



April 5, 2019

Nick Rodriguez, Board Chair  
100 Peabody Street NW  
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Rodriguez,

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 for 20-year Charter Review during 2019-20 school year

### **Qualitative Site Review Report**

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Capital City Public Charter School – High School between February 4, 2019 – February 15, 2019. 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 Capital City Public Charter School – High School.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux  
Deputy Director

Enclosures

cc: Karen Dresden, Head of School and Belicia Reaves, Principal

## Qualitative Site Review Report

**Date:** April 5, 2019

### **Campus Information**

**Campus Name:** Capital City Public Charter School – High School (Capital City PCS – HS)

**Ward:** 4

**Grade levels:** Ninth through twelfth

### **Qualitative Site Review Information**

**Reason for Visit:** School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2019-20 school year

**Two-week Window:** February 4, 2019 – February 15, 2019

**QSR Team Members:** Two DC PCSB staff members including one special education (SPED) specialist and three consultants including one English Learner (EL) specialist

**Number of Observations:** 21 (including 3 SPED observations not included in scoring)

**Total Enrollment:** 335

**Students with Disabilities Enrollment:** 72

**English Language Learners Enrollment:** 56

**In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:**

**Visit 1:** February 4, 2019 – 88.6%

**Visit 2:** February 5, 2019 – 92.8%

**Visit 3:** February 6, 2019 – 93.1%

**Visit 4:** February 11, 2019 – 80.1%

**Visit 5:** February 12, 2019 – 90.4%

**Visit 6:** February 13, 2019 – 94.9%

**Visit 7:** February 15, 2019 – 86.1%

### **Summary**

The mission of Capital City PCS is to "enable a diverse group of students to meet high expectations; develop creativity, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills; achieve a deep understanding of complex subjects, and acquire a love of learning along with a strong sense of community and character. We will graduate young adults who are self-directed, intellectually engaged, and possess a commitment to personal and civic responsibility." The QSR team observed evidence that Capital City PCS – HS's classroom environment and instructional delivery support its mission. All teachers used strategies to support the school's commitment to the research-based

Expeditionary Learning Model<sup>1</sup>, resulting in engaging instruction, relevant content, and extensive student participation. All classrooms involved some level of cooperative learning. Students conferred with one another to solve algebraic expressions, improve the accuracy of their notes, locate information within online articles, and conduct experiments. Several of the assigned tasks in classrooms required independent thinking: students needed to find patterns in a set of data, research civil rights movements, and determine how electrons are arranged in concentric atomic orbitals. Teachers supported students' development of a positive sense of self, using phrases such as "You are appreciated!" and "You are an engineer."

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). The QSR team scored a high 88% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain, slightly above the school's last QSR in 2014<sup>2</sup> when 80% of observations were rated as proficient or distinguished in this component. The highest rated component was *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport* with 94% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished. The lowest rated component was *Managing Student Behavior*, with 78% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished, which is still a positive score for high schools. Notably, only one observation was unsatisfactory in this component.

The QSR team scored 73% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain, an increase from the 65% the school earned in this domain in 2014. Scores varied more in this domain as the QSR team observed more "basic" levels of performance. The highest rated component was *Communicating with Students* with 82% of observations rated as distinguished or proficient. However, in *Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques*, less than half (43%) of observations were rated as proficient. Nevertheless, only one observation was unsatisfactory in this component.

#### In-School Suspension (ISS)

DC PCSB observed ISS on February 5, 2019. The Dean of Students, Mr. Vereen, informed DC PCSB that he was conferencing with a student and that no students had been assigned to ISS.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ccpcs.org/program/el-education>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.dcpcsb.org/qualitative-site-review/2013-14-capital-city-high-school>

## Governance

Nick Rodriguez chairs the Capital City PCS board of trustees. The school has been compliant with the School Reform Act<sup>3</sup> for the past five years, which requires the board to include two parent representatives and have a majority of DC residents.

## Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, Capital City PCS - HS described its special education program in a questionnaire. The school implements a primary inclusion model, in which it educates students with disabilities alongside their non-disabled peers as much as possible. All core content classes have an inclusion co-teacher. Capital City PCS - HS also holds resource courses taught by special educators in smaller settings for students who need to strengthen basic skills. Capital City PCS – HS uses Read & Write Google for audible access to all reading texts. Some students have access to LearningAlly<sup>4</sup>, which provides grade level texts for students reading far below grade level. Finally, Capital City PCS - HS uses blended learning to facilitate instruction.

The special education specialist on the QSR team conducted six special education observations: three co-taught core content classes and three small-group “resource” courses. Overall, the school implemented its stated program inconsistently as evidenced by the mixed levels of student engagement that DC PCSB staff observed, which are described below.

