



February 5, 2014

Allison Mayas, Board Chair  
National Collegiate Preparatory Public Charter High School  
4600 Livingston Road, SE  
Washington, DC 20032

Dear Ms. Mayas,

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 designated as Focus by Office of the State Superintendent of Education

#### **Qualitative Site Review Report**

A QSR team conducted on-site review visits of National Collegiate Preparatory Public Charter High School between December 2 and December 13, 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 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 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 National Collegiate Preparatory Public Charter High School. Thank you for your continued cooperation as PCSB makes every effort to ensure that National Collegiate Preparatory Public Charter High School is in compliance with its charter.

Sincerely,



Naomi DeVeaux  
Deputy Director

Enclosures  
cc: School Leader

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

National Collegiate Preparatory Public Charter High School (“National Collegiate Prep PCHS”) serves approximately 330 ninth through twelfth grade students in a single campus in Southeast Washington, DC’s Bellevue neighborhood. National Collegiate Prep PCHS offers an International Baccalaureate program in a shared facility. Using Charlotte Danielson’s *Framework for Teaching* rubric, Public Charter School Board (“PCSB”) staff and consultants conducted a Qualitative Site Review (“QSR”) in December 2013 to assess the quality of classroom management and instructional delivery at the school, as well as the school’s progress in fulfilling its mission and goals. National Collegiate Prep PCHS was selected to undergo a QSR because the school was designated as a Focus school under the Office of the State Superintendent of Education’s (“OSSE”) Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver index.

During the window from December 2 through December 13, 2013, two PCSB staff members and one consultant visited National Collegiate Prep PCHS. Due to scheduling difficulties and a second consultant’s illness, the QSR team was able to visit only 17 classrooms (approximately 60% of classrooms), including classrooms where more than one teacher was present. The team visited in both mornings and afternoons, observing students’ hallway behavior and late arrival procedures in addition to classroom environment and instructional delivery.

According to its charter application, the school’s mission is “(1) to provide a rigorous 9th- 12th grade standards-based college preparatory curriculum to maximize our students’ academic achievement, (2) to provide an interdisciplinary curriculum which integrates international studies themes across the academic curriculum leading to an International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma and (3) to prepare our students to be self-directed, life-long learners equipped to be engaged citizens of their school, community, country and world.”

The QSR team did not observe the school consistently fulfilling its mission. The academic program as observed by the team lacked rigor; students were often disengaged from lessons and teachers’ questions and activities did not challenge students. Questions posed as critical thinking questions tended to be based on recall rather than on critical thinking skills, such as questions requiring multiplication practice (“What is the numerator when you divide 30 by one-half and add ten. Then add one-quarter to that.”). The QSR team observed very little interdisciplinary instruction, and the IB curriculum was minimally evident in only two classrooms.

The *Framework for Teaching* rubric is made up of two domains: Classroom Environments and Instructional Delivery. Across the Classroom Environments domain, 75% of observations were rated proficient or exemplary. The highest rated elements of this domain were Managing Classroom Procedures and Managing Student Behavior (each 82% proficient). On the Instructional Delivery domain, 60% of the observations were rated proficient or exemplary. The highest rated element of this domain was Communicating with Students. The lowest rated element of this domain was Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, scoring at 35%.

The school climate was generally safe and orderly. The QSR team observed little to no student misbehavior and students moved through hallways quietly and courteously. Students generally appeared to like coming to school, and they demonstrated respect for each other. There

seemed to constantly be a few students wandering through the school hallways during class periods, and many students arrived to school late during one QSR observer's visit. A QSR observer also noted that at least two male non-instructional staff members (e.g. security guards, administrative staff) tended to refer to male students as "sir," but female students as "baby" or "baby girl."

OSSE designated National Collegiate Prep PCHS as a Focus school based on the performance of its African American and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. PCSB collected evidence for the following Focus strategies provided by National Collegiate Prep PCHS leadership team: well organized lesson plans, differentiated instruction, frequent use of formative assessments, professional development around assessment, training for teachers in cultural competency, and increased instructional time. PCSB observed evidence of implemented strategies designed to support the use of formative assessments, improve the relationships between teachers and students and increase instructional time.

**CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS AND BOARD GOVERNANCE**

This table summarizes National Collegiate Prep PCHS’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>The mission of our public charter high school is (1) to provide a rigorous 9th- 12th grade standards-based college preparatory curriculum to maximize our students’ academic achievement, (2) to provide an interdisciplinary curriculum which integrates international studies themes across the academic curriculum leading to an International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma and (3) to prepare our students to be self-directed, life-long learners equipped to be engaged citizens of their school, community, country and world.</p>	<p>Throughout the course of the observations, the QSR team concluded that National Collegiate Prep PCHS is failing to achieve several key aspects of its mission.</p> <p>First and foremost, the QSR team raised concerns about the rigor of the school’s academic programs. The curriculum is standards-based; standards and objectives were posted in every classroom. All teachers posed daily “Critical Thinking Questions”, but these questions did not actually engage students’ critical thinking skills, but were based more on students’ prior knowledge rather than their ability to analyze and synthesize information and develop new knowledge. For example, in a chemistry class, the day’s Critical Thinking Question was “What type of change is taking place, and how do we know that a change is taking place?” While the question may have been challenging for students, it did not engage their critical thinking skills to come up with a solution they have not already learned; there is a single correct answer. In some classrooms, teachers posed true critical thinking questions (e.g. “Why did these patterns of behavior arise?”) but activities were based on answering lower-level questions (e.g. recording information from a textbook into a worksheet about dates of colonization). In the Instructional Delivery domain, only one-third of the observations scored proficient in Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques. Half of observations were proficient or exemplary in Engaging Students in Learning. About half of teachers sought to engage students through multiple modes of learning, but in about half of classes, students were clearly not engaged. Students in these classes had their heads on their desks or were</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>talking off-topic.</p> <p>Very few observations included interdisciplinary instruction or international studies themes: the QSR team observed two IB classes, during which the students were working towards taking the IB exam. However, in most classes, there was very little apparent evidence of an International Baccalaureate (“IB”) diploma track: the QSR team noted the presence of a few Spanish vocabulary words on boards, one or two IB Learner Profiles, and one bulletin board about IB.</p> <p>The QSR team noted that the majority of the classroom instruction was teacher-directed and teacher-led, allowing few opportunities for students to learn to be self-directed, life-long learners. In general, student engagement in lesson content seemed to be mixed as well; in several observations, students talked off-topic during class time or had their heads down on their desks.</p> <p>Students were well-behaved in the school’s hallways and acted as responsible and respectful school citizens. Students had their shirts tucked in, were respectful of guests, and did not exhibit any misbehavior.</p>
<p>1. Students will demonstrate proficiency and/or content mastery in English (i.e., reading and writing).</p>	<p>While the QSR visit did not include a review of student academic achievement data, the team was able to observe English language arts instruction. English classes generally met PCSB’s standard for proficient instruction but was not exemplary. The QSR team noted that students spoke with vocabularies that seemed to be appropriate for their grade levels; every classroom had SAT words of the day posted and some teachers referenced these words. Instruction in English classes was teacher-centered and questions were primarily low-level. Students were inconsistently engaged in the lesson content and activities. Teachers’ checks for understanding were cursory, involving either choral responses rather than individual assessments or rapid-fire questions without follow-up for adjustment.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
2. Students will demonstrate proficiency and/or content mastery in a World Language.	The QSR team observed Spanish instruction. Teachers had posted Spanish vocabulary words, but the lesson objectives were written in English. Teachers did not consistently speak Spanish to the students or require students to speak Spanish.
3. Students will demonstrate proficiency and/or content mastery in mathematics.	In about half of the math class observations, students were intellectually engaged in the lesson. Students were invited to assess their own work and make improvements. Teachers also provided students with specific feedback on how students could improve their work product. The QSR team observed limited cases of interdisciplinary instruction in math during a music class. The other math classes observed failed to fully engage students or struggled with classroom management. Students worked on content such as multiplication and order of operations in an Algebra 2 Honors class; solving a right triangle in a Trigonometry class; and defining domains and x and y values in a 12 <sup>th</sup> grade math class.
4. Students will demonstrate proficiency and/or content mastery in history/social studies and of its application to current events.	In the observed history classes, students completed lessons related to content mastery and current events. Some of the topics discussed in history classes include differentiating between ages of history (e.g. Middle Ages versus pre-history); feudalism; colonialism and imperialism; and inventions and their effects on modern life (e.g. zippers, toaster ovens, felt pens).
5. Students will demonstrate proficiency and/or content mastery in science.	Due to scheduling conflicts and a consultant's illness, the QSR team was unable to observe science classes.
6. Student satisfaction with the school's programs and ability to demonstrate an understanding of Honor, Scholarship and Leadership values.	The school focuses on the four Panther Bs: Be Respectful, Be Prepared, Be Acceptable, Be Your Best Self. In the hallways, students were respectful and well-behaved. The QSR team did not note any particular instances of student leadership, though in one class, a teacher assigned a "group leader" during small group work. This group leader was responsible for making sure the other students understood the material and had the correct answers. The QSR team

