



October 29, 2013

Michael Durso, Board Chair  
Hospitality High PCS  
1851 9<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mr. Durso:

The Public Charter School Board (“PCSB”) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews (QSR) to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, 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 QSR during the 2013-14 school year for the following reason(s):

- School eligible to petition for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2013-14 school year
- School designated as Focus/Priority by Office of the State Superintendent of Education

**Qualitative Site Review Report**

A QSR team conducted on-site review visits of Hospitality High PCS between September 9<sup>th</sup> and September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2013. The purpose of the site review is for PCSB to gauge the extent to which the school’s goals and student academic achievement expectations are 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. PCSB also attended a board meeting in order to observe the school’s governance as it relates to fulfilling its mission, and charter goals.

Enclosed is the team’s report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report is focused primarily on the following areas: charter mission and goals, classroom environments, and instructional delivery.

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

Sincerely,

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of Naomi DeVeaux.

Naomi DeVeaux  
Deputy Director

Enclosures  
cc: School Leader

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Hospitality High PCS serves grades nine through twelve with a mission is to provide a solid secondary-education basis as well as a practical, theoretical and hands-on hospitality experience for the high school-aged youth community of the District of Columbia to prepare them for life in a changing workforce and global economy. In addition to Hospitality High PCS' 15-year charter renewal, the school has also been identified by the Office of the State Superintendent for Education (OSSE) to be a focus school. The school is in their second year as an OSSE-identified Focus school and the school leadership explained that they have implemented many changes based on PCSB's Qualitative Site Review reports from 2012-13, when it was in its first year as a focus school. These strategies include expanding to an eight-period day to give students more opportunities to improve math and reading skills and strengthening the co-teaching model while continuing to focus on the school's culture of collegiality and sharing. The review team conducted 21 observations over the two-week period. In a few instances, the QSR team may have observed the same teacher twice.

Overall, the school made some progress on its charter goals and in the areas of Classroom Environment and Instructional Delivery from last year to this but is still clearly in the process of implementing new approaches to learning. It's important to note that Hospitality High PCS is in its 15<sup>th</sup> year of operation.

In terms of instructional delivery where the focus of the school leadership has been, only 44% of classrooms observed in this domain were proficient or exemplary. The review team observed limited evidence of differentiated instruction and minimal evidence of co-teaching. Instruction varied widely across the classrooms observed and 56% of teachers were not assessed to be effective in the classroom. Teachers particularly struggled to keep the students engaged in discussions and only one-third of the observed instruction showed evidence of higher-order thinking and reasoning. The review team saw a second teacher in two classrooms but they did not appear to be co-teaching; the second staff in the classroom walked around to assist students when needed. The review team did not observe differentiated instruction in the co-teaching environment or in the other classrooms observed.

The school leadership is taking steps to improve the instruction at the school. Leadership stated that professional development has focused on instructional delivery, differentiated instruction, climate, and classroom management. However, based on the classroom observations, the school has work to do in all areas to implement these goals consistently across the campus. The observed classes were about a 50%-50% mix of low-level, recall content and higher-level thinking skills. The teachers connected the instructional content to students' lives and to the outside world, particularly in the hospitality classes. The review team heard many references to hotel guests and how to interact with them as classes discussed verbal and non-verbal communication skills. Additionally, the review team noted that the classroom management and climate in the building are better in the mornings, when fewer students were present, than in the afternoons.

Teachers observed were stronger in the domain of Classroom Environment, while the observations were lowest in Creating a Culture of Learning and Managing Classroom Procedures, where just over half of the teachers observed were proficient or exemplary in these areas. Instructional time was lost due to ineffective procedures. Students were often off task and not encouraged to participate.

In the afternoon, when the class sizes were larger (15-20 students in each classroom versus 5-10 in the mornings), the classrooms appeared more chaotic and the noise level rose significantly. While the new building is clearly welcome by the school, most classrooms are very small and students seemed to bump into each other during class when trying to work with small groups or get up for supplies. A number of students arrived late to school on the days observed. School leadership said that many students take classes at the local colleges and have internships, but many students also appeared to be tardy without excuses because they had late passes for teachers. Transitions between classes also took more time than was allotted in the afternoons; teachers had to stand in the hall and encourage students to enter their classrooms so the period could begin.