In two of the co-taught classes, the special educators spent the majority of their time managing student behavior. In one observation two students were removed from the table groups to sit at individual desks at the back of the classroom. The inclusion teacher monitored the whole class’ behavior but mainly focused on the two students at the back of the room, repeatedly asking them to engage with the learning task. Many students spoke over both teachers throughout the lesson, often regarding off-topic subjects. The inclusion teacher rephrased directions into simpler terms, reminded students of where they needed to be in the text, and attempted to facilitate turn and talks with minimal success. In the second co-taught class, the inclusion teacher was able to take on a more active role because students’ behavior was mostly appropriate. The teacher asked probing questions to help students respond to their writing prompt and occasionally gave academic feedback such as “You need to restate your claim.” Nevertheless, a significant amount of the teacher’s time was spent reminding students to get on task.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.dcpccb.org/policy/school-reform-act>

<sup>4</sup> <https://learningally.org/>

In the third co-taught class, both teachers worked together to provide personalized feedback to all students in an effective manner. In this observation students were writing personal narratives on GoogleDocs. The teachers had already read the students' first drafts and provided edits and questions embedded within the text. Students used a graphic organizer to respond to the edits and provide more details in their writing. Both teachers circulated throughout the classroom, conferencing with each student about their progress.

In a pull-out class called "College Research," the special educator led four students through individualized research projects. Each student entered the classroom and determined their task for the day: 1) reading and gathering clues, 2) organizing my notecards, 3) revising my paper, and 4) making my slides. The teacher made a plan for each student's session by asking, "What do you have for effects already? Organize these into three categories," and "Ok, how are you going to tackle this? Do you see patterns in your notes that you can categorize?" Two students used GoogleDocs to respond to feedback on their papers that the teacher provided before class. One student worked primarily with notecards to organize his thoughts. One student had a color-coded flipbook with instructions for each component of a paragraph. The teacher circulated to each student multiple times, ensuring all students were consistently engaged.

### Specialized Instruction for English Learners

Capital City PCS – HS's EL program "uses an inclusion model within the context of Expeditionary Learning, incorporating strategies and structures from the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model." The school explained that its EL program includes content classes, English language courses, and an extended school day for ELs. The EL specialist observed each of these program elements. While the EL specialist saw strong support for language development in the extended day and language specific course, she observed limited use of the SIOP model in the content class where "teaching teams made up of content area teachers and inclusion teachers are responsible for providing services to all ELs...using SIOP strategies."

The inclusion model is used within the classroom and includes small group instruction as needed. During the content course, the English teacher discussed a book the class was reading, asking students to respond to a question by writing a persuasive paragraph. There were objectives for other English classes on the board but not for this particular class, though "One of the most important aspects of SIOP is the inclusion of both content and language objectives for each lesson."<sup>5</sup> The EL teacher (different than the English teacher) provided individual support to ELs but

---

<sup>5</sup> Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., Short, D. (2017). *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners - The SIOP Model*. p. xiii.

did not teach any portion of the lesson. The class included SLOP Feature 14: Scaffolding Techniques Consistently Used, Assisting and Supporting Student Understanding through verbal scaffolding as the EL teacher asked students to repeat the learning task and talk through their understanding of the text and responses before writing. The EL teacher paraphrased students' responses and modeled the thought process students should follow to answer the question. The English teacher provided instructional scaffolding in the form of a graphic organizer featuring characters, a question about the characters, and an associated character trait. The class also included SLOP Feature 15: A Variety of Questions or Tasks that Promote Higher-Order Thinking Skills, as students had to answer a question about supporting characters' impact on the main character of a story and write a persuasive essay.

The EL specialist observed strong support for students' language development in the English language course. Students had ample opportunities to read, write, and receive feedback from the teacher. The class began with students reading from their Dialogue Journals in which the EL teacher had written individual letters. Students then responded in their journals and handed them in for feedback. Students moved on to individual work, with about half of them working on grammar (capitalization of letters) and others working on persuasive paragraphs based on a reading passage. The EL teacher reviewed each student's writing, instructing them in writing mechanics including how to write a topic sentence and following up with detailed explanations and evidence. She encouraged them to "go deeper" to explain their thinking further, and read their responses in real-time asking probing questions. When necessary, she provided grammar explanations like the difference between "proof" and "prove."