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	did not note any explicit mentions of honor, scholarship, or leadership values, though they seemed to be infused in the Panther Bs.
7. Teacher satisfaction with the school’s operations and programs.	The QSR team neither looked for nor observed evidence of this goal.
8. Family/parents’ support of the school and its mission.	The QSR team neither looked for nor observed evidence of this goal.
9. The Board of Trustees will ensure that National Prep is financially viable and demonstrates fiduciary responsibility for all monies received by and for the school.	The QSR team neither looked for nor observed evidence of this goal.
10. The Board of Trustees will ensure that National Prep has access to appropriate and quality human and capitol resources to support the education program.	The QSR team neither looked for nor observed evidence of this goal.
11. The Board of Trustees will ensure that National Prep maintains and enforces its fiscal and organizational policies.	The QSR team neither looked for nor observed evidence of this goal.
Board Governance	On November 20, 2013, a PCSB staff member attempted to observe a meeting of the National Collegiate Prep PCHS Board of Trustees. Due to a scheduling miscommunication, the Board was not expecting the staff member’s presence at the meeting and requested that she leave. There were four people present at the meeting, including the school’s Executive Director and another public charter school’s Chief Executive Officer, who identified herself as a meeting facilitator. Despite there not being quorum for a board meeting, the agenda appeared to include votes scheduled. The PCSB staff member left without

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>observing any discussion or voting and no attempt was made to reschedule the visit.</p> <p>Thereafter, a PCSB staff member attempted to review the school's submitted Board minutes from the 2013-14 school year, but according to the school, the Board of Trustees did not meet formally in July, August, or September.</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, 75% 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 about three-quarters of observations, interactions between teachers and students and between students were kind, respectful, and appropriate. Teachers consistently responded warmly and respectfully to students’ requests and questions. Highly-rated teachers even joked with their students and seemed to have personal relationships with them.	Limited	6%
		Satisfactory	18%
	Proficient	59%	
	However, in almost one-quarter of the observations, students were not consistently respectful of teachers. In particular, the team observed repeated cases of students interrupting their teachers or talking over them.	Exemplary	18%
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	Approximately 60% of observations were rated proficient or exemplary in “Establishing a Culture for Learning”. Teachers in these classrooms consistently encouraged their students to work hard, with comments like, “This is what you have to do in college.” These teachers also conveyed their enthusiasm for learning to students, with congratulations (e.g. “Yes, you’re so smart!” “Raise your right hand in the air. Bend it at the elbow. Now give yourself a pat on the back.”) and excitement (e.g. a teacher drumming on a student’s back after she understood the material).	Limited	18%
		Satisfactory	24%
		Proficient	53%

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

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>However, over 40% of observations did not exhibit proficient behavior in this element of the rubric. Students were not engaged in their work and teachers did not strive to convey the importance of effort and persistence. In one case, a teacher asked several times who wanted to learn a certain procedure, and very few students expressed interest. These teachers also exhibited low, neutral energy and did not convey their confidence in students' abilities.</p>	Exemplary	6%
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	<p>In over 80% of observations, teachers implemented effective classroom management procedures. Students began "Do Now" assignments when they entered classrooms. Co-teachers assisted in handing out worksheets and making sure students knew what to do. Some teachers pre-alerted students of upcoming lesson transitions and then used timers or buzzers to signal the time to transition.</p> <p>Almost 20% of observations were rated below the standard for proficiency. In these classrooms, lesson transitions were ineffective and resulted in lost instructional time. In one class, the teacher pre-alerted students of clean-up time, but had to prompt some students multiple times and other students did not participate at all.</p>	Limited	6%
		Satisfactory	12%
		Proficient	65%
		Exemplary	18%
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	<p>About 80% of observations were rated proficient or exemplary in "Managing Student Behavior". Teachers in these classrooms recognized positive behavior and gently redirected students who were misbehaving, either orally (e.g. "Student, are you with me?") or through physical proximity. In one observation, students were very responsible with the musical instruments given to them; the teacher said, "Is that instrument etiquette?"</p> <p>In observations with ineffective behavior management, teachers had to repeatedly talk over students and repeat directions because students did not listen the first time. In one case, a teacher had to say "Listen up" several times, without significant effect.</p>	Limited	6%
		Satisfactory	12%
		Proficient	47%
		Exemplary	35%

**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, 60% of classrooms received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Instructional Delivery domain.