The school has also implemented a new Lunch and Learn program. This common one-hour lunch period allows students to receive extra tutoring from teachers, complete detentions, or have free time. Teachers mentioned that they are available for tutoring during Lunch and Learn or they had the times posted on the wall. A few students who had attended a college visit to a university in Virginia the day before were encouraged to attend a teacher's tutoring time the following day to catch up on the course work missed. Students who earned free time were able to play basketball during lunchtime in the gymnasium.

One concern noted by a QSR member was that the special education coordinator stated that the school cannot provide Level 4 accommodations because there is not full time staff for a self-contained classroom. The school is only able to accommodate for inclusion and remedial services, and the special education coordinator said that if a Level 4 student were to apply, then the school would recommend that student for placement at another school. The special education team works with the parents to see if the school is the best fit. Parents are made aware that DCPS can offer these services, but sometimes the parents still choose for their child to attend Hospitality High PCS.

A PCSB staff member attended the Hospitality High PCS board meeting on September 18, 2013. Eleven board members were in attendance (two by phone) and three school staff. The school leadership explained to the board the progress the school had made on its goals over the previous year. The board members also discussed how to provide instructional support for students who begin at Hospitality High PCS below grade level to ensure that they are proficient on the DC CAS in tenth grade and graduate within four years. The board is also taking steps to have an internal evaluation of the school and the board to help the school prepare for their 15-year charter renewal.

### *Implementation of ESEA Focus Strategies*

Hospitality High PCS's leadership directed PCSB staff to attend events during the scheduled in-service professional development day on August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2013, that they felt would demonstrate the intervention and support strategies the school was implementing to support academic

achievement of Economically Disadvantaged students, who encompass the majority of the school's enrollment. PCSB collected evidence on implementation of the following Focus strategies: 1) the use of data and assessment to differentiate instruction; 2) professional development on differentiation; 3) the use of a curriculum management system to improve lessons; and 4) increased monitoring of students by teachers throughout lessons.

Overall, PCSB observed that Hospitality High PCS is taking steps to implement the strategies above, though the observed impact of these strategies on instruction thus far is mixed. PCSB observed professional development sessions during the scheduled in-service professional development day around the use of data walls, differentiated instruction, and the *Atlas* curriculum management system. During each of these sessions, the facilitators provided teachers with practical tools that they could use on day one of instruction to improve the achievement of students. In the data wall session, the facilitator ensured that each teacher participating knew how to create data walls quickly using a data set, and he facilitated a discussion around the importance of data walls for students. In the differentiated instruction session, the facilitator discussed various ways strategies for differentiation and gave teachers a tool that they could use across content areas to differentiate learning tasks for students. During the *Atlas* curriculum management session, the facilitator guided teachers through the use of the system, and pointed out various ways that the system supports teachers in improving lessons, such as allowing them to search the entire *Atlas* database for exemplar lessons around particular standards.

The impact of this professional development on instruction was mixed. In some classrooms observed during the two week unscheduled window, teachers differentiated the learning process, though in the majority of classrooms observed there was little choice in how students could complete the learning tasks. Most instructional activities involved whole group discussion. The team did not observe modified lessons for struggling students or co-teaching. The inconsistent implementation of strategies is concerning given that this is the fifteenth year of the school's operation and the second year of its "Focus School" status.

## CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

This table summarizes Hospitality High 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 those goals during the Qualitative Site Visit.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>Mission: The mission of Hospitality High School is to provide a solid secondary-education basis as well as a practical, theoretical and hands-on hospitality experience for the high school-aged youth community of the District of Columbia to prepare them for life in a changing workforce and global economy.</p>	<p>PCSB observed some evidence of implementation of the school’s mission throughout the school visit. Hospitality High PCS has a program in place geared towards training students for the work force in the hospitality industry. This program includes coursework and internships to help students earn certificates towards working in the industry. The review team observed hospitality and culinary teachers making consistent references to the workplace when teaching lessons. Teachers helped students connect the lesson’s topic to working with guests in hotels. Culinary classes and labs provided hands-on training for students. Many teachers observed modeled a part of the lesson to help students understand the topic. The QSR team noted evidence that the school attempts to expose students to post-secondary educational opportunities as well; some students had recently visited a university in Virginia and others take classes at Trinity University.</p> <p>The review team did not see evidence that the school has uniformly implemented the mission. While some classes, especially electives, referenced the hospitality industry, the core content classes were not aligned with that aspect of the school’s mission. The review team observed rigorous content aligned to the standards in about half of the classes where teachers expected students to solve tasks and complete assignments. In other classes, however, the content was not rigorous and students did not appear fully engaged.</p>
<p>1. To prepare students with the academic skills and experiences for continued education.</p>	<p>PCSB observed some evidence of this goal throughout the classroom observations. While the review team observed varying degrees of rigor and challenge in the classrooms, the review team did observe a variety of lessons that will increase academic skills and prepare students for continued education. English classes discussed non-fiction text and found details to support student statements. Students were also learning how to use a “double entry journal” to find quotes in an article and write a statement or question about the quote. In language classes, the teacher challenged students to use adjectives to describe items or work with formal and informal “you” in the second language. Teachers connected lessons to prior knowledge and students’ personal lives. Additionally, teachers had students work together in most classes to complete assignments.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>However, the level of difficulty in over half of the classes observed was not challenging to students. Some classes observed recited vocabulary definitions but the teacher did not challenge the students' understanding of the vocabulary terms with follow up questions or discussion. In classes where the teacher did not connect the lesson to previous knowledge or students' interests, the students were not engaged with the assignment. Additionally, the QSR team did not observe many teachers who utilized differentiation of process or product. In some classes, some students appeared confused with the lesson and unsure how to complete the assigned task.</p>
<p>2. To prepare students for career opportunities in the hospitality industry</p>	<p>PCSB observed students being prepared for a career in the hospitality industry throughout the classroom observations. During the hospitality classes observed, students learned different ways to communicate with guests, both verbally and non-verbally and teachers used frequent connections and references to the hospitality industry. These teachers consistently connected the lesson topics to students' lives. In a few observations, these connections to students' lives created a rich discussion about the topic.</p> <p>Most of the school's board members work for the hospitality industry. At the board meeting, a few members shared with the PCSB staff that students from Hospitality High PCS have internships at their hotels. Board members said this gives students the opportunity to practice the skills they are learning in their classes.</p>
<p>3. To provide students the tools, support, and opportunities needed to meet and exceed standards</p>	<p>PCSB observed some evidence of this goal throughout the classroom and school observations. Hospitality High PCS has instituted Lunch and Learn this year to work with students who struggle in classes. During the hour-long lunch block, students eat for a half an hour and then can go to certain teachers each day of the week for tutoring, assistance, and catch up if they missed a day. This is also the time for detention. This time is also used as an incentive for students who have earned free time. The review team regularly heard teachers state the days they are available for Lunch and Learn, and many had it posted in their rooms. During one lunchtime tutoring session, a teacher was helping two students with work missed two days prior.</p> <p>Additionally, the school has transitioned to an eight period day to give students more time in academic classes. Eighth period is for students who need additional support in reading and math. In addition, all ninth graders take a success class to help them learn the Hospitality High PCS culture and receive extra assistance to be successful in high school and beyond. During an observation, the ninth grade success class was reading the book <i>7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens</i>. Unfortunately, this classroom met in the basement, which echoed all of the conversation from the large class. Most students were not focused on the book, but were talking off-topic with peers.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>4. To provide resources, including technology tools, tutorial programs, and out-of-classroom learning experiences to enable students to meet standards through more complex thought processes.</p>	<p>PCSB observed some evidence of this goal throughout the classroom observations. Overall, the review team observed teachers using SmartBoards to project PowerPoint presentations, instructional videos, and problems. One teacher invited specific students to Lunch and Learn to work on a tutorial program for history. Teachers also gave students internet references for more information on the topic discussed in class.</p> <p>While these technology resources did enrich the class lessons, the review team could not determine if they helped students to meet the standards through more complex thought processes.</p> <p>The only out-of-class learning experience observed was one-on-one tutoring during Lunch and Learn. Two students were receiving assistance on an in-class assignment they had been absent for.</p>
<p>5. To develop work place skills outlined in SCANS.</p> <p>School leadership explained that SCANS skills have a three-part foundation: basic skills, thinking skills, and personal qualities for the hospitality industry.</p>	<p>PCSB observed evidence of this goal throughout the classroom observations. In addition to the three-part foundation, Hospitality High PCS also tries to teach students five workplace competencies related to SCANS: Resources, Interpersonal, Information, Systems, and Technology. In every classroom observed, the teachers had one to three “SCANS skills” written on the board next to the objective of the day’s lesson. The SCANS skills appeared to be relevant to the lessons taught. Some of the SCANS skills written on the board focused on communication in the workforce, working with diverse groups, and using effective learning skills to acquire knowledge and skills. During the lessons, observers heard teachers discussing the SCANS skills with their classes, particularly in the hospitality classes. One class discussed how body language could positively or negatively affect a relationship with a client.</p>
<p>6. Students will attend school on a regular basis.</p>	<p>PCSB observed some evidence of this goal throughout the classroom observations. The QSR team observed several tardy students on all observation days, though some of these students may have been attending college courses or working at their internships. Class sizes in the morning were much smaller than class sizes in the afternoon. The review team also observed that students did not transition quickly between classrooms. Teachers stood in the hall during transition to urge students to enter class on time. This took up a few minutes at the start of most periods observed.</p> <p>One review team member did observe the school staff monitoring student attendance. The office staff called several classrooms in the morning to see if specific students attended that period.</p>



Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>7. Hospitality High PCS will encourage the continuance of students from first enrollment to graduation.</p>	<p>While the review team did not observe any evidence related to this goal, a PCSB staff member attended the Hospitality High PCS board meeting where board members discussed how to increase the school's current enrollment. In addition to increasing enrollment, Hospitality High PCS leadership outlined to the board members how they are going to help students succeed through high school and graduation. This included Saturday learning sessions, Lunch and Learn tutoring during lunchtime, and remedial classes to help increase math and reading proficiency for students who enter behind grade level. The board members and leadership have set a goal to graduate more incoming ninth graders in four years than previously before.</p>

## CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENTS<sup>1</sup>

*This rubric summarizes the school's performance on the Classroom Environments elements of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "limited", "satisfactory", "proficient" and "exemplary" are those from the Danielson framework. PCSB considers any rating below "proficient" to be under the standard of quality expected of DC charter schools. On average, 58% of classrooms received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Classroom Environment domain.*

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
<b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>	In many classrooms observed, teachers spoke respectfully to students and created an environment where students were respectful to teachers and to each other. Many teachers seemed to have a positive, joking relationship with students and all teachers observed welcomed students at the door before class started. Some teachers were also able to connect the lesson to facts in students' lives, such as ways to communicate with a boyfriend or how a student talked with her boss about her work schedule and homework.	Limited	0%
		Satisfactory	38%
	In some classrooms observed, students continued to talk to each other or pass notes while the teacher was talking to the class. The unengaged students in these classes either sat quietly by themselves not involved in the work or talked with classmates. In these cases, many teachers attempted to bring all students into the conversations but the results were not successful.	Proficient	52%
		Exemplary	10%
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	Many teachers recognized high quality work by displaying examples on the wall and referencing a student's work to others. In one class, when students were stuck on how to display the biosphere visually, the science teacher referenced two students' art to provide examples. In about half of the classrooms observed, students put forth good effort to complete high quality work.	Limited	0%
		Satisfactory	43%
	However, in almost half of the classrooms observed, many students were off task, either talking to other students or staring passively around the room. Many students did not demonstrate a commitment or pride in their work. In these classrooms, observers did not see an expectation from the teachers for all students to participate in the lesson.	Proficient	57%
		Exemplary	0%
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	About half of the classrooms observed had smoothly functioning routines and little loss of instructional time during transitions. In these classrooms, students knew expectations and participated in routines, whether it was passing out and collecting papers or moving into groups. Observers saw teachers using timers and verbal cues to help students transition between groups or activities.  In the other half of the classrooms, teachers did not have effective routines in place. Some teachers were inconsistent in using the routines they have tried to establish. For example, a few teachers	Limited	10%
		Satisfactory	38%