The EL teacher strongly supported students by "previewing content and reviewing for upcoming assessments" during the extended day session at the beginning of the school day. She demonstrated knowledge of their work, asking if they had finished readings from English classes and CRIED<sup>6</sup> (school's acronym for persuasive paragraphs) paragraphs, how physics was going, and progress on history and geometry projects. The EL teacher supported students' writing skills development by giving them sentence starters and instruction about beginning paragraphs with topic sentences, continuing with evidence and explanations. She reviewed student work and provided immediate feedback, telling the student to start with a topic sentence summarizing the paragraph, provide greater detail in explanations, and fix grammar mistakes. Most students worked productively throughout the entire session, asking the teacher for assistance when necessary.

---

<sup>6</sup> CRIED: Claim, Reason, Introduction of Evidence, Evidence, Discussion of Evidence

## THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT<sup>7</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 88% 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	
<b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 94% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Interactions between the students and teacher were highly respectful. In proficient observations teachers spoke warmly to students, leaning in to see their work to provide feedback and encouragement. One teacher said, “I adore being here. I absolutely love teaching you on a daily basis.” In another observation students working together talked good-naturedly about their different academic strengths: “See, you’ve got smarts in this, but I’ve got smarts in that. We can switch!”</p> <p>In the distinguished observations students took intellectual risks and respectfully disagreed with and encouraged one another. For example, one student said, “You’ve got this” when a peer struggled. In another observation a student asked for guidance on how to respectfully object to a peer’s idea.</p>	Distinguished	11%
		Proficient	83%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of observation as basic in this component.</p>	Basic	6%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

<sup>7</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 89% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component.</p> <p>The distinguished observations were characterized by teachers' high expectations that with hard work, all students can master difficult material. In one observation the teacher said, "Please struggle a little - there's something healthy in struggle - but if you look at a problem and have no idea what to do, then ask for help because I am here to help you." Students in these observations took the initiative to improve their understanding of the content and frequently assisted one another in this endeavor. In one observation a student had completed the assigned work and wanted to get a head start on the next concept, saying, "I don't understand it, but I want to!"</p>	Distinguished	28%
	<p>Proficient observations conveyed the deep satisfaction that comes with understanding complex content. In circulating the room to check students' work, one teacher exclaimed, "I am seeing lots of people getting it! This is amazing!" Several students in these observations experienced epiphanies as they sought to grasp the content. Just one example is when a student sat back and said, "Ahh, I get it now," and smiled.</p> <p>High expectations for hard work and learning were the norm for most. Students got to work right away upon entering the room and worked until the end of class. In one instance students stayed in their seats even after the bell to finish their task. During an instructional video, a few students asked the teacher to pause it so they could make sure their notes were complete and accurate.</p>	Proficient	61%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 11% of the observations as basic in this component. In one observation the teacher stated, "We're going to do some college-level concepts," but the activity only required students to fill-in-the-blanks, even though the students were given all of the answers in a pre-test. In another observation some students were not interested in completing the task and said things like, "I hate this topic." The teacher told the students to "just get something down on the paper."</p>	Basic	11%
	<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 89% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the proficient observations classroom routines functioned smoothly. Most observations began with students entering the classroom and picking up an entrance task; they promptly began work upon sitting down. One classroom displayed a whiteboard near the door, listing the materials students would need that day. In another observation students took laptops from a cart when they entered and conscientiously replaced them at the end of the class. Teachers used timers to help students remain on track, and attention signals such as "If you can hear my voice clap once..." Students remained productively engaged during small group and independent work.</p> <p>In the distinguished observations routines and procedures were executed seamlessly with no loss of instructional time. In one observation the teacher prepared all materials before the lesson and pre-distributed them before students entered the classroom. Students transitioned into turn-and-talk, and small group work effortlessly. To manage time, one teacher stated "I notice that some of you are already done. If that is you, look up, make eye contact with someone else and then get together and share."</p>	Distinguished	11%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>In the other distinguished observation, students had jobs which they did at the end of the class period to ensure all materials were returned properly.</p>	Proficient	78%
	<p>The QSR team scored 11% of the observations as basic in this component. In one observation the bathroom procedure functioned unevenly: the rule was that students could leave one at a time to use the restroom, but the teacher allowed some students to circumvent this process, causing confusion and frustration among students. In another observation transitions were disruptive. Students got out of their seats to leave well before the bell rang. The teacher stopped everyone at the door and demanded to see their homework, causing a gridlock.</p>	Basic	11%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<p><b>Managing Student Behavior</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored 78% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations, student behavior was entirely appropriate. In one observation the teacher preventively monitored behavior so that everyone remained on task for the entire observation by constantly moving between student groups and engaging students with questions about their collaborative work. Students intervened with each other when needed, and the teacher swiftly and appropriately managed any minor misbehaviors. One teacher acknowledged when students tried to regulate themselves. For example, the teacher commented, "I know you were joking, but that was a great self-regulation technique."</p> <p>In the proficient observations, standards of behavior were clearly established. Teachers frequently and effectively monitored student behavior. In one class when there was chatter, the teacher stopped talking and waited for everyone's attention – which s/he quickly attained.</p>	Distinguished	11%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>In another observation the teacher looked up from helping a student when a group of students began talking about an irrelevant topic. "How's it going, guys? Are you finished? Ok, so what's next?" The students moved on to the next assigned task. On most class boards and on many of the learning target checklists students had next to their work, there was a learning target related to behavior or work habits, such as "I can focus on learning and staying on task." Teachers reinforced these behavioral expectations with general and individual reminders as needed.</p>	Proficient	67%
	<p>The QSR team scored 17% of the observations as basic in this component. Standards of behavior had been established, and teachers referred to classroom rules and responded to misbehavior, but with uneven results. For example, while most students adhered to the expectations, some held off topic conversations during independent work time. The teacher frequently told students to return to their work, which they did for a few minutes, only to begin talking about the nonacademic topic again. Because this cycle repeated itself throughout the observation, it falls into the basic range. In another observation two students held a loud side conversation during the entire class. After the teacher corrected the behavior and walked away, the students continued to talk. In a few observations, cell phones prevented full engagement from students because they listened to music instead of directions.</p>	Basic	17%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	6%

