



April 2, 2013

Kathy Bihr, Board Chair
César Chávez PCS
709 12th Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Dear Ms. Bihr:

The Public Charter School Board ("PCSB") conducts Qualitative Site Reviews to gather and document authentic evidence to support the oversight of all PCSB schools. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, PCSB shall monitor the progress of each school in meeting student academic achievement expectations specified in the charter granted to such school. Your school was selected to undergo a Qualitative Site Review during the 2012-13 school year for the following reason(s):

- School eligible to petition for 15-year Charter Renewal

Qualitative Site Review Report

On October 16 and 23, 2012, a Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of César Chávez PCS - Capitol Hill Campus. The purpose of the site review is for PCSB to gauge the extent to which the school's goals and student academic achievement expectations were evident in the everyday operations of the public charter school. To ascertain this, PCSB staff and consultants evaluated your classroom teaching by using an abridged version of the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* observation rubric. We also visited a board meeting and conducted focus groups with a random selection of students, a group of teachers, and your administrators.

Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report is focused primarily on the following areas: mission/goals of the school's charter, classroom environments, instructional delivery, meeting the needs of all learners, professional development, and school climate.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at César Chávez PCS - Capitol Hill Campus. Thank you for your continued cooperation as the PCSB makes every effort to ensure that César Chávez PCS is in compliance with its charter.

Sincerely,



Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: School Leader

CHARTER GOALS

This table summarizes César Chávez PCS’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 the goal during the Qualitative Site Visit.

| Goal | Evidence |
|---|--|
| Students will demonstrate mastery of the public policy curriculum at Chávez. | <p>As indicated in the master schedule given to the QSR team by the administrator focus group, the school currently features capstone and thesis courses as a part of its core curriculum for its 9th and 12th graders, respectively.</p> <p>The QSR team observed a class dedicated to the development and execution of thesis projects, which each student is required to complete in order to graduate. In this class, the students were able to articulate to the QSR team observer a summary of their theses and the school’s goal in requiring such a project to graduate. The students appeared invested in their work.</p> <p>According to the teacher focus group and the administrator focus group, seniors in need of assistance with their thesis project have the option of attending the Saturday Academy for support.</p> |
| Students will demonstrate mastery of core academic material. | <p>The QSR team did not review student achievement data as part of its site visits.</p> <p>This goal has been assessed through the Performance Management Framework (“PMF”).</p> |
| Students will demonstrate regular attendance at school. | The QSR team did not review attendance record data as part of its site visits. |
| The Chávez school will achieve a high reenrollment rate. | The QSR team did not review reenrollment data as part of its site visits. |
| Over 85% of students will meet graduation requirements within five years. | The QSR team did not review graduation data as part of its site visits. |
| Chávez students will be accepted into a post-secondary 2 or 4 year institution. | <p>The QSR team did not review college acceptance data as part of its site visits.</p> <p>According to the administrator focus group, the school currently has a college career counselor on staff and has also developed a "college prep advisory course" to support students’ transition to college. This course is offered for 9th – 12th graders two days per week.</p> |
| Chávez parents will be active and engaged in their student’s education and in the life of the school. | <p>According to the administrator focus group, the school offers three "financial aid nights" per year for all parents of 12th grade students and regularly e-mails parents to keep them informed of all educational opportunities available to Chávez students. Administrators also contact families of students in the summer to ensure awareness and understanding of school policy.</p> |

| Goal | Evidence |
|---|---|
| Students will be able to read at the grade appropriate level. | According to school leaders, high school students currently reading at a 2 nd or 3 rd grade level are assigned Saturday Academy intervention. The QSR team did not review reading grade level data as part of its site visits. |
| Chávez students will make a year or more of progress on the SAT-9 Math test, as measured by NCE gains. (Updated Assessment: DC-CAS) | The QSR team did not review student achievement data as part of its site visits. |
| AP Performance | The QSR team did not review AP performance data as part of its site visits. |
| Students will attain competitive scores on the SAT. | The QSR team did not review SAT/PSAT achievement data as part of its site visits. According to information provided by the administrator focus group, Chávez PCS has hired four KAPLAN instructors to teach an SAT prep course to all juniors after school. There are currently 98 students enrolled in the course who will take four practice exams during the course in preparation of taking the SAT. |
| PSAT Performance | The QSR team did not review PSAT performance data as part of its site visits. |

SCHOOL MISSION

This rubric summarizes the school's performance on aligning its operations with the mission and goals of its charter.