<sup>1</sup> Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	constantly reminded students to raise their hands to talk but many students continued to shout out answers over others. This led to a few very loud classrooms where none of the students could be heard. A few teachers did not have routines in place for handling materials. Students were confused when asked to pass up papers in one class and in another class, the teacher had no routine for passing out materials and supplies, which took almost 18 minutes to complete.	Proficient	47%
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	<p>About 60% of the classrooms observed had effective classroom management procedures in place and students generally followed them. Most rooms had clear standards of conduct posted on the walls and teachers verbally reinforced positive behavior, recognizing students who were following directions and behaving well. Teacher dealt with misbehavior respectfully, in a way that maintained the dignity of the student. One teacher spoke to a student outside of the classroom to address his misbehavior while another teacher squatted down close to the student to discuss a behavior issue.</p> <p>In over one-third of the classrooms observed, particularly the afternoon classes, the teachers' attempts to maintain order were not successful. Classrooms had more students in them during the afternoon than the mornings and teachers had a more difficult time managing behavior after lunch. Students were disruptive to others in classes and attempts by the teacher to regain control were unsuccessful. In a few classrooms observed, the teachers repeatedly tried to manage behavior by saying, "give your attention to the speaker in the room" and "good afternoon." Teachers repeated these phrases many times during the lessons without a sustained effect. At times, when a student had permission to speak, the teacher was talking loudly over this student to the students misbehaving.</p>	Limited	0%
		Satisfactory	38%
		Proficient	43%
		Exemplary	19%

## INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY

*This rubric summarizes the school's performance on the Instructional Delivery elements of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "limited", "satisfactory", "proficient" and "exemplary" are those from the Danielson framework. PCSB considers any rating below "proficient" to be under the standard of quality expected of DC charter schools. On average, 44% of classrooms received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Instructional Delivery domain.*

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
<b>Communicating with Students</b>	<p>In half of the classrooms observed, teachers gave clear directions, stated the purpose and objectives of the lesson, and had agendas posted on the board. In a few classrooms, the teacher invited students to explain the content of the lesson to the class and proactively pointed out possible areas of misunderstanding. The students in these classes seemed to understand the teachers' presentations and were able to complete tasks with full understanding.</p>	Limited	10%
		Satisfactory	38%
	<p>In other classrooms, the content and purpose of the lessons were not clear. Some teachers did not explain directions for activities, just told students to begin when they received the worksheet. Other students were confused and did not understand the lesson content as presented. In a few classes, the majority of students remained confused with the activities and attempted to ask other students what to do. Some of these students just sat at their tables until the activity was over without doing any of the work. In a few classrooms, teachers used incorrect grammar when presenting the lesson and when interacting with students.</p>	Proficient	38%
		Exemplary	14%
<b>Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</b>	<p>Just one-third of the teachers observed used questioning and discussion techniques to engage students and enhance the lessons. In these classrooms, teachers asked questions with multiple answers to extend classroom discussion. Questions were open-ended and promoted student thinking and teachers often asked students to defend their responses. In a few classrooms observed, students responded to other students during the discussions.</p>	Limited	14%
		Satisfactory	52%
	<p>However, the questioning in most classrooms required simple recall of facts or procedures. Questions were of low cognitive level requiring a single correct response. In some classes, teachers only asked for definitions of terms. Students knew the definitions from a previous lesson but it was unclear if students understood how the vocabulary term applied to the lesson or real life. When asked, some students responded incorrectly and, in one case, the teacher did not correct the student and moved on. While teachers attempted to involve more students, few actually participated in the discussions. In many classes, the same three to five students responded to the questions asked by the teacher even through the teacher encouraged more students to participate.</p>	Proficient	29%
		Exemplary	5%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	In approximately one-third of the classes observed, students were intellectually engaged in the lesson. Some learning tasks engaged high-level student thinking such as an English class where students were completing a “double entry journal” to explore the non-fiction text they were reading.	Limited	0%
	In the other classrooms observed, student engagement was largely passive. Students chose not to participate and were not encouraged to do so. Many of the learning tasks required recall and there was no choice in how students could complete the tasks. Most class activities involved whole group discussion, characterized by little participation from off-task students, or independent work, with many students not participating. The review team did not observe modified lessons for struggling students or evidence of a co-teaching model. In the two instances where there was a second staff member in the room, the second person walked around to observe students and answer questions. Additionally, the review team observed limited instances of differentiation in product or process.	Satisfactory	62%
		Proficient	33%
		Exemplary	5%
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	In about half of the classrooms, students had the opportunity to assess each other and work with peers to make sure they understood the content of the lesson. Teachers gave specific feedback to students in some classrooms and regularly monitored and checked for understanding. Teachers also helped students remember content by using graphic organizers, lists, or annotated notes.	Limited	10%
		Satisfactory	38%
	In just under half of the classrooms observed, teachers did not check for understanding and there was little evidence that students knew how teachers would evaluate their work. Teachers walked around to monitor behavior instead of student work. When they did give feedback, it was not specific and did not help students improve the quality of their work.	Proficient	52%
		Exemplary	0%

**APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC**

<b>Class Environment</b>	<b>Limited</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<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: INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY OBSERVATION RUBRIC**

<b>Instructional Delivery</b>	<b>Limited</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<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.