## 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. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<p><b>Communicating with Students</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored 82% of observations as basic in this component.</p> <p>In the distinguished observations the teachers addressed learning targets explicitly. One teacher pre-taught important vocabulary relevant to the lesson, using explanations that connected directly to students' lives: "The next word is 'petition,' a formal request to the court. This 'petition' isn't the same as when you signed your names in support of wearing holes in your jeans at school." Teachers in the distinguished observations consistently wove academic vocabulary into their instruction: In referring to a picture of a "whites only" sign, the teacher described it as a "primary source" and "a law in practice enforcing the separation of races." In one observation a student gave the teacher the idea to link a new and difficult concept to one the students were already familiar with: "Oh, so is this like the Bohr model?" The teacher then explained the connection to everyone, using two diagrams on the board.</p> <p>In the proficient observations the teachers' explanation of content was clear and scaffolded, and the lessons invited student intellectual engagement. Furthermore, the students in these observations engaged with the learning task, indicating they understood what they were being asked to do. Teachers circulated as students worked on their assignments, closely observing the work and answering questions with explanations that pushed student thinking and allowed them to strengthen their understanding of the content. In one observation the teacher pointed out "so you guys want to measure this distance here, between the bottom of the stack of books and the bottom of the ramp, that's the 'run.'"</p>	Distinguished	19%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>Another observation included a teacher pinpointing the error in a student's math calculations, yet not doing the thinking for her: "Look at this one. You found the zeroes. Here, we got a factor of <math>x-3</math>, but we got a zero of positive 3. What was the step you used to move from here to here?"</p>	Proficient	63%
	<p>The QSR team rated 19% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations students were confused about what they should be doing. In two observations the teachers attempted to provide scaffolding by creating graphic organizers, but the teachers' explanations were confusing, and students asked several clarifying questions about how they were supposed to use their graphic organizer to support their writing project. In another observation the teacher had to clarify the learning task for several students, and at times the directions were still not clear.</p>	Basic	19%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<p><b>Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored 43% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation the teacher and students all asked questions, initiated topics, and challenged each other. During small group work time, one teacher reminded students that they all had to agree on the justifications they came to as a group and that each student had to be prepared to share out the group's thinking. During whole group discussion in another observation students built off each other's ideas. In the proficient observations discussion involved open-ended questions and a variety of students speaking. Discussion was a tool used to promote deep understanding and attainment of the learning target.</p>	Distinguished	7%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The entrance task in one observation had multiple correct answers, and the teacher built a discussion around students' answers to the task. As students contributed their answers, the teacher challenged student thinking, saying, "Talk to me about your answer." When one student hesitated, the teacher remained focused on her until she could explain her thinking. During another observation the teacher asked students to confirm their answers and compare with other students for accuracy. The students were asked to discuss with their peers about the correct solutions if they needed assistance – "go check in with John if you need help with #5, he's the expert on this one." In another observation two students worked together, and one asked the other, "Why did you add this? So how will you figure that out?"</p>	Proficient	36%
	<p>The QSR team rated 57% of observations as basic in this component. In some observations, participation levels were high, but questions were rapid-fire; student groups were merely asked to report their answers out. During one observation there were limited opportunities for student and teacher discussion. Some of the questions posed to students were low-level requiring only one-word answers, such as, "When we write evidence, do we paraphrase it?" or "Who are you researching?" In some observations the teachers did not ask for justification of thinking or try to link students' responses together. Other parts of the discussions in these observations were based on low-level questions such as "How many electrons does hydrogen have?"</p> <p>One teacher attempted to get students to respond to one another and cold call, but few participated. One teacher framed strong discussion questions at times, but eventually answered them him/herself, saying, for example, "The character is telling him to be responsible, right?"</p>	Basic	57%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	The QSR team scored 89% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component.	Distinguished	17%