| School Mission | Limited | Satisfactory | Proficient | Exemplary |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| The school's mission and educational goals as articulated in the charter application and subsequent amendments are implemented in the day to day operations of the school. | Limited observations of day to day observations as aligned with mission and educational goals by any school stakeholders. | Day to day operations and activities as aligned with mission and educational goals are demonstrated by some staff members. | Day to day operations and activities as aligned with mission and educational goals are demonstrated by nearly all staff members. | Day to day operations and activities as aligned with the mission and educational goals are demonstrated by students throughout the school building. |
| The Board and school administrators govern and manage in a manner consistent with the school's design and mission. | Administrators and Board members demonstrate a limited understanding of the school's design. Evidence of its use in the management and governance of the school is substantially lacking. | Administrators and Board members demonstrate an adequate understanding of the school's design. There is evidence that understanding of the design is sometimes used to effectively manage and govern the school. | Administrators and Board members demonstrate a good understanding of the school's design. There is evidence that understanding of the design is used to effectively manage and govern the school. | All key administrators and Board members demonstrate an excellent understanding of the school's design. There is significant evidence that understanding of the design is used to effectively manage and govern the school. |
| The school's curriculum and instruction are aligned with the school's mission and educational goals. | School curriculum and instruction are not aligned with the mission and educational goals and/or are utilized in limited/no classrooms. | School curriculum and instruction are aligned with the mission and educational goals and are utilized in some classrooms. | School curriculum and instruction are aligned with the mission and educational goals and are utilized in most classrooms. | School curriculum and instruction are aligned with the mission and educational goals and are utilized in all classrooms. |
| The school has met or is making progress toward meeting the educational goals of its charter. | The school demonstrates limited evidence of progress towards monitoring and making progress towards few of the goals of its charter. | The school demonstrates adequate evidence of progress towards monitoring and making progress towards some of the goals of its charter. | The school demonstrates proficient evidence of progress towards monitoring and making progress towards most of the goals of its charter. | The school demonstrates exemplary evidence of progress towards monitoring and making progress towards all of the goals of its charter. |

School Mission Summary

According to its charter application, the mission of César Chávez Public Charter School is: "To challenge students with a rigorous curriculum that fosters citizenship and prepares them to excel in college and life." Gathering and documenting evidence of the school's success in fulfilling this mission served as the ultimate purpose of the QSR team's on-site reviews, which included: a full-day scheduled observation on October 16, 2012 and a half-day unscheduled observation on October 23, 2012 (hereinafter referred to as the "school day visits"). During the school day visits to Chávez PCS – Capitol Hill Campus ("Capitol Hill"), the QSR team focused on observing classes in session and the school climate in general.

During the school day visits, the team also conducted focus group of randomly selected students, randomly selected teachers, and the school's administrators. In addition, the QSR team observed a board of trustees meeting on October 12, 2012. All of these observations fall under the umbrella of the QSR visit.

At the Board of Trustees meeting, seven out of the twelve total members were in attendance, which under Chávez's rules and regulations comprises a quorum; also in attendance were the Managing Director and the Chief Operating Officer. During the board meeting, discussion focused on academics, governance, and finances. The Managing Director updated the Board on the re-accreditation review by the American Academy of Liberal Education. The Chief Academic Officer reviewed academic outcomes for each campus compared to the goals for the 2011-12 academic year. The Board discussed DC-CAS scores as well as PMF results. Specifically, the Board discussed differences in campus outcomes and how Chávez schools in general could improve math scores in the same way that they have reading scores. The Chief Operation Officer answered questions posed by Board members about the PMF results, particularly the Median Growth Percentile. The Board also discussed teacher quality, teacher recruitment and retention, and teacher salaries. The Board discussed the prospect of moving strong teachers to weaker campuses, and how “other professions pay what they need to pay to get the best” and that Chávez should consider doing the same. Other discussion items included: curriculum revision relating to the Common Core State Standards, special education, college acceptance, and student retention. The Board set a goal that all Chávez schools would be in Tier 1 within five years--members stated that there is no point in having a charter sector if they were just going to be average. Two candidates for board membership were approved. Financial issues were discussed, as well as the PCSB Board vote regarding closing single campuses instead of the entire charter.