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
<p><b>Communicating with Students</b></p>	<p>Over 80% of the observations scored proficient or exemplary in Communicating with Students. Every observed classroom had similar postings related to the lesson: standards, objectives, Do Now activities, critical thinking questions, and SAT vocabulary words. Teachers repeatedly communicated directions and procedures and responded to student misunderstanding promptly. Teachers used correct standard American English in speaking and writing.</p> <p>In a few cases, students were unsure of how to complete tasks and teachers’ attempts at helping students understand were ineffective. The teachers had to repeat their instructions multiple times, even for Do Now activities. In one case, a teacher spent several minutes during the Do Now discussing when the class’s last meeting was, distracting students from their work.</p>	Limited	6%
		Satisfactory	12%
		Proficient	71%
		Exemplary	12%
<p><b>Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</b></p>	<p>Only about one-third of observations were proficient in Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques. In these classrooms, teachers encouraged students to ask each other questions or make comments about others’ work. These teachers encouraged students to offer multiple plausible answers to a question.</p> <p>However, two-thirds of the observations were not proficient. Most questions</p>	Limited	35%
		Satisfactory	29%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>were low-level and better suited to checking for comprehension than inviting discussion. Academic discussion was primarily between students and teachers, rather than among students. All classrooms had critical thinking questions posted and teachers regularly referred to them. These questions were based on students' prior knowledge rather than their ability to analyze and synthesize information and develop new knowledge, as discussed above. In some cases, teachers posed true critical thinking questions (e.g. "Why did these patterns of behavior arise?") but activities were based on answering lower-level questions (e.g. recording information from a textbook into a worksheet about dates of colonization).</p>	Proficient	35%
		Exemplary	0%
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	<p>About half of the observations were rated proficient or exemplary in "Engaging Students in Learning". In these classrooms, students were engaged in the lessons, pacing was appropriate, and students were given some choice in how they completed class activities (e.g. individually or in groups).</p>	Limited	24%
		Satisfactory	24%
	<p>In about half of classes, many students were not engaged in the lesson. Many students had their heads down during instruction, or talked off-topic during class time. Instruction was primarily teacher-led, and students had little choice in how to complete assignments or tasks. Activities were largely based on completing worksheets.</p>	Proficient	47%
		Exemplary	6%
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	<p>In every observation, teachers used a "Do Now" and/or exit tickets to monitor student learning. In the majority of classrooms, students seemed to understand how they would be evaluated. Teachers and aides circulated throughout student work time to check for comprehension, sometimes making marks on students' papers, and to answer students' questions. Some teachers even encouraged students to assist other students in following the correct</p>	Limited	6%
		Satisfactory	24%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>procedures for completing activities.</p> <p>About a third of classrooms were not proficient in this element of the rubric. Teachers' questions tended to be more about students' comprehension of the instructions, rather than comprehension of the content. Even in some observations rated proficient, teachers relied on low-level questions to gauge student understanding, but did not require all students to answer questions; as such, the feedback given was not specific and the teacher was not able to ensure that all students understood the lesson.</p>	Proficient	65%
		Exemplary	6%

**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.



## SCHOOL INTERVENTION AND SUPPORT STRATEGIES

The following table summarizes:

- a) National Collegiate Preparatory PCHS’s intervention and support strategies for its African American and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups, as detailed in its web-based tool; and,
- b) the evidence that the PCSB staff member observed of the school implementing the strategies between December 2, 2013 and December 13, 2013 for the purposes of the 2012 ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

Schools that have been identified as Focus schools in August 2013 are in the beginning stages of their implementation; as such, PCSB uses only the two-week observation window to gather evidence as to the school’s initial implementation, as opposed to the two-week observation window plus a scheduled day of strategies. As such, it may not be possible to observe certain strategies chosen by the school. PCSB will attempt to observe these strategies in the next monitoring visit in Spring 2014.

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 seen 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.