	<p>The tasks in the distinguished observation required complex thinking on the part of students. The pace of the lessons flowed smoothly, with the warm-up leading to discussion, followed by activities that allowed students to consolidate their understanding of the learning target. Along the way, students dabbled in inquiry of their own, one student pointing to the timeline of Black history on the wall as he formulated a hypothesis.</p> <p>The learning tasks and activities in the proficient observations were designed to challenge student thinking and invite students to make their thinking visible. In each observation students made use of a cadre of relevant resources. In one class, students solved inequalities and had to show their work, moving at their own pace through assigned modules. In another, students answered questions about applying for financial aid for college, referring to resources such as lecture notes and websites. In yet another observation students drew diagrams showing the distribution of electrons in atoms, referring to notes, PowerPoints, and the periodic table displayed in the classroom. These lessons resulted in active intellectual engagement by most students, with teachers scaffolding to support that engagement, whether through whole class instruction or one-on-one conversation. The pace of these lessons was appropriate, allowing students time to wrestle with challenging content while avoiding too much “down time.”</p>		
	The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component.	Basic	6%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component.	Unsatisfactory	6%
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 73% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation the teacher spent most of their time circulating, looking at students' work, providing precise individual feedback and bursts of reteaching when needed. Some students asked one another for feedback on their work: "Do you think this is a remainder? On number 2?" Students occasionally assessed their own work: One student told the teacher, "I thought I had the right answer and then I checked it and realized I had to change..." Assessment was fully integrated into instruction in this observation, with students continually using feedback to improve their learning.</p> <p>In the proficient observations teachers assessed groups of students. For example, one teacher asked each group of students to share the results of their "Do Now" task aloud and gave feedback such as "Yes, good" to each group. Another teacher circulated between groups of students and answered their questions as they worked. Some feedback in these observations was directed to the whole class, but it was specific and oriented toward future improvement: "Remember folks, when in doubt make sure those S [orbitals] are filled out, and we get much better results." At another point the teacher in this observation used a "think aloud" method to assess the whole class, feigning misunderstanding as she diagrammed electrons at the board: "So I do this and then this, right?" Some students chimed in, "No, you have to put two electrons in each S orbital first!" to which the teacher responded, "Oh, right, thank you!" Sometimes the teachers in these observations provided feedback to individuals, for example: "Let me see what you've got...." The majority of the feedback in these observations, although given mostly to groups, was specific</p>	Distinguished	6%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>enough for students to apply to future work, placing them in the proficient range.</p>	Proficient	67%
	<p>The QSR team rated 28% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations there was little evidence that students understood how their work would be evaluated: one teacher indicated that “if you don’t finish this, you have homework, and your classwork grade will be lower.” Another teacher monitored understanding only through the students’ questions as she circulated. She did not ask questions to the students to gauge their understanding, nor did she provide any constructive feedback other than direct answers to their questions. Another teacher monitored learning for the class as a whole, asking “What does that learning target mean to you?” And soliciting answers from just two students before moving on. Other examples of whole-class assessment included, “So for those of you who did your homework, what amendment was Plessy focused on?” A few students answered correctly. At one point the teacher encouraged students to compare their notes with a partner to see if they had missed anything, but only a few students participated.</p>	Basic	28%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

## APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT 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 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 situated within broader learning. Teacher's explanation of content is appropriate and connects with students' knowledge and experience.	Teacher's oral and written communication is clear and expressive, anticipating possible student misconceptions. Makes the purpose of the lesson or unit clear, including where it is situated within broader learning, linking purpose to student interests. Explanation of content is imaginative, and connects with students' knowledge and experience. Students contribute to explaining concepts to their peers.
<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.

**APPENDIX III: SCORE BREAKDOWN BY COMPONENT**

Percent of:	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	6%	0%
Basic	6%	11%	11%	17%	19%	57%	6%	28%
Proficient	83%	61%	78%	67%	63%	36%	72%	67%
Distinguished	11%	28%	11%	11%	19%	7%	17%	6%
<b>Subdomain Average</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.78</b>

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	88%	73%
<b>Domain Averages</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>2.82</b>