



June 8, 2018

Jason Andreat, Board Chair  
Achievement Prep Public Charter School  
Wahler Place Elementary  
908 Wahler Place SE  
Washington, DC 20032

Dear Mr. Andreat,

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, DC PCSB shall monitor the progress of each school in meeting the goals and student academic achievement expectations specified in the school's charter. Your school was selected to undergo a Qualitative Site Review during the 2017-18 school year for the following reason(s):

- Campus earned Tier 3 on school year 2016-17 Performance Management Framework

### **Qualitative Site Review Report**

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Achievement Prep Public Charter School- Wahler Place Elementary (Achievement Prep PCS - Elementary) between April 23, 2018 - May 4, 2018. Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report focuses primarily on the following areas: classroom environment and instruction.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at Achievement Prep PCS - Elementary.

Sincerely,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Naomi DeVeaux.

Naomi DeVeaux  
Deputy Director

Enclosures  
cc: Shantelle Wright, Founder/CEO

## Qualitative Site Review Report

**Date:** June 8, 2018

### **Campus Information**

**Campus Name:** Achievement Prep Public Charter School – Wahler Place Elementary (Achievement Prep PCS – Elementary)

**Ward:** 8

**Grade levels:** Prekindergarten-3 (PK3) – 3

### **Qualitative Site Review Information**

**Reason for visit:** Campus earned Tier 3 on school year 2016-17 Performance Management Framework (PMF)

**Two-week window:** April 23, 2018 – May 4, 2018

**QSR team members:** One DC PCSB staff member and two consultants including a special education specialist

**Number of observations:** 17 (including two special education pull-outs not included in overall scoring)

**Total enrollment:** 486

**Students with Disabilities enrollment:** 51

**English Language Learners enrollment:** n<10

**In-seat attendance on observation days<sup>1</sup>:**

**Visit 1: April 23, 2018** – 81.5%

**Visit 2: April 26, 2018** – 88.2%

**Visit 3: May 2, 2018** – 82.0%

**Visit 4: May 3, 2018** – 86.9%

### **Summary**

Achievement Prep PCS' mission is "to prepare students to excel as high-achieving scholars and leaders in high school, college, and beyond."

Observers saw little evidence that Achievement Prep PCS – Elementary is meeting its mission. Academic expectations and rigor were low across the campus. Class time was mostly devoted to managing behavior to keep students safe and compliant. As a result, teachers praised students merely for complying with directions, but opportunities for genuine academic thinking and discussion were rare.

Despite evidence of common behavioral management systems across classrooms, in roughly half of the classrooms, teachers worked to keep lessons structured with

---

<sup>1</sup> The floor for the attendance metric on the PMF for K-8 is 85% and the target is 95%.

mixed results. In these classrooms students exhibited severely disruptive and at times unsafe behavior, which directly impacted the teacher's ability to instruct and students to learn. The school's classroom procedures and student behavioral expectations were strict and highly structured. Teachers used common behavior management systems and de-escalating language, indicating the school is working systemically to improve school culture. Teachers summoned administrators often to actively resolve student conflicts. However, due to the severity and frequency of students' misbehavior in most observations, much instructional time was lost while teachers and administrators worked to address the behavioral issues.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendix I and II). The QSR team scored 53% of observations as proficient in the Classroom Environment domain, a nine-percentage point drop from the campus' last QSR in 2016 in which 62% of observations were scored as distinguished or proficient in this domain. The highest rated component was *Managing Classroom Procedures*. In the majority of observations (60%) the teacher's management of materials and supplies was well planned and successfully executed. The lowest rated components were *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport* and *Managing Student Behavior*. Despite clear routines and common language, slightly less than half of observations (47%) were rated as proficient in these components. While teachers genuinely attempted to respond to disrespectful behavior among students, the results of their efforts were uneven with limited success. Rarely did a teacher use disrespectful language towards students. However, interactions among students were harsh; name-calling and put-downs were prevalent in nearly every observation.