Instructional Delivery	Limited	Satisfactory	Proficient	Exemplary
<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.



**ADDENDUM I: SCHOOL INTERVENTION AND SUPPORT STRATEGIES**

This table summarizes Hospitality PCS' intervention and support strategies as detailed in its web-based Intervention and Support Plan, and the evidence that the PCSB staff member observed of the school implementing those strategies during both the scheduled day and the unscheduled observation window for the Fall 2013 Qualitative Site Visit for the purposes of the 2012 ESEA Flexibility Waiver. PCSB leaves it to the discretion of school leadership to determine the best use of time during the scheduled day of observations for the purposes of Focus/Priority intervention strategies. As such, it may not be possible to observe certain strategies chosen by the school. In cases where PCSB did not have the opportunity to observe the strategy, we will use the standard language of ‘While this strategy may be in place, PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy.’ Different language will be used to indicate poor implementation of a given strategy.

Please note that much of the evidence for the implementation of intervention and support strategies was observed through classroom observation, and was aligned to the *Framework for Teaching*. As such, PCSB noted the specific classroom observation elements that speak to these strategies, where appropriate, in order to avoid repetition.

IndiStar Indicator	School’s Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
<p>ID04: All teams prepare agendas for their meetings.</p> <p>ID05: All teams maintain official minutes of their meetings</p> <p>ID07 - A Leadership Team consisting of the principal, teachers who lead the Instructional Teams, and other key professional staff meets regularly (twice a month or more for an hour each meeting).</p> <p>ID10 - The school’s Leadership Team regularly looks at school performance data and aggregated classroom observation data and uses that data to make decisions about school improvement and professional development needs</p> <p>ID11 - Teachers are organized into grade-level, grade-level cluster, or subject-area Instructional Teams.</p> <p>ID13 - Instructional Teams meet for blocks of time (4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include instructional leaders and data team members in meetings to assure clear communication in the school between departments</li>   <li>-Examine school-level performance data on a regular basis to make decisions, and observe classrooms.</li>   <li>-Use data to inform instruction and professional development</li>   <li>-Assessment protocol with teachers, focusing on the process and importance of Data Talks. For school year 2013-2013, this is the first step of a formal process. The school will have a specialist dedicated to this starting by the beginning of the school year.</li> </ul>	<p>According to school leadership, the hiring of a dedicated specialist for the school’s data and assessment systems is the first step in improving their overall process. PCSB did not observe teachers examining school-level performance data to make decision, though the professional development observed would give teachers some of the tools necessary to do so. During the in-service training that PCSB observed on August 21, 2013, PCSB observed a session for teachers in which teachers learned how to create bi-weekly data walls using simple steps in Excel. The session ended with another one of the teachers describing how to share data with students through a class data talk, and how to use data to inform instruction and create reteach plans. During the classroom observations, observers saw at least two examples of data walls, though it was unclear if these data walls were used to improve instruction.</p>