In the focus groups and classroom observations, most teachers demonstrated a dedication to student improvement regarding both student understanding of the substantive topics and their development of communication and relationship management skills in preparation for college life and adult life in general. Most teachers efficiently managed their classrooms, ensuring execution of their lesson plans while flexibly adapting the substantive topics to appeal to expressed student interests. They tailored their pedagogical approach to address the level of apparent student comprehension (or lack thereof) of the material. Many students demonstrated a dedication to complying with teacher instruction with a view toward the underlying value of the material as conveyed in the lesson. Some students, however, demonstrated disengagement from the lesson and impeded effective class-wide instruction and participation. These situations, though not totally isolated, were in the minority.

The school administrators have instituted an official school-wide disciplinary point system (known as "PAR," which stands for “Professional, Actively engages, and Respectful). As designed, each student has two categories of points that follow the student around his or her classes. Each student receives a point for a demonstration of good behavior that the student aggregates going forward and can cash in to receive an award (e.g., a field trip). In addition, each student receives a point for a demonstration of bad behavior that adds up and result in a penalty at particular

thresholds (e.g., detention). This was Capitol Hill's second year employing the point system. The principal acknowledged during the administrator focus group that the system was not as effective as it should be because, as the QSR team noted during their observations, teachers inconsistently enforced the system as to: (1) what constitutes "good behavior" or "bad behavior" for the purpose of assigning a point (e.g., one teacher awarded points for satisfactory behavior whereas another only for excellent behavior and another never mentioned the points despite frequently addressing inappropriate behavior); (2) assigning the points based, at least partly, on overall class behavior as opposed to purely on an individual basis; and (3) how to keep track of the points assigned (e.g., one teacher diligently kept track on the board whereas another shouted them out but never appeared to recall her previous assignments of points).

Most classes featured effective instruction on substantive topics such as math, foreign language, persuasive writing, biology, and policy-oriented thesis development, with an apparent aim toward collegiate, life management, and citizenship preparation. Productive collaboration (e.g., small-group assignment completion), judicious discussion (e.g., respectful debate), and product development (e.g., formal presentations through computer programs) were frequently incorporated into the lesson plans. Some classes, however, relied on rote memorization, low-level questioning, and student regurgitation of teacher-fed material without calling for critical analysis. Overall, the level of questioning appeared wanting with regard to a focus on critical analysis.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENTS

This rubric summarizes the school's performance on the Classroom Environments elements of the rubric during the scheduled and unscheduled visits.

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

| Class Environment | Limited | Satisfactory | Proficient | Exemplary |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Organizing Physical Space | Teacher makes poor use of the physical environment, resulting in unsafe or inaccessible conditions for some students or a serious mismatch between the furniture arrangement and the lesson activities. | Teacher's classroom is safe, and essential learning is accessible to all students, but the furniture arrangement only partially supports the learning activities. | Teacher's classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; teacher uses physical resources well and ensures that the arrangement of furniture supports the learning activities. | Teacher's classroom is safe, and students contribute to ensuring that the physical environment supports the learning of all students. |

Classroom Environments Summary

The school was inconsistent in its performance on the Classroom Environments rubric, which includes five elements: Environment of Respect, Culture of Learning, Managing Classroom Procedures, Managing Student Behavior, and Organization of Physical Space.

Most classroom interactions were entirely respectful and dedicated toward working on the lesson. The students participated in productive, cooperative on-topic discussion as guided by the teacher and on several occasions, without prompt, assisted each other in their pursuit of understanding the material. Many teachers made noticeable effort to display respect for the students, which the students reciprocated. For example, one teacher greeted all students at the door when they entered the classroom and informed them not to expect a warm-up today (as normally done) and instead sit and wait for instructions, which they did. Some classroom interactions, however, were generally negative due to teachers lacking classroom management skills. Observers reviewed one teacher struggling to manage the behavior of students whom the observer had seen behave appropriately in another classroom earlier in the day and in another class, a group of misbehaving students loudly made fun of another student who was one of the few willing to participate in the lesson. The teacher tried to address their behavior but was unable to completely stop it.

Most students appeared committed to improving their understanding of the material through participation in the lesson. Most teachers used instructional methods to ensure participation by all students, and most students were willing to comply with teachers' instructions. Most teachers appeared to have high expectations for their students, and most students demonstrated pride in their work. However, some teachers did most of the reasoning for the students. For example, two co-teachers wrote terms and statements on the board, which the students copied; the teachers did not ask for any kind of reflection or explanation of its meaning, purpose of inclusion, etc.

