportunities to learn from different adults as teachers co-teach to ensure an effective inclusion environment for all students. The QSR team noted student autonomy and choice present in multiple observations; students took ownership of their learning and engaged with enthusiasm. Teachers generally handled misbehavior quickly with minimal disruption to instruction. Student engagement remained high in most classrooms with the exception of a few observations where procedures appeared less established and students ignored teacher directions.

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 80% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain, up from the 75% of observations rated as distinguished or proficient in this domain during the school's last QSR in November of 2013. Observers rated 86% of classrooms as proficient in the *Establishing a Culture for Learning*, and more than one observation earned distinguished ratings for the *Managing Classroom Procedures*,

---

<sup>1</sup> This data has not been validated by the school. DC PCSB pulled the data in May 2017.

*Managing Student Behavior*, and *Managing Classroom Procedures* components. In these observations teachers communicated the importance of the content and learning and students took pride in their work. Classrooms functioned efficiently, with little instructional time lost due to ineffective procedures.

The QSR team scored 73% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain, up from the 68% of observations rated as distinguish or proficient in this domain during the school's last QSR in November of 2013. Classrooms earned the highest ratings in the *Engaging Students in Learning* component, with 86% rated as proficient. Teachers in these observations explained content clearly and students understood expectations for quality work.

#### Governance

DC PCSB reviewed the meeting minutes from Center City PCS' Board of Directors meeting on March 15, 2017. A quorum was present. The board discussed the recent science fair among all six Center City PCS campuses. The CEO shared that he is working to improve employee retention and academic achievement. The Finance and Academic Committees discussed a joint meeting to finalize the current and three-year budgets of each campus. The Academic Committee reviewed midyear MAP results and explained that Principals and Assistant Principals are coaching teachers in preparation for the PARCC test. The CEO informed the Board that Center City PCS received official notification of accreditation.

#### Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, Center City PCS – Petworth provided answers to specific questions posed by DC PCSB regarding the provision of instruction to Students with Disabilities. A Special Education specialist looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Overall the school effectively implemented the co-teaching model, components of gauging student understanding, collaborative planning, and lesson differentiation as described.

- The school reported in its Special Education Questionnaire that a co-teaching model is implemented through station teaching or parallel teaching and inclusion in the middle grades in the core content areas. The reviewer observed station teaching in one classroom, and a one teach one assist in one classroom and a pull-out session in the special education office. In the classrooms where there was one teach one assist, both special educators pulled a small group of students out of the general education classroom after the whole group lesson. The reviewer did not observe parallel teaching in the classroom on this day.
- The school stated that they use student-friendly technology for instruction and/or intervention such as Lexia, Achieve 3000, and Ten Marks. The special education observer observed a student working on Lexia in the pull-out. The student worked independently on the computer-based intervention program. The teacher monitored the student's understanding by asking probing questions about the silent "e" vowel sounds.
- The school described that differentiation in an inclusive classroom can include small groups based on data with differentiated materials, content or vocabulary that is pre-

taught or retaught and or the use of manipulatives to model and support understanding. The reviewer observed small group teaching in a pull-out setting with two students. One student was reading independently and the other student was working on Lexia. The teacher provided a graphic organizer to support a student reading a passage to outline story elements. Both students had differentiated materials.

### Instruction for English Language Learners (ELL)

Center City Public Charter School - Petworth submitted responses to a questionnaire related to the school's provision of services for the school's ELL population. Overall the QSR team observed mixed evidence of the school's implementation of its ELL program, which includes both push-in and pull-out instruction. The observer noted the following during the two EL classroom observations:

- The school shared that all students in K-8<sup>th</sup> grade who are identified for additional English language support will receive English language instruction and/or English Language Arts (ELA) instruction through an inclusion model. The QSR team observed full inclusion for all students. In all ELL observations, ELL and lead-teachers taught collaboratively in the same classroom.
- According to the ELL questionnaire, inclusion teachers provide English Language instruction in the form of pull-out services for Level 1 and 2 ELLs via the Newcomer curriculum and/or push-in services for level 3, 4 and 5 students via instruction that targets student's specific learning goals in listening, speaking, reading or writing. The QSR team did not observe any pull-out services during the observation window. The schedule indicated that there would be pull-out during one observation, but during that period both teachers co-taught in the classroom.
- The school described that English language arts instruction is provided to the students in the general education setting, with the ELL student receiving grade-level sheltered-content instruction with the support of the inclusion teacher via the Center City content curriculum. The QSR team observed one ELL teacher lead two different small groups with evidence that she modified the lesson for the first group differently than the second. She asked slightly different questions and students in one group wrote answers to questions while students in the other group answered those questions verbally. One group listened while the teacher read aloud, while students in the other group read sections silently then answered questions. The team did not observe any modified work in any of the other classrooms.
- The school explained that collaboration between the general education teacher and the inclusion teacher occurs in grade level/content classes where both teachers provide supports, scaffolds, and accommodations so all students have access to content instruction. Inclusion teachers are expected to plan and collaborate with general education teachers to develop high quality instructional resources and lessons that meet the needs of all students. The QSR team observed evidence that teachers planned collaboratively for each class period. In one class the ELL teacher led leveled small groups through guided reading. In both groups the teacher used the same text

for students; in one group the teacher read aloud to the group, in the second group, students took turns reading aloud and silently. In another observation the ELL teacher did not appear to provide additional supports, scaffolding, or specific accommodations but rather rotated around the room to support behavior to keep students on task.

- According to the ELL questionnaire, inclusion teachers are expected to adapt the general education curriculum and provide supplemental materials for ELs so that they can access core content curricula. The QSR team did not observe the use of any supplemental or adapted materials.
- The schools described that inclusion teachers are expected to co-teach in content classrooms according to Center City PCS expectations. Teachers co-deliver this intentionally designed instruction in parallel, station, or small group teaching structures. The QSR observed both small group and parallel teaching structures. In one classroom the ELL teacher delivered small group instruction during and ELA block. In another observation the teachers both moved about the room as students worked in pairs to answer questions, then each teacher facilitated a large group of students through a jigsaw activity.
- According to the ELL questionnaire, inclusion teachers are expected to design and deliver specialized instruction that is data-driven and meets the needs outlined on each students' individual plan. Observers saw leveled small-groups during ELA instruction, tailored to student ability. The teacher used different strategies in each group to help students access the material such as reading aloud, highlighting specific (but different for each group) vocabulary, and having students answer verbally or in writing depending on ability. Observers did not see specific individual plans.
- The school described that teachers use a variety of check for understanding techniques in the classroom, such as the use of equity sticks, cold call, fist to five, show call, tech tools such as Plickers and Kahoot, as well as exit ticket data. This data is used to regroup students in daily instruction, to re-teach specific skills and to pre-teach concepts to students who might require additional background before instruction is delivered on a topic. The QSR team did not observe any of the check for understanding techniques listed above in co-taught classrooms with an ELL and general education teacher. However observers noted checks for understanding used in other classrooms including cold calling and thumbs up/thumbs down. Some students worked on a personalized math program, TenMarks, once they finished their math work, but the team did not observe any other tech tools used to assess understanding. The QSR team did not observe specific pre-teaching or re-teaching in small groups.

**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 charter review or charter renewal process, DC PCSB staff will use quantitative data to assess whether the school met those goals.

