January 30, 2020

Christopher Wilkinson, Board Chair
Washington Latin PCS
5200 2nd St. NW
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Wilkinson:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews (QSR) 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 2019-20 school year for the following reason(s):

- School eligible for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2020-21 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report
A Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team conducted on-site reviews of Washington Latin Public Charter School – Upper School between November 11, 2019 – November 22, 2019. Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the QSR 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 QSR at Washington Latin Public Charter School – Upper School.

Sincerely,
Rashida Young
Chief School Performance Officer

Enclosures
cc: School Leader

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: January 30, 2020

Campus Information
Campus Name: Washington Latin Public Charter School – Upper School
(Washington Latin PCS – Upper School)
Ward: 4
Grade levels: Ninth through twelfth

Qualitative Site Review Information
Reason for Visit: School eligible for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2020-21 school year
Two-week Window: November 11, 2019 – November 22, 2019
QSR Team Members: Two DC PCSB staff, two consultants, and one special education (SPED) specialist
Number of Observations: 18 observations
Total Enrollment: 341
Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 41
English Language Learners Enrollment: 5
In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:
Visit 1: November 13, 2019 – 95.6%
Visit 2: November 14, 2019 – 95.0%
Visit 3: November 18, 2019 – 95.0%
Visit 4: November 21, 2019 – 95.6%

Summary
Washington Latin Public Charter School's mission is "to provide a challenging, classical education that is accessible to students throughout the District of Columbia." The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team observed strong evidence that Washington Latin PCS – Upper School is fulfilling its mission. DC PCSB observers saw evidence of a challenging curriculum as students collaboratively analyzed complex ideas, translated advanced Latin texts, and shared strategies for solving math problems. Observers noted the classical elements of the education at Washington Latin PCS – Upper School, as teachers consistently held discussion-style classes, in which teachers and students alike posed questions that deepened thinking and challenged ideas.

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 92% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest-rated components were *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)* and *Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b),* with 94% of observations scored as proficient or above in each component and none as unsatisfactory. Observers noted that teachers demonstrated knowledge and caring about individual students. Students readily celebrated each other's success and participated in discussions without fear of put-downs. Students and teachers displayed a strong commitment to learning across

most observations. Teachers conveyed high expectations for students by asking probing questions to push their thinking deeper. In instances when a student doubted their abilities, teachers encouraged them with statements such as "Wow, that is a tough sentence; let's work on it together."

The QSR team scored 83% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The highest-rated component was *Communicating with Students (3a),* with 95% of observations scored as proficient or above in this component and none as unsatisfactory. Teachers clearly communicated the purpose of the lesson and encouraged students to participate. Teachers situated the learning goals within the broader context of the curriculum, and students often helped deepen one another's understanding of a concept or strategy.

Governance
Christopher Wilkinson chairs the Washington Latin PCS Board of Trustees. The School Reform Act requires all DC public charter schools to have a majority of DC residents and two parents, which the school has been compliant with for the past five years.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities
Prior to the two-week window, Washington Latin PCS – Upper School completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. DC PCSB observed three SPED environments, including one co-taught inclusion classroom and two unscored pull-outs. Overall, the school partially implemented its stated program with fidelity as evidenced by students engaged in learning in some of the observations described below. Key trends from the SPED observations are summarized below.

- To demonstrate that co-planning occurred, the school explained that the team would observe the SPED and general education teachers working together seamlessly. This was partially observed during the one co-taught classroom that DC PCSB observed. In this observation, teachers used the One Teach, One Assist model with little interaction between the SPED and general education teacher. During the observation, an altercation outside of the classroom caused the SPED teacher to have to leave the room, which left the general education teacher solely responsible for facilitating instruction. During this observation, there was no evidence that the assessment provided to students had been modified to differentiate for students' individual needs. Further, all of the students in the class engaged in the same activity with no evidence that the teacher tracked students' responses or followed up to incorrect responses from students.

- As a program that uses co-teaching, the school stated that reviewers would observe three forms of co-teaching, including general education and SPED teachers team-teaching, station teaching, and pull-out services. The SPED

specialist observed one co-taught classroom that followed the One Teach, One Assist model, as well as two pull-out sessions. In the co-taught observation, the SPED teacher supported the general education teacher by following up with students regarding their behavior and redirecting students to follow along with the learning task. Halfway through the lesson, the SPED teacher left the classroom and the general education teacher finished the lesson alone. In the pull-out sessions, the SPED teacher effectively modified the learning task to meet the needs of the students. During one math pull-out session, one student said, "I just don't understand what he was saying." The SPED teacher then modeled through the guided release method to help students understand. The teacher modified the task, telling the student to focus on a few questions instead of all of them, and presented alternative strategies for solving the problem. By the end of the lesson, students could both complete the task and explain their reasoning.