IndiStar Indicator	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
to 6 hour blocks, once a month; whole days before and after the school year) sufficient to develop and refine units of instruction and review student learning data		
<p>IE05 - The principal participates actively with the school's teams.</p> <p>IE08 - The principal spends at least 50% of his/her time working directly with teachers to improve instruction, including classroom observations.</p> <p>IE13 - The principal offers frequent opportunities for staff and parents to voice constructive critique of the school's progress and suggestions for improvement</p> <p>IE14 - The principal provides timely, clear, constructive feedback to teachers</p>	<p>-The principal's participation with school teams should be observable through adjusted instructional practice, and principal visibility throughout the school. The principal will continually document both observations and feedback for teacher use in improving instructional practice.</p> <p>- Facilitate instructional team meetings</p> <p>-Identify struggling teachers through frequent classroom observations</p> <p>-Conduct frequent classroom observations and provide timely feedback by creating a formal observation calendar, with a particular focus on supporting high need teachers</p> <p>-Offer opportunities to staff and parents to voice constructive criticism of the school's progress. This will be accomplished in part through parent surveys, given to parents on Back-To-School night on August 21<sup>st</sup>.</p>	<p>PCSB observed administration walking throughout the hallways during instruction, though did not observe administrators conducting classroom observations.</p> <p>More information on the quality of instruction may be found in the Instructional Delivery section of this report.</p> <p>With regard to the administration of parent surveys, while this strategy may be in place, PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy.</p>
<p>IF01: The principal compiles reports from classroom observations, showing aggregate areas of strength and areas that need improvement without revealing the identity of individual teachers.</p> <p>IF10 - The principal plans opportunities for teachers to share their strengths with other teachers</p>	<p>- Formalize a process for teachers to share their strengths with other teachers, including leading PD, mentoring teachers, revitalizing teacher learning communities</p> <p>-Implement a teacher needs survey to ascertain teachers to lead or assist with</p>	<p>With regard to teacher learning community activities, while this strategy may be in place, PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy.</p> <p>With regard to teachers sharing strengths with other teachers, PCSB observed a teacher training others to create and use data walls during the in-service professional development held on August 21, 2013. Please see page six of this report, in the</p>

IndiStar Indicator	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
	<p>professional development based on their area of strength and topics of interest for Teacher Learning Community.</p> <p>-For the 2013-2014 school year, professional development offerings will be based off of teacher needs, ascertained from the strategic planning with a group of teachers during summer 2013. Most of the professional development will be offered by Lead Teachers (see below).</p> <p>-For the 2013-2014 school year, the school has a new position called Lead Teacher. These are experienced educators who work with other teachers, administrators and parents to help both teachers and students have a positive academic experience. They will provide support to teachers in their department in lesson planning, classroom management and instructional delivery.</p> <p>-Create Teacher Learning Communities based on subject for teachers to explain and teach one another on how they have implanted school wide initiatives and goals in their classrooms to discuss data.</p>	<p>section with indicators starting with ID04, for further information about the data wall session.</p> <p>While PCSB did not observe the school administering a teacher needs survey to ascertain teacher strengths and weaknesses from their perspective, PCSB did observe a professional development session that responded to a need identified by school leadership, differentiation. The lack of differentiation was documented at the Spring 2013 QSR and through the school's assessment data. In response, Hospitality PCS required teachers to attend a session on differentiation during the in-service professional development on August 21, 2013. Provided, according to school leadership, by national differentiation expert, Ms. Gwen Bryant. She began the session by describing the call for teachers as adjusting practice to give students what they need to know about the content, and to help students access the content. Outcomes included becoming aware of what differentiated instruction is, and why it is appropriate for all learners, as well as for teachers to become familiar with the various approaches to differentiation. The facilitator gave teachers the opportunity to discuss the importance of differentiation with each other. She then provided examples of what differentiation is and what it is not. She then gave teachers some practical tools they could use to learn more about students. The facilitator discussed various parts of a lesson in which that teachers could differentiate (process, product, tools used, etc.), and asked teachers to share ideas on how they have differentiated in the past. The facilitator finished the session by describing how teachers should differentiate by tiers within lesson plans, and by giving the teachers a tool to use in order to begin differentiating in their classrooms. The school's Hospitality Program Coordinator, Mr. Cucciardo, explained to PCSB during a discussion on the professional development day that for school year 2013-2014, school leadership will require teachers to provide evidence of differentiation within each lesson plan. School administrators will then monitor the implementation of these differentiated plans during classroom instruction.</p>