<b>Mission and Goals</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
<p>Mission:</p> <p>The Center City Public Charter Schools (CCPCS) empower our children for success through a rigorous academic program and strong character education while challenging students to pursue personal excellence in character, conduct, and scholarship in order to develop the skills necessary to both serve and lead others in the 21st century.</p>	<p>The QSR team saw evidence that Center City PCS – Petworth is meeting its mission. In the majority of observations, teachers focused on engaging students in learning and supporting them as they accessed the material. Teachers asked questions, facilitated discussions, gave feedback, and pushed students to explain their thoughts and ideas. Teachers explicitly modeled polite language and allowed students to practice positive interactions with each other.</p> <p>With respect to the rigorous academic program, the team rated 73% as proficient or distinguished in the <u>Instruction</u> domain of the Danielson Framework, as detailed later in this report.</p>
<p>Goals:</p> <p>Center City PCS proposes that at least 70% of all students in grades K-8 will achieve at or above the 40th percentile or meet/exceed their spring growth target in math and reading based on NWEA MAP national norms by June of each year.</p>	<p>In the classrooms observed, the QSR team saw math teachers providing opportunities for students to solve problems independently and in groups. In math classes students rotated through stations including computer stations to practice skills. Students discussed how they arrived at answers and demonstrated some strategies on the board.</p> <p>In ELA classes, the QSR team observed teachers providing students with different ways to access ELA content. Students wrote complex sentences and read their sentences to each other. They used vocabulary words like <i>intriguing</i>, <i>natural phenomenon</i>, and <i>artifact</i>.</p> <p>Students took an active role in their learning in multiple classrooms. Some groups were student-directed and teachers provided sentence starters to help facilitate discussion. In other classes, teachers directed most of the</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>learning. In one class, students planned and worked on a class newspaper. Students worked together on computers, wrote stories, and sketched out comic strips.</p>
<p>Students will read and comprehend grade level appropriate text in the core content areas.</p>	<p>Observers saw both read-aloud and close reading of complex text in multiple classrooms. Teachers encouraged students to read clearly and asked students to make inferences as they read a novel. In one class the teacher asked, "What's one thing that you're working on when you're reading?" A student replied, "Pausing when I see commas." The teacher said, "Can you read it one more time?" Later in the lesson the same teacher asked students, "What's the title of that chapter? Give me an inference on why you think we might be marking this chapter based on our objective for today?"</p> <p>In one observation the teacher guided the discussions but tried to have students respond to each other directly while sharing ideas. In another class, students led their own discussions of a text, first in pairs then in larger groups. Students used sheets titled "tools for discussion" with bullet sentence starters such as "When the author said..." and "Could you say more about that?" The teachers in the classroom periodically reminded students to use the tools "we've been practicing all year" but generally allowed students to facilitate the process of answering questions about the text.</p>
<p>Students will master and apply grade-level appropriate computation skills and concepts; they will use mathematical reasoning to solve problems.</p>	<p>In the classrooms observed, the QSR team observed students in math classes solving problems independently and in groups. Students rotated through stations including computer stations to practice math skills. Students discussed how they arrived at answers and demonstrated some strategies on the board. Teachers used various strategies to support learning including using models to compare tenths and hundredths, physical movements to represent x-and y-axes, and reteach lessons with small groups while others practiced problems or worked on computers.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>All Center City PCS campuses will achieve an average of at least 90% attendance each year.</p>	<p>On each day of observations, the school had attendance rates above 90%.</p> <p><b>In-seat attendance during the two-week window:</b>  <b>Visit 1:</b> March 30, 2017 - 94.0%  <b>Visit 2:</b> March 30, 2017 - 94.0%  <b>Visit 3:</b> April 4, 2017 - 92.8%</p>
<p>All Center City PCS campuses should achieve an average of at least 75% re-enrollment each year.</p>	<p>DC PCSB will review quantitative data from the Performance Management Framework to assess this goal for the review.</p>
<p>Center City PCS students will build character by performing community service. Our goal is for at least 75% of students in grades 4-8 to participate in a minimum of two community service activities annually as measured by student exit tickets and tracked through PowerSchool.</p>	<p>DC PCSB will review community service hour data to assess this goal for the review.</p>

## THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT<sup>2</sup>

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. The QSR team scored 80% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 79% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations students and teachers displayed mutual respect. Teachers sat on the floor with students or made eye contact with them when they spoke. Teachers and students said, “Bless you” and “Thank you” when appropriate.</p>	Distinguished	14%
	<p>Teachers modeled polite interactions during conflict and encouraged students to practice what was modeled. In one distinguished observation a student became upset when another student took her seat. The teacher modeled a kind way for the student to ask the other student to move. The student resisted at first, but the teacher continued to encourage her to practice it and then the two students happily played a matching game together.</p>	Proficient	65%
	<p>The QSR team rated 21% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations the QSR team noted mixed interactions between students and teachers. In one observation the teacher used abrupt language with students during regular interactions. When students were disrespectful to him or each other he resorted to giving multiple “checks” but did not specify or address the problem. In another observation students laughed at each other’s answers and the teacher did not address it.</p>	Basic	21%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

<sup>2</sup> Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	<p>The QSR team scored a high 86% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations the teacher communicated the importance of the content and held high expectations for students. These teachers encouraged everyone to participate and sought out answers from students who were not as engaged. Teachers used verbal praise to encourage student effort such as "You guys did an awesome job reading", "Nice, give her two snaps and a clap on three", and "This is work that makes me want to dance! Good job!"</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers demonstrated neutral enthusiasm for the subject and students exhibited a limited commitment to completing work on their own. In one observation students were distracted by playing with Slime under their desks that the teacher did not notice. In another observation students played games on their laptops when the teacher was not looking, then would toggle back to their work when the teacher came close.</p>	Basic	14%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 84% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Overall students adhered to established routines and played active roles in cleaning up and passing out materials. In a distinguished observation students easily cleaned up their stations and transitioned to a whole group setting. The teacher awarded Dojo points to three teams and said, "Congratulations." The students transitioned to small groups for discussions without losing instructional time.</p>	Distinguished	14%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>Teachers used various strategies to get student attention or manage time, including countdowns or quick “one two three, eyes on me”, or cell phone timers. In one observation the teacher called out “Freeze!” The entire class stopped, put their hands on their heads and looked at the teacher. In a distinguished observation a student worked independently and used a sand timer to keep himself on pace. The teacher worked with both students on different lessons and went back and forth between them with no time lost.</p>	Proficient	72%
	<p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations poor execution of procedures resulted in lost instructional time. Teachers repeated instructions multiple times and had to speak to individual students individually as well. In one observation the teacher spent a lot of time passing back papers during which students remained disengaged and talked to each other or played with things at their desk. Teachers in these observations stopped class several times to reset expectations and deal with students who were not on task.</p>	Basic	14%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 72% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers in these observations consistently monitored student behavior and frequently acknowledged positive behavior through narration and awarding positive Dojo points. One teacher said, “I am going to give a whole class Dojo point. Everyone entered silently and read silently. Thank you.”</p>	Distinguished	14%
	<p>Teachers used proximity to redirect students, or pulled them aside privately to discuss a behavior issue. In most classes there were few issues with behavior and in a distinguished observation students worked through a conflict without teacher intervention. In on distinguished observation students discussed a problem and talked about how to solve it without teacher intervention.</p>	Proficient	58%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 21% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers attempted to influence student behavior, but with limited success. One teacher used a bell to get student attention and would say, "I need it silent." Students dropped their voices for a minute or two, and then got loud again. The teacher repeated this pattern every few minutes throughout the observation.</p> <p>Teachers in these observations administered consequences inconsistently. One teacher gave "checks" to students throughout the class period without an obvious strategy for why some students received deductions and others did not for exhibiting the same behavior. In another class students monitored points with teacher prompting, with the teacher calling out the student in front of his/her peers.</p>	Basic	21%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	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. The QSR team scored 73% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Instruction domain.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<p><b>Communicating with Students</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored 71% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers delivered clear directions about what the class would do and learn. In a math class the teacher described, “I’m going to give you a drill today that will help me determine who your partners will be going forward.” Other teacher said “Let’s refresh our minds about...” and “You did all this work already, so now these discussions are going to help you put it all together.” Teachers wrote objectives on the board for student reference throughout the class, such as: I will be able to use metric and area models to show 1/10 as fractions greater than 1 and decimals.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	71%