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School’s Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
Well-organized lesson plans, with logical progression and appropriate pacing	Lesson plans will be placed on each teacher’s desk in a folder clearly labeled “Lesson Plan,” for the QSR team to observe.	While this strategy may be in place, the review team did not see lessons placed on each teacher’s desk in a folder clearly labeled “Lesson Plan”. However, in most classrooms, teachers used the whiteboard to display and reference the learning objectives, do now, SAT word of the day and exit ticket. In one math class, students graphed a set of slope-intercept form equations, identified intersecting lines and analyzed polygons. The teacher used the posted learning objectives, SAT word and exit ticket to transition between learning activities. In a history class, students read the “do now” on the whiteboard and worked to complete the “do now” after entering the room.

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
Differentiated Instruction	<p>Differentiated instruction, as a result of co-planning, should be visible in a number of different ways throughout the school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Co-teaching for ELA and Math, with the special education teachers.</li> <li>▪ Teachers are expected to come up with lesson plans for three learning groups: students who are struggling, those who are on target, and those who can go beyond the current instruction.</li> <li>▪ Students are put in learning communities depending on their need (high and low performing learning communities).</li> <li>▪ Co-teaching should be done in parallel.</li> </ul> <p>Lesson plans contain differentiated activities. There is a portion of the lesson plan template that requires the inclusion and description of differentiated student activities.</p>	<p>The review team observed no evidence of co-teaching and no math classrooms with two adults. In some of the non-math classrooms, the review team observed two adults in the classroom. The additional adult in the classroom served as a teacher assistant. In one class, the additional adult passed out worksheets, collected worksheets and restated statements made by the teacher.</p> <p>The review team observed no examples of three learning groups. In one math class, the review team observed two learning groups. The two groups worked on the same assignment, but one group needed little to no assistance from the teacher. Therefore, the teacher provided more individual instructional support to group that needed additional assistance.</p> <p>During most observations, students worked in small groups. In general, the small groups were not established by learning needs. In one math class, the teacher assigned small groups by students picking a number 1-4 out of a box. In a history class, the students selected their small group.</p> <p>While this strategy may be in place, the review team neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to the differentiated activities included in lesson plans.</p>

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
Frequent use of formative assessments	Teachers are constantly assessing students using Exit Tickets in order to place them into learning communities to target instruction at the students' particular levels. Teachers administer Exit Tickets at the end of each class and use data from Exit Tickets to inform instruction.	In most of the observed classrooms, teachers assessed student learning at various points of the lesson. In a math class, the teacher assessed student learning via exit tickets. The exit ticket required students to take an exit quiz on graphing and solving equations. In another math class, students added, subtracted and multiplied a series of matrices. The teacher assigned students to small groups and almost all students were required to present a portion of their group's work. In a history class, students orally presented their work on inventions. Both teachers and students asked the presenters to explain how their invention changed over time. After the presentations, the teacher instructed students to "write down some of the conveniences that these inventions have afforded us" (exit ticket).
Professional Development around assessment	ANet trainers frequently come into the school to train teachers in the use of assessment. As a result, instruction should be highly differentiated according to student data. Data trainings and meetings occur according a schedule that was devised at the beginning of the school year. These trainings and meetings are facilitated by the Achievement Network partners and member of National Prep's Data Team.	While this strategy may be in place, the review team neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to ANet professional development. ANet testing occurred during the second week of the unscheduled QSR window.
Training for teachers in cultural competency	As a result of their cultural competency training, there should be improved relationships observed between teachers and students, resulting in improved academic outcomes. Respect, harmonious and trusting relationships, and positive rapport between teachers and students should be apparent.	While the QSR visit did not include a review of the cultural competency training, the review team was able to observe relationships between teachers and students. As described in the <i>Framework for Teaching</i> element of "Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport", about three-quarters of observations, interactions between teachers and students were kind, respectful, and appropriate. Teachers consistently responded warmly and respectfully to students' requests and questions. Highly-rated teachers even joked with their students and seemed to have personal relationships with them. In most of the observations, the "4 B's – Be Respectful; Be Prepared; Be Accountable; Be Your Best Self" was visibly displayed.

Strategy Described in Intervention Plan	School's Description of Strategy on the Ground	Evidence
Increased instructional time	Our daily schedule outlines the addition of time to the school day as compared to last school year. All students attend test prep classes for additional hour that was added to the school day this school year.	PCSB did not observe additional classes, though the school leader indicated that the schedule now includes test preparation classes.