Most classes functioned smoothly with little loss of instruction time through widely understood routines and procedures. For example, while the students were taking a test, the teacher checked the students' notebooks, which they had purposefully placed on their desks for review, to minimize disruption. Teachers were expected, per school-wide policy, to use the "point system for behavior," but the teachers administered the points on different bases and used different approaches to maintaining a record of the points assigned. As a result, it seemed that the number of points a particular student had been assigned depended on that student's particular teachers or classmates perhaps as much as the student's behavior. In some classes, procedures were not enforced, which led to frequent disruption. For example, two co-teachers did not regulate bathroom pass usage. In the class of ten, each student left the class to use the bathroom pass at least once and two left twice.

Exemplary student work was posted on bulletin boards in the classrooms. However, the space available in several classrooms did not match the size of the class. In one case, the students had to closely sit next to each other, which led to constant disruptive interaction and physical agitation. In another class with 10 students, the room was significantly larger than other classrooms with class sizes of twenty or more. Moreover, the two teachers in the class of ten did not cooperatively teach in that they both stood near the board and filled in the graphic organizer even though several students appeared disengaged and distracted other students. The computer lab room featured several broken tables that wobbled.

INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY

This rubric summarizes the school's performance on the Instructional Delivery elements of the rubric during the scheduled and unscheduled visits.

| Instructional Delivery | Limited | Satisfactory | Proficient | Exemplary |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| 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 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. |

| Instructional Delivery | Limited | Satisfactory | Proficient | Exemplary |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Using Assessment in Instruction | Students are unaware of criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and do not engage in self-assessment or monitoring. Teacher does not monitor student learning in the curriculum, and feedback to students is of poor quality and in an untimely manner. | Students know some of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and occasionally assess the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards. Teacher monitors the progress of the class as a whole but elicits no diagnostic information; feedback to students is uneven and inconsistent in its timeliness. | Students are fully aware of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards. Teacher monitors the progress of groups of students in the curriculum, making limited use of diagnostic prompts to elicit information; feedback is timely, consistent, and of high quality. | Students are fully aware of the criteria and standards by which their work will be evaluated, have contributed to the development of the criteria, frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards, and make active use of that information in their learning. Teacher actively and systematically elicits diagnostic information from individual students regarding understanding and monitors progress of individual students; feedback is timely, high quality, and students use feedback in their learning. |
| Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness | Teacher adheres to the instruction plan in spite of evidence of poor student understanding or of students' lack of interest, and fails to respond to students' questions; teacher assumes no responsibility for students' failure. | Teacher demonstrates moderate flexibility and responsiveness to students' needs and interests, and seeks to ensure success of all students. | Teacher seeks ways to ensure successful learning for all students, making adjustments as needed to instruction plans and responding to student interest and questions. | Teacher is highly responsive to students' interests and questions, making major lesson adjustments if necessary, and persists in ensuring the success of all students. |

Instructional Delivery Summary

The school was inconsistent in its performance on the Instructional Delivery rubric, which includes the following elements: Communicating with Students, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, Engaging Students in Learning, Using Assessment in Instruction, and Demonstrating Flexibility.

Most teachers communicated clearly to students both orally and in writing. All teachers communicated accurate substantive information in their lessons to students. Most teachers made clear to the students their purpose in choosing to teach the particular lesson within the unit and in choosing to teach the particular unit within the scope of the class' topic. Most teachers used comfortable, assuring communications which the students responded very well to. For example, a teacher taught the students how to cut and paste from a Microsoft Word document to a PowerPoint presentation, a skill the students expressed gratitude to learn. According to the students in one class, the teacher had previously provided a packet that clearly outlined the steps to completing the assignment. The assignment seemed to build from one lesson to another, requiring recall and new application toward a final product.

In using questioning and discussion techniques, the school had some strong teachers and some who needed further development. Some teachers used questioning and discussion techniques that called for critical thinking, collaborative reasoning, and frequent participation by most students. One teacher ensured students kept on task by asking questions to individual students and facilitating cooperative responses; the questions featured both pure fact-recall and reasoning based on fact-recall. Some teachers, however, relied on lower-level questioning without encouraging the students to engage in critical analysis of the substance conveyed. Others used discussion techniques ill-fitted for the student ambience (e.g., a "gallery walk" in a class that the teacher struggled to control even during what was supposed to be a direct teacher-led discussion with all the students facing forward toward her). Further examples include a teacher asking the students to turn and talk about a topic relevant to the lesson but then the students engaged in completely off-topic conversation; the teacher did not follow up to gauge on-task participation or understanding.

