



July 20, 2016

Monica Ray, Board Chair
Community College Preparatory Academy Public Charter School
2405 Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20020

Dear Ms. Ray:

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 2015-16 school year for the following reason:

- DC PCSB rated the school as Tier 3 on the 2014-15 Performance Management Framework

Qualitative Site Review Report

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Community College Preparatory Academy PCS between May 9 and May 20, 2016. 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 environment, 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 Community College Prep PCS.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of Naomi DeVeaux.

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Connie Spinner, School Leader

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: July 20, 2016

Campus Name: Community College Preparatory Academy Public Charter School

Ward: 8

Grade levels: Adult Education

Total Enrollment: 359

Reason for visit: DC PCSB rated the school as Tier 3 on the 2014-15 Performance Management Framework

Number of observations: 10

Summary

Community College Preparatory Academy Public Charter School (CC Prep PCS) is an adult education school whose mission is to provide the education and skills development that will empower and prepare under-credited adults for postsecondary education success, viable employment and lifelong learning. CC Prep PCS offers an adult education/General Educational Development (GED) program, a career and technical program, college preparatory classes, an evening program, extended academic time, and an online/blended learning program. The school offers vocational courses including Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC), hospitality, Microsoft Office Suite (MOS), and Comptea A+ (helpdesk). The QSR team observed a few of these course offerings during the two-week window, however we not see some classes because the schedule did not outline the correct hours for the courses. DC PCSB plans to observe these classes during the SY2016-17 QSR in preparation for the school's five-year review in SY2017-18.

The QSR team used the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching to examine classroom environments and instructional delivery (see Appendix I and II). The team scored an impressive 90% of observations as proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. In the components of Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport and Establishing a Culture for Learning, the QSR team scored 100% of the observations as proficient. Teachers and students interacted in a respectful manner in and out of the classroom. Teachers conveyed the importance of the academic material and held high expectations for students. The QSR team scored 73% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The QSR team scored 100% of the observations as proficient for the Engaging Students in Learning component. Teachers engaged students through varying the classwork and providing students with different ways to approach the content. Teachers also adjusted the pacing of lessons to give students more time to learn new concepts.

As an adult education program, CC Prep PCS has the option to serve students with disabilities. This decision is determined by whether an adult education program chooses to accept federal funding from the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). CC Prep PCS has opted not to accept these funds, and is not obligated to fully execute the requirements of IDEA. Please see the attached email (Appendix III) from the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) explaining adult education program options and requirements to serve students with disabilities.

CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

This table summarizes the school’s goals and academic achievement expectations as detailed in its charter and subsequent Accountability Plans, and the evidence that the Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team observed of the school meeting those goals during the Qualitative Site Visit.

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|---|--|
| <p>Mission: The mission of Community College Preparatory Academy is to provide the education and skills development that will empower and prepare under-credited adults for postsecondary education success, viable employment and lifelong learning.</p> | <p>Observers saw staff working with students to connect classwork to the skills needed to pass the General Educational Development (GED) exams and for employment and postsecondary education. Students and faculty discussed goals and transferrable knowledge/skills during classroom instruction.</p> <p>One instructor emphasized the importance of critical thinking, high-level inquiry, and developing deeper understanding of the content. Another teacher reminded students of reading strategies they could use on reading comprehension test such as identifying the main idea and supporting details of a passage to underscore the main point of the text. The school displayed postsecondary posters in the hallways and in one of classrooms.</p> |
| <p>Goals: PMF Goal #1: Student Progress: Students improving one or more goals in ABE or ESL performance <i>Student academic growth over the course of a program year</i></p> | <p>Instructors reviewed test results with students, making them aware of their progress on improving scores in Adult Basic Education (ABE). Based on these discussions in the classroom, students came into the lab after class knowing what to work on based on their most recent scores.</p> |
| <p>PMF Goal #2: Student Achievement: Secondary credential attainment <i>Students who complete a program of study to earn a secondary credential</i></p> | <p>The QSR team observed a blended learning model in the lab classroom observations. Students worked on Achieve3000 and GED Academy while</p> |

| Mission and Goals | Evidence |
|---|---|
| <i>(GED/NEDP)</i> | lab managers tutored and/or worked one-on-one with the students in weak areas. In one observation the teacher taught reading skills by connecting current events or situations that students witness in the media. |
| PMF Goal # 3: Career and College Readiness: Employment and postsecondary outcomes <i>Preparedness for students' employment and/or entry in</i> | Students are able to take courses related to specialized areas of employment including: Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC), hospitality, Microsoft Office Suite (MOS), and Comptea A+ (helpdesk). Instructors made connections with classroom learning to career/employment readiness such as using variables in equations to determine how much money a student would make per week. |
| PMF Goal #4: Leading Indicators: Predictors of future student progress and achievement <i>Students' attendance and retention rates</i> | The number of students in each classroom varied greatly. The QSR team observed three to 13 students present in classrooms during instruction. There were nine to 14 students working in the labs during the observations. |
| Governance: | A DC PCSB staff member attended the Community College Prep PCS Board Meeting on May 19, 2016. A quorum was present; four board members attended in-person and one member participated by phone. The Director of Operations presented the school's budget and its prospective performance on the financial audit report. The Executive Director discussed the school's academic performance, facility search, and attendance-boosting strategies. The Board approved the 2016-17 School Calendar and amended its Leave Policy. |

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT¹

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 90% of the observations as “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain.