- To provide accommodations according to the IEPs of SWD, the school stated that it provides multiple accommodations. Of the accommodations listed in the school's questionnaire, the SPED specialist observed the SPED teacher providing preferential seating, guided questions, verbal follow-up, repetition of directions, frequent check-ins, frequent breaks, and one-on-one tutoring.

- To provide modifications according to the Individual Education Plan (IEPs) of SWD, the school wrote that the team might see a variety of modifications both in teacher pedagogy and materials. Of the modifications listed, the SPED specialist observed teachers providing appropriate pacing of speech, wait time, and effective questioning techniques with the use of many open-ended questions such as, "How did you know to do that?" Throughout these observations, class sizes were small and whole group instruction was limited to only ten students in the largest co-taught class observed.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[1]

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Classroom Environment 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 92% 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[2]	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	The QSR team scored 94% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations interactions between teachers and students, and among students, were highly respectful. Students celebrated each other's success and freely. Teachers demonstrated knowledge and caring about individual students. For example, with a lockdown drill scheduled for later in the day, one teacher acknowledged that some students may have felt afraid or anxious, and let them know that they could come to them confidentially if they felt scared.	Distinguished	33%
	In the proficient observations talk between teachers and students was uniformly respectful. In one observation, the teacher made a joke and students laughed along, telling him, "That was a good one." Teachers in these observations greeted students by name as they entered the classroom, and successfully responded to any disrespectful behavior among students. In one observation, the teacher heard a friendly squabble between students and asked them to "Let it go." One student briefly sang the *Frozen* song, "Let it go, let it go," before both students refocused on their work.	Proficient	61%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as basic in this component.	Basic	6%