	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers were not clear about the objective and students had multiple questions about directions and next steps. In one observation a student expressed frustration. The teacher asked him about it but the conversation trailed off and did not seem to get resolved.</p> <p>In another observation the teacher gave instructions for students to move to different places in the classroom based on progress with their work. About half of the students seemed to understand where to go and began working immediately but other students seemed confused and wandered or talked with friends. Later in the same class, the teacher gave instructions for students to put papers in a bin, then as students began to move she said, “Let me change directions. I’ll just collect your work. This is too much movement.” She began giving deductions before students had time to get back to their seats.</p>	Basic	29%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques</b>	The QSR team scored 64% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations students took an active role in asking and answering questions. In an ELA class students worked in pairs to answer questions about a text. The students then discussed the chapter and explained their reasoning. In other classrooms most students enthusiastically participated when the teacher asked questions.	Distinguished	0%
	Teachers in these observations asked open-ended questions and encouraged students to justify their answers. In one observation a student read a passage and answered comprehension questions. The teacher said, "Do you think that is the answer? Why? Or Why not?" The student answered and the teacher pushed him to give more information. In other observations teachers facilitated discussions in whole group and small group settings. Teachers pushed students to build on other student answers, and gave students opportunities to share answers with each other (e.g., turn and talk) before sharing out with the whole class. In math classes, teachers asked questions such as "Why should I do...?" and "What would I do first if...?"	Proficient	64%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers led the majority of questioning and very little discussion occurred. A math teacher completed work on an overhead and asked questions as she worked such as "How do I show...?" or "How many..." but often did not wait for a student answer before she completed the work on the overhead. Another teacher did not wait if a student did not respond immediately. In another observation the teacher asked questions and cold-called students, but few responded. Overall few students engaged in the dialogue. The teacher asked a student at the front of the classroom "Why are you doing that? Why did you write it like that?"</p>	Basic	29%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	7%
<p><b>Engaging Students in Learning</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored 86% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations activities engaged students and provided various ways for students to complete work and projects. Students in one observation worked on making a class newspaper. The students worked on computers, wrote stories, and drew comic strips. In another observation the teacher provided time for students to discuss their strategy for how to use independent work time. In an observation where students worked in centers, students appeared focused and knew the expectations for each center.</p> <p>Teachers in these observations delivered lessons that required intellectual engagement and encouraged higher-order thinking. In one</p>	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>observation students wrote complex, or “juicy,” sentences. The teacher reviewed some examples with the class. The teacher also led the students in talking about the meaning of the sentence and what they noticed about it. Students had the opportunity to share their sentences and they used words such as “intriguing” and “natural phenomenon.”</p> <p>Teachers provided extra work for students who finished early, or had students serve as peer tutors once they finished their own work. One teacher told students they could create their own challenge problems once they finished.</p>	Proficient	86%
	<p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers did not provide any choice for how students could complete assignments and few students appeared intellectually engaged. Only a few students actively participated and several students remained disengaged throughout the observation period.</p>	Basic	14%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<p><b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored 71% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations the teachers provided specific feedback to students as they circulated the classroom. Teachers also invited students to assess their own work and each other’s work. During these exchanges students provided feedback and edited their writing based on the suggestions from other students. One teacher</p>	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>asked students to use their arms to show what an x-axis looks like.</p> <p>In another observation a teacher offered individual feedback to students through questioning and by reviewing their work. The teacher said, "Let's read the word. I will write it down. Let's split it. When there are two g's what is the sound? What kind of syllable? Is it closed or long vowel?" The student answered incorrectly and the teacher used a visual on the board to scaffold for the student.</p>	Proficient	71%
	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers in these observations made no clear attempts to assess student understanding. One teacher never circulated but did a few global checks in the middle of class by asking "got it?" to no student in particular. A few muttered "yeah." Another teacher worked with a small group and continued to ask, "Do you understand?" The students nodded but the teacher did not look at their work or push for more specifics to assess if the students did understand the material.</p>	Basic	29%
	<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
<b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>	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.
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	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.
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	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.
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	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
<b>Communicating with Students</b>	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.
<b>Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</b>	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.
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	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.
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	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.