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|--|--------------------|------|
| Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport | The QSR team scored 100% of the 10 observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. Teachers greeted students by name and hugged some of them. Teachers asked students how they were doing and students responded with details about their weekend and events that were happening in their lives. | Distinguished | 0% |
| | Lab managers in all of the observations high-fived students as they accomplished tasks. Students seemed at ease asking teachers and lab managers for help with content or with using the computers. Teachers, lab managers, and students smiled laughed and told each other to have a good evening after class. | Proficient | 100% |
| | The QSR team scored none of observations as basic in this component. | Basic | 0% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| Establishing a Culture for Learning | The QSR team scored 100% of the 10 observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In every | Distinguished | 0% |

¹ Different review team members may observe teachers more than once.

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|------|
| | <p>observation, teachers stressed the importance of learning the material, following steps in a problem, and checking completed work. Instructors and lab managers recognized students' efforts and praised them as they completed assignments. Most students came into the classrooms and the labs getting right to work and putting forth concentrated effort. In one observation three students came to class early to study before the instruction began.</p> | Proficient | 100% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as basic in this component.</p> | Basic | 0% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p> | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| Managing Classroom Procedures | <p>The QSR team scored 90% of the observations proficient and none as distinguished in this component. Students were engaged in productive small-group and individual work in multiple observations. Transitions were swift and seamless in all 10 observations. One teacher used timers to keep the class on schedule. Students understood how to look at their results on online activities and move to new tasks on the computers. Teachers circulated the workstations in the lab to assist students if they had questions.</p> | Distinguished | 0% |
| | | Proficient | 90% |

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|
| | The QSR team scored 10% of observations as basic in this component. In this observation a few students needed extra guidance and prompting to follow the routine and get back on track with work. | Basic | 10% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| Managing Student Behavior | The QSR team scored 70% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. Students were quiet and considerate in the lab, respecting each other's space and work atmosphere. Students used headphones when they needed to hear the audio on the computer. Others spoke quietly to a teacher when working on reading skills or trying to solve a problem. | Distinguished | 0% |
| | In one observation several students responded at once to a teacher's question. The teacher asked them to "hold on" and remember turn-taking. One student took a picture of the notes with his phone and started texting. The teacher came over and said, "Texting is not permissible in class, please put your phone away and focus on the notes." The student complied with the teacher's request. | Proficient | 70% |

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|
| | <p>The QSR team scored 30% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers inconsistently responded to student misbehavior. In one observation students were having personal conversations and laughing loudly. The teacher was not able to successfully redirect the students, however they eventually stopped and quieted down on their own.</p> <p>In another observation a lab manager stopped circulating around the lab and did not notice that a student starting looking at social media instead of doing academic work. Eventually another lab manager came over to the student and redirected her to the appropriate site.</p> | Basic | 30% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p> | 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 73% of the observations as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Instruction domain.

| Instruction | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|-----|
| Communicating with Students | <p>The QSR team scored 70% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers stated learning goals and outlined the class material. They also explained content in a clear manner and modeled processes for completing tasks when needed. One teacher worked with a student who was expressing frustration with the essay portion of the GED. The teacher talked through a strategy for completing this section of the exam.</p> | Distinguished | 0% |
| | <p>Another teacher talked to a student about her progress in reading and her goal for where she should be at the end of the month. The teacher showed her all of her attempts, starting scores, and her progress from April to May. The teacher explained that he wanted her to slow down and focus on the method of solving the multiple choice questions in a very critical way.</p> | Proficient | 70% |

| Instruction | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|--------------------|-----|
| | <p>The QSR team scored 30% of observations as basic in this component. In one observation a teachers attempted to clarify misunderstandings about variables in algebraic equations. Students still held misconceptions about variables in algebraic equations. In one observation students argued with the teacher about the content. The teacher still tried to clarify but was not able to clear up the content during the observation.</p> | Basic | 30% |
| | <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 70% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers engaged students in discussions and gave them wait time to respond to comments. Teachers also encouraged students to explain their answers.</p> | Distinguished | 10% |
| | <p>In one observation, a student heard a broad response about a woman's right to choose, and the student challenged the response saying, "You have to be more specific." The teacher said, "Exactly!" and asked the other student to provide more detail about his answer.</p> | Proficient | 60% |