The QSR team scored just 37% of observations as proficient in the Instruction domain, a six-percentage point drop from the 43% the campus earned in the Instruction domain in 2016. The behavior challenges represented in the Classroom Environment domain directly impacted the quality of instruction. Most teachers spent a disproportionate amount of time responding to student behavior, reducing the amount of time for academic instruction. Generally, the well-managed classrooms with more than one adult in the room scored higher in the Instruction domain because students had more opportunities to engage with content, ask and answer questions, and receive feedback on their progress with one teacher while the other maintained order in the classroom. The highest rated component was *Communicating with Students*. In all but one observation teachers scored either proficient or basic for at least attempting to explain the instructional purpose of the lesson and the directions to complete an assigned activity. The lowest rated component was *Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques*. Only 20% of observations were rated as proficient. Teachers in these three observations

posed questions designed to promote student thinking and understanding among most students. In the majority of observations, however, learning tasks were of low cognitive challenge and students did not have opportunities to respond to one another during academic discussion.

Achievement Prep Elementary PCS' QSR scores are about thirty percentage points below average compared to other K-8 charter schools in Washington, DC; and notably, no observations received a 'Distinguished' score in any component, which is the highest rating on the Danielson rubric.

#### In-School Suspension (ISS)

Administrators at Achievement Prep Elementary informed the QSR team that they do not have an ISS room at the school. Nevertheless, administrators were present in hallways and several students were removed from the classroom when they exhibited a behavioral crisis or engaged in severely disruptive behavior.

#### Governance

DC PCSB reviewed minutes from Achievement Prep PCS' most recent board meeting on February 21, 2018. A quorum was present. The Chief Talent Officer gave a presentation on the Local Education Agency's (LEA) current state of talent and plans for the 2018-19 school year. The board then voted to go into executive session for the remainder of the meeting.

#### Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, Achievement Prep Elementary PCS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Overall, the school's program implemented accommodations for SWD with fidelity, including the use of co-teaching and increased support staff (e.g. paraprofessionals) in the classroom. The school also used instructional resources such as manipulatives and computer programs during Station Teaching to enhance the effectiveness of its co-teaching model.

- To demonstrate that co-planning has occurred, the school explained that the QSR team would observe small group instruction within the general education setting, and that SWD would be given modified or accommodated assignments. The special education specialist observed effective small group instruction during Station Teaching in the general education classroom when the special education teacher pulled students into small groups to work on a lesson. In each observation, students were on-task and the instructor frequently used direct questioning to monitor for student understanding. The special education teacher used the same materials during his/her small group

instruction that were provided to general education students, but the special educator scaffolded instruction for SWD and used techniques such as prompting for recall, direct questioning, and chunking content to ensure SWD grasped the material.

- To support the learning of SWD, the school reported that they offer resources such as support personnel, computers, visual aids in the classroom, manipulatives, reading mastery, and assistive technology. In the self-contained classroom, the special education specialist observed teachers training students how to use text-to-speech technology in preparation for the upcoming PARCC assessment. In that same classroom, there was a mental health counselor who supported the behavioral needs of students by working one-on-one with the students with the most pronounced behavioral needs. In all the special education observations, students had an opportunity to participate in Lexia Learning, a personalized learning computer program for reading. Additionally, many of the classrooms contained visual representations of concepts that were posted around the room (e.g., faces to represent emotions, math symbols with written explanations of procedures, and clip art to represent learning behaviors). During a math lesson where the special education teacher provided inclusion support, the general education teacher used manipulatives in the form of paper money and plastic coins to teach word problems involving decimals.
- To provide accommodations according to the Individualized Education Programs (IEP) of SWD, the school reported that staff restate and clarify directions, provide extended time on assignments, chunk assignments, provide frequent breaks, graphic organizers, anchor charts and assisted reading. The special education specialist observed teachers restating and clarifying directions, using graphic organizers, and providing assisted reading. In one observation of a pull-out session, the teacher gave the students frequent breaks as needed. However, in the general education classroom, one of the consequences implemented for student misbehavior was the loss of recess or classroom breaks, which contradicted the school's stated efforts to provide breaks for SWD as an accommodation. The students who lost recess were visibly upset. They put their heads down on their desks, covered their faces, and began to cry.
- To provide modifications according to the IEPs of SWD, the school wrote that the QSR team might observe students receiving modified curriculum or assignments during a lesson. The special education specialist did not observe noticeable changes to the curriculum provided to students. During two small-group, push-in observations, SWD were provided the same content and