Most teachers were able to intellectually engage the students throughout the lesson, employed appropriate activities and materials, and instructively represented the content in the lesson while balancing suitable structure and pacing of the lesson. For example, upon one student's response to a question, the teacher would ask other students the same question to check their level of attention and their own understanding of the material. That teacher actively engaged students in reasoning and articulating their answers, asking the students to explain their statements. In another class, student engagement was exemplified by diligent, independent study and general student attentiveness to the teacher's communications. Yet some teachers did not make significant effort to facilitate deeper consideration of the substantive topic or wider participation by the students in the class.

Most teachers employed strategies to be able to both individually evaluate student performance and also efficiently gauge class-wide comprehension. For example, a teacher assigned a test and had the students articulate why teachers assign tests, what the consequences would be if a student fails, and how a failing student would improve his testing performance going forward. After most students expressed that they were struggling on the test and could not work forward to completion (since they did appear engaged in effort), he stopped the test and collected it for

his review. Another teacher appeared to have a clear sense of where each student currently stood in completing their thesis project through frequent individual interactions; the interactions were only possible because each student was working independently and diligently through the class period. The teacher made the effort to ensure that students understood her reasoning in amending a deadline for part of their thesis and what it meant for her expectations of them. Some teachers though had little control over their respective classes and relied on verbal response for assessment. Another teacher administered an assignment labeled "assessment" but the students indicated that they did not understand the questions. The teacher instructed them to use their notes but many still struggled to come up with answers.

Some teachers appeared to tailor their lessons based on student progress after each class period. For example, one teacher made clear to the students upon entering that there would be no warm-up exercise that day. Instead, she differentiated the instruction to provide students who would benefit from extra instruction in completing their thesis more time while others could work independently.

MEETING THE NEEDS OF ALL LEARNERS

This rubric summarizes the school's performance on the elements of the rubric related to meeting the needs of all learners.

| All Learners' Needs | Limited | Satisfactory | Proficient | Exemplary |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| The school has strategies in place to meet the needs of students at risk of academic failure. | The school has implemented a limited number of programs to help students who are struggling academically to meet school goals. Resources for such programs are marginal; or the programs experience low participation given the students' needs. | The school has implemented programs and provided adequate resources to help students who are struggling academically to meet school goals. Based on individual needs, student participation is moderate. | The school has implemented special programs and provided significant resources to help students who are struggling academically to meet school goals. Based on individual needs, student participation is moderate to high. | The school has implemented research-based and/or special programs and provided a full complement of resources to help students who are struggling academically to meet school goals. Based on individual needs, student participation is high. |
| The school has strategies in place to meet the needs of English Language Learners ("ELLs"). | The school has a program in place to meet the needs of English Language Learners who enroll at the school. In order to comply with federal regulations, however, the program could benefit from increased staffing, improved staff qualifications and/or additional resources. | The school has a program in place to meet the needs of English Language Learners who enroll at the school. The services are in keeping with federal regulations, which include sufficient staffing with requisite training and resources. | The school has a successful program in place to meet the needs of English Language Learners who enroll at the school. The services are in keeping with federal standards for sufficient staffing with requisite training, qualifications and resources. | The school has a successful program(s) in place to meet the needs of any English Language Learners who enroll at the school. The services are in keeping with, and in some ways, exceed federal standards for staffing with requisite training, qualifications and resources. |

Meeting the Needs of All Learners Summary

The QSR team observed special education instruction on two occasions. In one class of ten mixed-ability students co-taught by a special education teacher, the teachers did not foster a culture of high expectations. Students were allowed to pass any question asked of them without having to make an effort to reason toward an answer or otherwise further interact. However, in a thesis development class featuring both honors and non-honors students, the teacher took care to address the needs of a subsection of the class that had fallen behind in their thesis progress, which she did only after ensuring the other students understood what they were expected to have done by the end of the class and how they could go about getting their questions addressed.

Regarding meeting the needs of English Language Learners, the QSR team did not observe any relevant evidence in its on-site reviews.

According to the teacher focus group the and administrator focus group, the school's ELL specialist had created push-in and pull-out accommodations for students in need of ELL services. The ELL specialist supported the teachers with lesson planning to help ensure that the needs of ELL students were met. The QSR team did not observe the ELL specialist's work or ELL instruction.