| Instruction | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| | The QSR team scored 30% of the observations as basic in this component. During these observations, the teachers spent time walking around to each student and having a brief conversation about the lesson they are working on for the day. The teacher framed some questions to clarify material but only a few students engaged in the activity. | Basic | 30% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| Engaging Students in Learning | The QSR team scored 100% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. Teachers engaged the students with a mix of different learning tasks. Students worked collaboratively in small groups and discussed how to approach assignments such as sorting evidence from a story. In the lab students focused on the individual activities. They used their computers, notes and books to complete lessons. Teachers sat or knelt next to students to look at their work and support their engagement. | Distinguished | 0% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as basic in this component. | Basic | 0% |
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| | | | |

| Instruction | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|--|---|--------------------|-----|
| Using Assessment in Instruction | <p>The QSR team scored 50% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations the teachers gave feedback to students and elicited evidence from students to see if they understood the material.</p> | Distinguished | 0% |
| | <p>One teacher posted pieces of chart paper titled “evidence board” around the room. The teacher asked students to place the different evidence they find from the story to support the argument on the appropriate evidence board. The students work collaboratively to determine what evidence went under the five different categories. In another observation the teacher asked students to summarize an article for the class. The students provided summaries and received feedback.</p> | Proficient | 50% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored 50% of the observations as basic in this component. Instructors and lab managers circulated but did not give feedback. In one observation the instructor had ample evidence that that students were confused because they continued to give incorrect answers to his questions. He tried to adjust the lesson to clarify the material but was not able to get the students to understand the concepts. Students continued to solve the problems incorrectly after class and during the lab time.</p> | Basic | 50% |

| Instruction | Evidence Observed | School Wide Rating | |
|-------------|---|--------------------|----|
| | The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | 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. |

| The Classroom Environment | Unsatisfactory | Basic | Proficient | Distinguished |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 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 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. |
| 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 of 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. |

| Instruction | Unsatisfactory | Basic | Proficient | Distinguished |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p>Using Assessment in Instruction</p> | <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p> |

APPENDIX III: EMAIL FROM OSSE TO CC PREP PCS

From: Maisterra, Amy (OSSE)
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2015 6:38 PM
To: Maisterra, Amy (OSSE)
Cc: ndeveaux@dcpcsb.org; apatel@dcpcsb.org
Subject: Important OSSE Policy Clarification: Adult Education Programs and IDEA Obligations

Dear Adult Education Program Leader,

I am writing with an important clarification regarding your program's obligations to serve individuals with qualifying disabilities under the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

We have reviewed relevant Federal and local law and determined that, while the state must ensure access to a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) under IDEA, there are different obligations for elementary and secondary programs than there are for adult education programs, as adult education programs that do not grant regular high school diplomas and are chartered to serve adult students.

The state and all publicly funded agencies serving potentially eligible populations (3-22) must work to ensure that FAPE is offered. Annual IDEA funding is made available by an allocation process which is based upon the number of eligible students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) that are enrolled in your program. If an adult education program receives notice from OSSE of an IDEA allocation, this means that it has the option of applying for IDEA funding through a two phased process. This application process is designed to ensure that programs that accept funds can meet all requirements of IDEA. Thus, if adult education programs accept these funds, they are obligated to fully execute the requirements of IDEA.

However, adult education programs can choose not to accept IDEA funding. For all programs that do not receive IDEA funding, **your program is obligated to notify all students under the age of 22 identified with qualifying disabilities under IDEA of the fact that your program will not implement their IEP and they have the right to access a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in accordance with their IEP, at DCPS or another program that provides FAPE.**

Whether a student described above makes a decision to remain enrolled in your program or to un-enroll, you are required to issue a Prior Written Notice (PWN) and upload the Notice in the Special Education Data System (SEDS) in accordance with OSSE's guidelines, which can be found at: http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/OSSE_Entry_Exit_Guidance_FINAL_20140726.pdf

You are also required to provide OSSE with the names of all students who decide to un-enroll from your program, so that OSSE can provide the student with information on

other programs available to the student to provide FAPE.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions regarding this update. We will also be contacting your school in the upcoming weeks to ensure clarity regarding required next steps.

Sincerely,

Amy

Amy Maisterra, Ed.D., MSW
Assistant Superintendent
Elementary, Secondary, and Specialized Education
Office of the State Superintendent of Education
810 First St, NE, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20002
(202)481-3757 (o)
(202) 741-0227 (f)
(202) 641-1458 (c)
amy.maisterra@dc.gov