supporting materials (e.g., graphic organizers and worksheets) that general education students were given for the same task. However, the special education teachers did offer scaffolded instruction in the form of focused questioning, context clues and visual aids such as pointing to the pictures in a story or drawing out word problems on a white board.

- In one observation, the special education specialist observed a restorative circle in the self-contained classroom that was especially effective. Three adults and three students shared their feelings about text anxiety. Earlier that day, the students exhibited negative behavior, slamming down the computer laptop, cursing, throwing a backpack, and walking around the classroom aggressively while completing a practice run of the PARCC test. In the restorative circle, one student expressed that testing made him feel anxious and frustrated. Another student shared that his earlier behavior was a result of him not wanting to take the test because the text-to-speech software was reading too fast and he did not understand it. The teacher asked, "If we spent some time working on how to slow down the pace of the reading, do you think that you would feel better?" The student confirmed that he thought the teacher's suggestion would help. In another conversation, the teachers and students shared strategies for how they approach stressful situations, "I like to take my deep breaths. I close my eyes and say something positive to myself. Like - come on, you got this!" The classroom environment was patient, trusting, and caring.

## THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Classroom Environment domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits<sup>2</sup>. The label definitions for classroom observations of “distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” and “unsatisfactory” are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 52% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations students and teachers generally spoke with care and kindness. When students exhibited disrespect towards one another, the teachers addressed the behavior successfully. In several observations teachers explicitly taught students how to take turns and gave them language to work out interpersonal conflicts. When students interrupted one another or spoke out of turn, teachers would say, “Please let him/her finish, and then we want to hear what you have to say,” or “Make sure you’re tracking the speaker to let them know you respect their voice.”</p> <p>Although there was quite a bit of name calling across all observations, the proficient teachers responded in a way that did not escalate the situation, and students quickly apologized. Teachers gave high-fives to celebrate student work and students frequently displayed “shine fingers” to encourage their peers.</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>In two different observations, the teachers taught emotional vocabulary to help students solve interpersonal conflicts. In one observation students matched their emotions to those of fictional characters in their reading to express how they were feeling. In a restorative circle, one teacher said, “I don’t think that you were feeling angry exactly... what is a better word for how you were feeling?” The student finally stated, “I was frustrated.”</p>	Proficient	47%

<sup>2</sup> Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 20% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations when students spoke to one another disrespectfully, teachers' interventions were unsuccessful. In one observation a student shouted, "I hate my partner!" and refused to work with her. Students continued to insult each other even though they received consequences. One student started to cry because a peer called her "disgusting." In another observation the teachers attempted to prompt a genuine discussion but had to repeatedly stop to say, "I'm sorry you don't have the respect of your peers. Let's try that again once everyone is tracking you." Students continued to bicker as the adults unsuccessfully attempted to focus students on the lesson. In these observations, consequences did not alter student behavior. One student said, "I don't care about your stupid chart" in response to having his color changed on the class behavior chart for making an obscene gesture at the teacher.</p>	Basic	20%
	<p>The QSR team scored 33% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. These classrooms were emotionally and, at times, physically unsafe environments. In one observation students called each other names, yelled, hit one another, cried, knocked over chairs, took their shoes off and rolled around the room, pulled each other's hair, mocked and threatened one another. One student said, "I'm going to smash your face!" In another observation a student said of a peer, "Will you please put her to sleep? She's dirty." Because teachers lost control of the classroom, they were unable to address the students as they verbally insulted each other. In another observation the teacher's tone was harsh, directive, and impatient when engaging with students: "Move it!... Sit down... What did I <i>just</i> tell you?... Hey, hey, stop it! That is not the signal. Sit down and give the signal."</p>	Unsatisfactory	33%