The administrator focus group stated that the school requires its teachers to use an official lesson design template that has been tailored to push teachers to address the different needs of learners. The school also employed consultants who were tasked with raising teacher awareness of culturally preferred approaches for enhanced student engagement during instructional activities, i.e., cooperative learning as opposed to competitive activities. Tutors also apparently worked with students who were several grade levels below in reading. On Saturday, the school runs a Saturday Academy program, particularly for students who are failing courses and seniors in need of support of thesis writing. The QSR team did not observe any of these tools or strategies during the course of its site visits.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

This rubric summarizes the school's performance on the Professional Development elements of the rubric during the scheduled and unscheduled classroom observations and as discussed during the focus groups with administrators, faculty, and staff.

| Professional Development | Limited | Satisfactory | Proficient | Exemplary |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Time is made available throughout the year. | The school offers very few professional development days throughout the school year, and teachers indicate that they do not have enough time for ongoing professional development and planning. | The school offers several professional development activities throughout the school year, although teachers indicate they could use more time for planning. | The school day and the annual calendar reflect a strong focus on professional development and planning. Most teachers agree that they are given sufficient time for professional development and planning. | The school day and the annual calendar reflect a high priority given to professional development and planning. All teachers agree that they are given sufficient time for a variety of professional development opportunities and planning. |
| Extra support is in place for novice teachers. | The school offers limited formal or informal support and guidance for novice teachers. These teachers do not think that the support is adequate. | The school offers formal or informal support and guidance to novice teachers. These teachers think that the support is adequate. | The school has implemented a support system that is effective in meeting the needs of novice teachers. | The school has implemented a highly structured support system that is highly effective in meeting the needs of novice teachers. |

Professional Development Summary

Based on the official professional development calendar for the 2011-12 academic year, as presented to the QSR team, the school infuses professional development into the school day by requiring time Wednesdays from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 pm for teachers to meet in groups and on Friday afternoons for teachers to meet by departments and grade level. At the end of each quarter, school leadership designates one professional development day, after students receive interim reports, to help the teachers review student grades and attendance. The faculty also revisits the school's goals to discuss their effectiveness in meeting those goals. Some additional topics of professional development study during this year included discussions on school culture, Student Support Team (SST) services, NWEA/MAP analysis and data-driven instruction.

The QSR team did not observe any evidence of particular support for novice teachers.

SCHOOL CLIMATE

This rubric summarizes the school's performance on the School Climate elements of the rubric during the scheduled and unscheduled classroom observations and as discussed during the focus groups with students, faculty, and staff.

| School Climate | Limited | Satisfactory | Proficient | Exemplary |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| The school is a safe and orderly learning environment. | The school's discipline policies and practices are not well-articulated or understood by most of the staff, students and parents. Such policies and practices are partially implemented due to the lack of clarity or understanding and, as a result, the learning environment provides limited safety and order. | The school's discipline policies and practices are adequately articulated and understood by the administration and by most of the staff, students and parents. Such policies and practices may not be fully implemented, due to a lack of clarity or understanding. The learning environment, however, is relatively safe and orderly. | The school's discipline policies and practices are clearly articulated and understood by the administration, staff, students and parents. Such policies and practices are consistently implemented, providing for a safe and orderly learning environment. | The school's discipline policies and practices are clearly articulated and understood by the administration, staff, students and parents. Such policies and practices are fully implemented by students and staff, providing for a consistently safe and orderly learning environment. |

School Climate Summary

The administration has designed and implemented a school-wide, comprehensive student disciplinary program known as "PAR". The program was explained to the QSR team to function as follows: a teacher is expected to assign a student one point for a particular demonstration of good behavior by that student. Students can cash in their total good behavior points in return for a particular award (e.g., a field trip) in accordance with reaching certain thresholds. In addition, a teacher is expected to assign a student one point for a particular demonstration of poor behavior. Students are subjected to disciplinary measures in accordance with reaching certain thresholds. This, the 2012-13 academic year, was the second year the school had used the program. The QSR team observed that posters explaining the discipline program were displayed frequently and throughout the building. Students could explain to the QSR team how the program generally worked and the general reasoning behind it. Teachers were aware of the program and their general expectations in enforcing it. However, the QSR team observed that the administration's articulation of the program to teachers was not detailed enough nor was there sufficient oversight because different teachers assigned points on different bases and frequency.

The QSR team observed security officials searching the students upon entry to the building for weapons. During the visit, the team observed that all students wore their uniform properly.

According to the information provided by the teacher focus group and the administrator focus group, the school meets with students during the summer to ensure that they understand the code of conduct and the attendance and discipline policies. On Wednesdays and Fridays, students are assigned to advisories where they receive academic and socio-emotional support from their advisor. "Students of the Month" are selected for each grade level and receive the Principal's Award. Students on the "Dean's List" and the "Honor Roll" are also individually identified and celebrated.