IndiStar Indicator	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
		<p>Please see the Instructional Delivery section of this report, particularly the element of <i>Engaging Students</i> for additional information on the impact of the professional development on differentiation observed in classrooms.</p> <p>With regard to the Lead Teacher's work with teachers during the scheduled day or during the two week observation window, while this strategy may be in place, PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy.</p> <p>With regard to Teacher Learning Community sessions, while this strategy may be in place, PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy.</p>
<p>IIA01 - Instructional Teams develop standards-aligned units of instruction for each subject and grade level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Execute review and revisions of curriculum to ensure alignment with CCSS</li> <li>- For school year 2013-2014, the school will continue to use the Atlas curriculum management online system to both plan and store lessons.</li> </ul>	<p>With regard to curriculum planning, while this strategy may be in place, PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy during the scheduled professional development day on August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2013, and school leadership let PCSB know that this has been ongoing throughout the Summer 2013.</p> <p>During the August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2013 professional development day, PCSB observed a refresher course for staff in the use of the Atlas curriculum management online system. This system is used school-wide, and both administrators and teacher-colleagues may access the teaching staff's units. The system facilitates teachers building their unit calendars, developing units of study (including supporting the alignment of standards to the units of study), and editing course assignments. This system guides teachers through the necessary parts of lesson planning, including essential questions, alignment to standards and benchmarks, and course activities (including resources such as web links). Atlas also provides sample exemplar course assignments for various units of study, allowing teachers to search by standard.</p> <p>Please see the Instructional Delivery section of this report for further information on how teachers executed instruction during</p>

IndiStar Indicator	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
<p>IIB04 - Teachers individualize instruction based on pre-test results to provide support for some students and enhanced learning opportunities for others</p> <p>IIB05: All teachers re-teach based on post-test results</p> <p>IID02 - The school tests each student at least 3 times each year to determine progress toward standards-based objectives</p> <p>IID06 - Yearly learning goals are set for the school by the Leadership Team, utilizing student learning data</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communicate expectation that teachers align pre- and post- tests to standards, and compile data based on assessments; teachers then create intervention plans to address mastery</li> <li>- Continuously review data walls</li> <li>- Continuously look for evidence of differentiation in classrooms</li> <li>- Model use of data for teachers</li> <li>- Assess students throughout the year using Scantron Performance Series</li> <li>- Provide professional development opportunities based on needs identified through analysis of student data</li> </ul>	<p>the unscheduled observation window.</p> <p>PCSB did not observe any teacher references to student data or pre- or post-tests, and differentiated instruction throughout the classrooms observed was not uniformly effective. PCSB saw a couple of classrooms that utilized small groups to differentiate instruction; it was unclear if instruction was reaching all students within this small group, as at least one student did not engage in any way with the learning task. In most classrooms observed, there was little to no differentiation in how instructors presented content, and in how students were to perform a learning task. In some classrooms observed during the two week window, PCSB saw data walls, though teachers generally did not make reference to the data walls during instruction.</p> <p>With regard to leadership meetings with individual teachers, while this strategy may be in place, PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy.</p> <p>During the August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2013 in-service professional development session, PCSB did observe a professional development session on the use of data walls. Please see page eight of this report for additional information. PCSB also observed a professional development session on differentiation, which was previously identified as an area of focus by both the Spring 2013 QSR and by the school's own assessment data. Please see page ten of this report for additional information.</p>
<p>IIIA01 - All teachers are guided by a document that aligns standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment.</p> <p>IIIA09 - All teachers clearly state the lesson's topic, theme, and objectives.</p> <p>IIIA17 - All teachers re-teach when necessary.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure submission and feedback for lesson plans, guided by approved curricular units.</li> <li>- Train teachers in the use of the online curriculum management system, and lead professional development on use of lesson plan template.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see the evidence listed under indicator IIA01 for evidence related to training in the online curriculum management system, <i>Atlas</i>.</p> <p>With regard to the provision of feedback for lesson plans, while this strategy may be in place, PCSB neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this strategy.</p> <p>Teachers generally circulated throughout classrooms, mostly for</p>

IndiStar Indicator	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
<p>IIIA28 - All teachers travel to all areas in which students are working.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide support for teachers who struggle with lesson planning in small groups or individually.</li> <li>- Convey expectation that teachers should be circulating throughout their classroom.</li> </ul>	<p>classroom management needs. In some classrooms, teachers circulated to check on student progress with the learning task. One teacher stood next to each student for a time during the instructional period to examine his or her work and to provide immediate feedback. Another teacher observed watched as each student completed part of a learning task, and scaffolded instruction in instances where the teacher noticed incorrect answers. Teachers generally did not remain stationary throughout instruction. In about half of the classrooms observed during the two week observation window, teachers communicated clear directions to students, stated the purpose and objectives of the lesson, and had agendas posted on the board.</p>