The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 53% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. Across these observations students were eager to participate and teachers conveyed the importance of learning and that with hard work all students could be successful. One teacher said, "This is important because we need to know how strong you are in math and reading so that we can help you get even stronger." In these observations students working independently or at centers remained engaged even when not directly under teacher supervision.</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>Teachers offered specific directions for how students should participate. When students struggled, teachers asked classmates to send positive energy and consistently said, "We're going to come back to you" instead of allowing students to opt-out. Similarly, when one student didn't want to answer a question, the teacher said, "How about I re-read the problem in a different way? I just <i>know</i> you can get this."</p>	Proficient	53%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 33% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations not all students consistently participated in the lessons and teachers had not set a climate of learning, choosing activities that required behavior standards students were unable to attain. In center rotations when students were not working directly with the teacher, students disengaged and put their heads down or began to fight with their peers without teacher intervention or with unsuccessful attempts by teachers to redirect behavior. In one observation the teacher who was supposed to be leading a small group had to stop teaching every few minutes to address a behavior issue at the various centers.</p> <p>Some teachers issued ClassDojo<sup>3</sup> points to every student who raised their hand to answer a question. One student raised his hand and said to his peer, "I don't even know the answer. Do you?" The student responded, "No, just raise your hand for a point."</p> <p>Several activities lacked appropriate rigor for the grade. For example, one class simply copied text onto a worksheet by filling in the blanks with dialogue directly from their book. In another observation the teacher asked questions of a small group but immediately answered them. The students responded, "Yeah, that's what I was going to say."</p>	Basic	33%
	<p>The QSR team scored 13% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations no learning occurred because the classroom was chaotic and the teachers spent the entire observation attempting to manage behavior.</p>	Unsatisfactory	13%

<sup>3</sup> Clasdojo.com: "ClassDojo is a classroom communication app used to share reports between parents and teachers. Teachers track student behavior and upload photos or videos"

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 60% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. Teachers used uniform strategies to ensure learning time was maximized across proficient observations. Most teachers used a timing device and established attention-getting signals, counting down while stating behavioral expectations, "Five: put away your materials, four: clean-up, three: get ready to move, two: eyes on me, one: stand next to your desk" and a chant that students recited: "One-two-three (teacher) eyes on me (students)." In proficient observations teachers excelled at giving <i>specific</i> directions such as "Clean your board and put your marker on your name tag," or "Put your extra cube on your cube stick and then fold your hands" which minimized student confusion.</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>Students generally knew where to go and how to get started when transitioning between math and literacy stations. Students helped prepare for transitions by collecting or handing out materials to make clean-up/set-up efficient. Students used specific hand signals for going to the bathroom, sharpening their pencils, and other needs. This system prevented the teacher from interruptions during small group instruction.</p>	Proficient	60%