---

[1] Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

[2] DC PCSB does not report out qualitative evidence if less than 10% of observations in any given component earned a "basic" or "unsatisfactory" level of performance.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating[2]	
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team scored 94% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation, the teacher communicated a genuine passion for the subject. In addition, students questioned one another during discussions, indicating a commitment to learning and a willingness to assist their peers in understanding the content.	Distinguished	6%
	In the proficient observations teachers conveyed the expectation of high levels of student effort. One teacher encouraged a student who faltered on a challenging task by saying, "Wow, that is a tough sentence, let's work on it together." Teachers in these observations insisted on precise use of language by students. For example, one teacher reminded a student to use the correct academic term. The teacher said, "That's called the radicand, remember?" Students in these observations expended good effort to complete high-quality work. One student attempted a problem several times; when it was correct, that student threw their hands up in victory and proudly showed their work to peers.	Proficient	88%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as basic in this component.	Basic	6%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team scored 89% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations students themselves ensured that transitions and other routines ran efficiently. For example, students placed their phones in a caddy upon entering the class and took out their homework without being asked.	Distinguished	11%
	In the proficient observations classroom routines functioned smoothly. Students followed directions as they transitioned between activities, handed out materials, and entered and exited the classroom. Students also worked productively during small-group and independent work.	Proficient	78%
	The QSR team scored 11% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers had established routines, but their operation wasn't smooth. In these observations, inefficient routines such as putting phones away upon entering the classroom, transitioning between activities, distributing materials, and asking permission for the bathroom resulted in lost instructional time.	Basic	11%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 89% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations behavior was almost entirely appropriate. Teachers in these observations monitored behavior subtly by refocusing students on the topic at hand ("Ok, let's move on,") or walking around the room as they taught. In some distinguished observations, students respectfully intervened with classmates at appropriate moments to ensure compliance with standards of conduct. For example, in one observation a few students were talking about a video game during instruction; another student asked, "Don't you have work to do?" The two students laughed and returned to their notes.	Distinguished	39%
	In the proficient observations teachers frequently and effectively monitored student behavior using established standards of behavior. When students occasionally held off-topic conversations or had their phones, teachers politely reminded them of the expectations and students complied. In one observation, the teacher moved two students' seats after they engaged in off-topic conversations, and students became focused after that.	Proficient	50%
	The QSR team scored 11% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, teachers' responses to student misbehavior was uneven. In one observation a teacher asked a student to close out of a non-content related website a few times before s/he complied. In another observation, a teacher's requests, such as, "Take out your notes," "Sit down," "Pay attention," and "Open your iPad to X site," were completely ignored by some students, with no consequences or teacher response.	Basic	11%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 83% 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	
Communicating with Students	The QSR team scored 95% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations teachers used rich and imaginative language to explain content. Teachers also offered brief vocabulary lessons where appropriate. For example, one teacher remarked, "There is this great word [the writer] uses, *exteriority*, the act of being on the outside. I think [the writer] is trying to say that even when people are not politically describing this topic, they're still describing it in a way that makes [women] feel like they are outside of the norm." Students also used academic language in context and helped deepen each other's understanding of the content. In a few distinguished observations, students worked together to translate difficult Latin sentences.	Distinguished	17%
	In the proficient observations teachers provided clear objectives, with some teachers situating the learning in the broader context of the curriculum. One teacher reminded students of their larger goal before they began editing their writing drafts. The teacher said, "You're telling a story that's trying to communicate an experience to a reader, [so focus on the big ideas rather than spelling and punctuation first.]" Teachers in these observations used modeling and provided strategies students might use as they approached a task.	Proficient	78%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as basic in this component.	Basic	6%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques	The QSR team scored 72% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations both teachers and students posed questions that challenged thinking and encouraged academic discourse. In one observation, students role-played inspection officers and immigrants, and the students themselves challenged each other to come up with better questions. Afterward, students initiated a discussion about why the experience was so difficult for the immigrant, asking each other how they felt during the exercise.	Distinguished	29%
	In the proficient observations teachers posed open-ended questions, used effective wait time, and invited students to talk to one another. For example, in one observation, a student commented to another, "But you have to be careful because if you have, for example, 6 there, you would have a completely different step." The students continued their conversation about the procedures without teacher prompting.	Proficient	43%
	The QSR team scored 21% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers questions ranged from those that required students to provide detailed explanations to those with a single correct answer. In one observation, students had the opportunity to collaborate to solve a problem, and some student talk resulted, but it was mostly facilitated by the teacher. In these observations questions often followed a single path of inquiry. Although many students participated, teachers did not attempt to create discussions between students.	Basic	21%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	7%
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team scored 81% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations, virtually all students engaged in the lessons, which required high-level student thinking and explanation of their thinking. Students attempted and then analyzed various methods for approaching a task, discussed complex text at high levels, translated challenging Latin paragraphs, and curated advertisements as part of a persuasive project.	Distinguished	25%
	In the proficient observations most students engaged in grade-level appropriate content. Teachers provided relevant materials and paced the lessons to support students' learning needs. For example, students solved math problems in small groups; discussed the historical context of a classic text; deciphered the connection between square roots, whole numbers, and exponents; and edited personal narrative drafts.	Proficient	56%
	The QSR team scored 13% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, only some students intellectually engaged in the lesson. In these observations learning tasks were a mix of those requiring thinking and those allowing students to be passive. In one observation, the teacher spent 17 minutes explaining the importance of taking careful notes. Following this, most students engaged in collaboratively solving a given problem using a provided formula.	Basic	13%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	6%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team scored 82% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations teachers constantly took the pulse of the class and monitored learning in an ongoing and sophisticated manner. In one observation, during independent work time, a teacher looked at each student's work and sat down next to two students to offer specific feedback and support. "Ok, take a look at your last column," they said to one student, "We need to make that more specific." The teacher gave the student strategies to try, then circled back later to check their progress. In some observations, students initiated their own improvements by asking relevant questions, both to the teacher and to their peers. High-quality feedback came from several sources, including teachers, peers, and assessments.	Distinguished	19%
	In the proficient observations, teachers made the standards of high-quality work clear. At times students self-assessed; one teacher provided students with pointers about how to "be your own first editor" while editing their rough drafts. In these observations, feedback included timely guidance. For example, one teacher reviewed a student's work and said, "Give me a fully described moment in the story so I can see where it's going and how it sounds so I can put that in context."	Proficient	63%
	The QSR team scored 13% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers monitored understanding for the class as a whole, asking questions during instruction. When students volunteered answers, teachers provided brief general feedback, such as, "Ok, nice." Teachers in these observations did not invite students to engage in self- or peer-assessment.	Basic	13%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	6%

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

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

APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC

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

Appendix III: Domain Averages by Component

Percent of:	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	6%	6%
Basic	6%	6%	11%	11%	6%	21%	13%	13%
Proficient	61%	88%	78%	50%	78%	43%	56%	63%
Distinguished	33%	6%	11%	39%	17%	29%	25%	19%
Subdomain Average	3.28	3.00	3.00	3.28	3.11	2.93	3.00	2.94

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	92%	83%
Domain Averages	3.14	2.99