<b>The Classroom Environment</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>School Wide Rating</b>	
	<p>The QSR team scored 27% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations students did not consistently respond to the teacher’s classroom management techniques. For example, a teacher would say, “Raise your hand if you can hear my voice,” and few, if any students, would respond. Teachers in all classes used a “My Choices” color card (in descending order: green, yellow, orange, red) to manage behavior. In these observations students did not respond to directions and the teacher would begin issuing color changes for noncompliance. Several teachers said, “Ok, let’s try that again” but the second and third attempts were unsuccessful, and students began to express their frustration and boredom by acting out or sighing loudly while practicing lining up, moving to the carpet, and standing up behind their chairs repeatedly.</p>	Basic	27%
	<p>The QSR team scored 13% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In one observation there were not enough working computers for each student at the computer station at any given time. One student began to cry because her classmates refused to share their computer with her. In the same classroom students jumped over their chairs in an unsafe manner and some students threw their materials. In the other observation several students didn’t have any work to do when they finished early because they didn’t know where their materials were located.</p>	Unsatisfactory	13%
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations the color system effectively reinforced positive behavior. Teachers issued a series of warnings and told students, “This is your last warning before a color change,” which deterred further misbehavior. All classrooms had a “Peace Corner” with an hourglass timer and drawing</p>	Distinguished	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	materials where students could go to de-escalate. In the proficient observations these spaces were effective places for students to self-regulate, reflect, and return back to instruction without being removed from class.	Proficient	47%
	The QSR team scored 40% of observations as basic in this component. In basic observations the color system was ineffective at modifying student conduct issues. Teachers repeatedly refocused and redirected student behavior with uneven results. Many teachers spent a disproportionate amount of time on student behavior rather than academic content. In a few instances, consequences were given inconsistently. For example, one student received a color change because his "tummy wasn't touching the table," while other students were sitting further away from the table throughout the lesson and did not receive a consequence. Similarly, some students received a warning for standing up without permission while others were given a minute to get back into their seats without receiving a consequence. A lot of time was devoted to interpersonal conflicts. Teachers repeatedly said, "No, don't say that... That's not nice.... Please focus over there... That's a warning." Classrooms with only one teacher were generally less academically focused than classrooms with two adults because one could manage behavior while the other taught.	Basic	40%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 13% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations students had severe reactions to color changes. One student was so upset by a color change that he threw the snack cart across the room. In one observation an adult dragged a student by the hand out of the classroom when he went into crisis. Students screamed and called one another hurtful names and hit each other without consequence, while other students engaged in the same behavior received consequences inconsistently. In another observation students continually hit one another and pulled each other's hair at the computer station while the teachers unsuccessfully attempted to deter the misbehavior by issuing reminders about behavior expectations.</p>	Unsatisfactory	13%

## INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 37% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Instruction domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Communicating with Students</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 43% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In proficient observations teachers stated the objective in age-appropriate language, such as, "We are going to look at how the character's feelings change during the story." One teacher situated the learning task within the broader learning: "Today we are going to solve word problems. Make sure you show your work so I can see what you understand from the last two days or rotations." One teacher expressed passion for the content, saying, "I'm super excited for reading today because we have a book of poetry!" Another teacher introduced the topic of feelings by inviting students to talk to their peers about a feeling they had recently in a turn-and-talk. Students engaged in the learning tasks, indicating that they knew what they were supposed to do.</p> <p>In a few observations teachers projected a slide on the board that told students which station they would be in: guided mean/reading, technology, or independent work. Students referenced the board to self-monitor their progress through stations.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	43%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 50% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations two major trends emerged. In some classes, the teacher clearly introduced the topic and modeled the steps, but could not fully explain the content throughout the lesson due a lack of effective behavior management. In other classes, the teacher’s attempt to explain the instructional purpose had only limited success and the lesson directions had to be clarified. A few students in one observation asked, “Are we supposed to be writing?” In one observation the teacher distributed a math rack and told students they were to compose numbers to twenty. Seemingly unprepared with a lesson plan, the teacher gave students some time to play with the math rack and then collected them and said they were going to use ten frames instead.</p> <p>In another observation the teacher passed out a bar graph worksheet that had missing words that students were to simply copy off of the board. The teacher did not provide any explanation for why they were learning about bar graphs or their usefulness. The bar graph was not relevant to the questions the teacher asked the students to solve.</p>	Basic	50%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	7%
<p><b>Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored 20% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. Notably, all of the proficient observations were math classes. In these observations teachers posed questions designed to promote student thinking and understanding. One teacher asked students to make multiple representations of five, saying, “She made four on the top and one on the bottom. Can you find two more ways to make five” Another teacher invited students to explain their thinking: “Which number is greater? How can you tell? Explain your steps.”</p>	Distinguished	0%



Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>Another teacher asked, "And <i>why</i> should I put the minus sign? What happened in our story?" The student replied, "We should use the minus sign because four bears went to sleep." Teachers in these observations used equity sticks and cold calls to ensure most students participated, not just those who initially volunteered.</p>	Proficient	20%
	<p>The QSR team scored 67% of observations as basic in this component. Some teachers asked predominantly low-level recall questions such as, "What is the character's name? Where does he live?" When students answered incorrectly, there was often no clear feedback or follow-up. In one such observation a teacher attempted to ask a student to explain his thinking: "Why did you choose this word? Why does this word look like <i>picture</i> to you?" The student could not answer and the teacher moved on in the lesson. In another observation a teacher asked, "What do you notice about the front cover?" A student responded, "I notice..." and the teacher moved on to another student without giving the first student enough time to think about her answer. In other observations student behavior interfered with the teacher's ability to listen and respond to student answers. In multiple observations teachers asked thoughtful questions, but immediately had to address unrelated behavior issues while students answered, therefore limiting the potential genuine academic discussion. For example, during a read-aloud, the teacher asked, "Where are the characters? Oh wait, cut. I need everyone criss-cross applesauce hands in their lap." Such interruptions resulted in only one genuine discussion about the book in a twenty-minute read-aloud.</p>	Basic	67%
	<p>The QSR team scored 13% of observations as unsatisfactory. In these observations there were no opportunities for students to share their thinking or respond directly to one another in genuine academic discussion due to chaos and lack of teacher control in the classroom.</p>	Unsatisfactory	13%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 40% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations teachers used materials and resources that were appropriate and engaging. Several teachers used rubber bears for addition and subtraction word problems that provided a hands-on visual for students to match key academic vocabulary to addition and subtraction operations. In other observations teachers provided academic choice to engage students in learning. In one math lesson students practiced making change in a pretend grocery store. In multiple observations students used graphic organizers to capture their thoughts and organize their writing. In a few observations students had individual white boards which allowed them to share their work with their peers and receive instant feedback. Pacing in these observations was appropriate and effective. The lessons moved quickly enough to keep students engaged but not too quickly as to lose or confuse students. In a few observations the teacher provided time for lesson closure and reflection, in one such observation asking students what they learned about decomposing numbers.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	40%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 53% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations only some students were intellectually engaged in the activity. In center rotations students who were not working directly with the teacher often began off-task activities such as drawing, putting their heads down on their desks, or engaging in interpersonal conflicts. In some lessons the teacher spent the majority of the lesson fixing student behavior and as a result, students became visibly frustrated or bored. When asked to re-do the correct procedure for lining up multiple times, many students in one observation began sighing loudly to express frustration which sometimes escalated the teacher's response. As a result, a significant amount of learning time was lost.</p> <p>In several observations learning tasks only required minimal student thinking, allowing most students to simply fill-in-the-blanks of a worksheet or sit passively if they chose not to work. In one observation a student at the technology station did not login but rather watched another student's monitor for over ten minutes.</p>	Basic	53%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	7%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations teachers circulated the classroom to monitor student work, offer feedback, and answer questions. In some observations teachers adjusted their teaching strategies as a result of student misunderstanding. For example, while assessing the foundation PK skill of counting the words in a sentence, one teacher drew lines between the words to help students once s/he realized students were struggling to meet the objective without the visual aid. In another observation students used a rubric to edit and revise their work. When offering feedback, one teacher asked students to identify the words in the word problem that helped them make decisions about their approach to solving it so they could improve their reasoning in the future. In another observation a teacher circulated and graded each student's exit ticket, giving those that missed a problem specific feedback on why it was incorrect and how to fix their mistakes.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	47%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 40% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations feedback was general and not oriented toward future improvement. One teacher circulated throughout the classroom to check students' written responses to reading. To several students, s/he said, "No, check the text," indicating that the student's answer was not rooted in textual evidence. However, there was no follow-up or discussion about what textual evidence supported the question or why. Some students looked back in the text but few altered their work product. Other teachers asked for general checks for understanding with phrases such as, "You guys understand that? Yes, alright, good," without confirming that students indeed understood the context. Another teacher said, "If you have the correct number bond, stay sitting in scholar position (hands folded on top of desk). If not, fix it." However, some students did not know why their number bond was inaccurate or how to fix it and simply stayed in scholar position.</p>	Basic	40%
	<p>The QSR team scored 13% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations there were no opportunities for the teacher to determine if the students understood the lesson due to severe behavior distractions that took the teacher's attention for the duration of the class period.</p>	Unsatisfactory	13%

## APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT RUBRIC

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

## APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION RUBRIC

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<b>Communicating with Students</b>	Teacher's oral and written communication contains errors or is unclear or inappropriate to students. Teacher's purpose in a lesson or unit is unclear to students. Teacher's explanation of the content is unclear or confusing or uses inappropriate language.	Teacher's oral and written communication contains no errors, but may not be completely appropriate or may require further explanations to avoid confusion. Teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose, with limited success. Teacher's explanation of the content is uneven; some is done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow.	Teacher communicates clearly and accurately to students both orally and in writing. Teacher's purpose for the lesson or unit is clear, including where it is situated within broader learning. Teacher's explanation of content is appropriate and connects with students' knowledge and experience.	Teacher's oral and written communication is clear and expressive, anticipating possible student misconceptions. Makes the purpose of the lesson or unit clear, including where it is situated within broader learning, linking purpose to student interests. Explanation of content is imaginative, and connects with students' knowledge and experience. Students contribute to explaining concepts to their peers.
<b>Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</b>	Teacher makes poor use of questioning and discussion techniques, with low-level questions, limited student participation, and little true discussion.	Teacher's use of questioning and discussion techniques is uneven with some high-level question; attempts at true discussion; moderate student participation.	Teacher's use of questioning and discussion techniques reflects high-level questions, true discussion, and full participation by all students.	Students formulate many of the high-level questions and assume responsibility for the participation of all students in the discussion.
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	Students are not at all intellectually engaged in significant learning, as a result of inappropriate activities or materials, poor representations of content, or lack of lesson structure.	Students are intellectually engaged only partially, resulting from activities or materials or uneven quality, inconsistent representation of content or uneven structure of pacing.	Students are intellectually engaged throughout the lesson, with appropriate activities and materials, instructive representations of content, and suitable structure and pacing of the lesson.	Students are highly engaged throughout the lesson and make material contribution to the representation of content, the activities, and the materials. The structure and pacing of the lesson allow for student reflection and closure.
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	Students are unaware of criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and do not engage in self-assessment or monitoring. Teacher does not monitor student learning in the curriculum, and feedback to students is of poor quality and in an untimely manner.	Students know some of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and occasionally assess the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards. Teacher monitors the progress of the class as a whole but elicits no diagnostic information; feedback to students is uneven and inconsistent in its timeliness.	Students are fully aware of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards. Teacher monitors the progress of groups of students in the curriculum, making limited use of diagnostic prompts to elicit information; feedback is timely, consistent, and of high quality.	Students are fully aware of the criteria and standards by which their work will be evaluated, have contributed to the development of the criteria, frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards, and make active use of that information in their learning. Teacher actively and systematically elicits diagnostic information from individual students regarding understanding and monitors progress of individual students; feedback is timely, high quality, and students use feedback in their learning.

### Appendix III: SCORE BREAKDOWN BY COMPONENT

Percent of:	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	33%	13%	13%	13%	7%	13%	7%	13%
Basic	20%	33%	27%	40%	50%	67%	53%	40%
Proficient	47%	53%	60%	47%	43%	20%	40%	47%
Distinguished	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Subdomain Average</b>	<b>2.13</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>2.33</b>

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	52%	37%
<b>Domain Averages</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>2.27</b>