



April 7, 2017

Donald Hense, Board Chair
Friendship Public Charter School – Collegiate Academy
4095 Minnesota Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20019

Dear Mr. Hense:

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 2016-17 school year for the following reasons:

- School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year
- School designated Focus by Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE)

Qualitative Site Review Report

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Friendship Public Charter School – Collegiate Academy between February 6 and February 17, 2017. Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report focuses 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 Friendship Public Charter School – Collegiate Academy.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: School Leader

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: April 7, 2017

Campus Information

Campus Name: Friendship Public Charter School – Collegiate

Ward: 7

Grade levels: 9 through 12

Qualitative Site Review Information

Reason for visit:

- School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year
- School designated Focus by Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) for its special education subgroup in reading

Two-week window: February 6 through February 17, 2017

QSR team members: Three DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) staff including one English Language Learner Specialist, and four consultants including one special education specialist

Number of observations: 41

Total enrollment: 747

Students with Disabilities enrollment: 117

English Language Learners enrollment: 3

In-seat attendance on the days the QSR team conducted observations:

Visit 1: February 6, 2017 – 94.1%

Visit 2: February 7, 2017 – 91.7%

Visit 3: February 8, 2017 – 92.8%

Visit 4: February 9, 2017 – 90.9%

Visit 5: February 10, 2017 – 90.4%

Visit 6: February 13, 2017 – 91.2%

Summary

The mission of Friendship Public Charter School is to provide a world-class education that motivates students to achieve high academic standards, enjoy learning, and develop as ethical, literate, well-rounded, and self-sufficient citizens who contribute actively to their communities. The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team observed evidence that Friendship Public Charter School – Collegiate Academy (Friendship PCS – Collegiate) provided a “world-class education that motivates students to achieve high academic standards,” with 64% of observations rated as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain.

After 9th grade, the school is divided into four academies including the Fine Arts Academy, Early College Academy, Academy of Health Science, and Academy of Information Technology and Engineering.

Tracking down teachers was challenging at times, as the teachers’ schedule provided by the school was often inconsistent with the teacher’s actual schedule.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environments and instructional delivery (see Appendix I). The QSR team scored 68% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest rated component in the Classroom Environment domain was *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport*, with 71% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished. Students and teachers generally demonstrated positive relationships. Students showed respect for the teachers by following directions the first time asked, responding to the teacher's gentle redirection, and apologizing for off-task behavior. The QSR team scored 64% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The highest rated component in the Instruction domain was *Using Assessment in Instruction*, with 73% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished. Teachers circulated to look at individual student work, asked students to come to the board to do math problems, and used exit tickets to assess student understanding. The lowest rated components in the Instruction domain were Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques and Engaging Students in learning, each with 56% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished. In many observations, questioning led students on a single path of inquiry with limited opportunities for students to speak directly with each other as teachers dominated discussion. Engagement was weak in many observations as students socialized or kept their heads on their desks as other students presented.

In-School Suspension Room

There were six students present in the in-school suspension room. The QSR team observed students completing class work and heard the adult monitoring the students encourage them not to return to in-school suspension.

Governance

DC PCSB reviewed Friendship PCS' October board meeting minutes. A quorum was present. The Finance Committee approved the LEA's clean audit and discussed the net income and enrollment trends. The School Performance Committee reviewed academic data from each campus. The Board discussed the LEA's upcoming charter review.

Friendship PCS informed DC PCSB that they were only having an executive session when a staff member tried to observe the December 2016 meeting.

A DC PCSB staff member observed part of the Friendship Public Charter School Board of Trustees meeting on March 30, 2017 after the executive session portion. A quorum was present. During the meeting the Board discussed a Finance Committee report in which the Head of the Finance Committee proposed a new investment policy. The Board agreed to vote on at the next Board of Trustees meeting. The Board then discussed its focus on college success as context for its School Performance Report. The Board reviewed NWEA MAP academic results and discussed best practices from two campuses that had particularly strong results.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Waiver Focus School Intervention and Support Plan

Friendship PCS – Collegiate was first identified by the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) as a Focus school in fall of 2014 based on the performance of their students with disabilities on the reading portion of the state assessment in school year

2012-13. OSSE was delayed one year in its identification of the school as a Focus school and DC PCSB began monitoring the school in school year 2014-15. While the ESEA Waiver expired on August 1, 2016, Focus and Priority schools are still required to implement Intervention and Support Plans as the state transitions to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) during school year 2016-17. OSSE granted certain flexibilities, including flexibility from intervention and support plan monitoring, to Focus and Priority Schools that met specific performance thresholds based on 2016 PARCC results.¹ Friendship PCS – Collegiate did not meet these minimum performance thresholds² thus DC PCSB is required to continue monitoring the school’s implementation of its intervention and support plan during school year 2016-17. Prior to the two-week window the school submitted responses to an ESEA Questionnaire focusing on instructional improvement strategies to support special education students in English Language Arts.

- The school wrote that it uses collaborative planning and that students receive accommodations and modifications in accordance with their Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) as needed. These accommodations and modifications may include visual aids, graphic organizers, word lists, and process charts. As described below in the *Specialized Instruction* section, the QSR team saw the use of process charts, and on-on-one assistance.
- The school wrote that it provides additional reading support to students performing below grade level through reading labs. The QSR team observed two reading lab classes.
 - In one observation the teacher assessed students’ comprehension skills through individual comprehension questions after a short video clip. The teacher provided students with sentence starters where necessary to help students respond. Students also responded to short writing prompts individually about how mosquitos transmit disease before moving on to small group instruction (guided reading) or individual work with the intervention software. Teachers assessed each student’s learning by asking comprehension questions throughout the lesson.

¹ Flexibilities will be granted for eligible schools in which:

- ✓ At least 25 percent of students in the school performed at level 3 or above (for Focus schools this includes only students in the identified subgroup and subject area); and
- ✓ At least 5 percent of students in the school performed at level 4 or above (for Focus schools this includes only students in the identified subgroup and subject area).
- ✓ At least 67 percent of all students met the four-year graduation rate, as required by ESSA (high schools only).

Letter from OSSE to Friendship Public Charter School, September 6, 2016

² Friendship PCS – Collegiate special education students’ results on the 2015-16 PARCC assessment in English Language Arts were as follows for PARCC levels 3 through 5:

- Level 3: 3%
- Level 4: 0%
- Level 5: 0%

- In another observation students completed a Do Now as a class and discussed a reading from the day before to activate background knowledge. The teacher split students into small groups, one working with the teacher to read a text and answer questions, one group reading independently, and another using intervention software on computers.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, Friendship PCS - Collegiate provided answers to specific questions posed by DC PCSB regarding the provision of instruction to students with disabilities in the Special Education Questionnaire. The reviewers saw evidence of the described methods of supporting students with disabilities within, and outside of the general education environment. Overall the school program effectively implemented the components of gauging student understanding, collaborative planning, and lesson differentiation as described.

- The school wrote that exit slips and Do Nows are used to gauge student understanding. The special education specialist observed a Do Now where students responded to a writing prompt as a teacher walked around to check their work. The QSR team saw the consistent use of exit slips, and in one observation, the teacher used information from the previous day's exit tickets to review misunderstood concepts at the beginning of class.
- The school wrote that special and general educators plan together every week. In co-taught classrooms, co-teachers actively led different parts of the lesson. Responsibility and ownership over instruction appeared equitable and consistent between both educators in most classrooms. In two of five classrooms with more than one teacher, the one-teach one-assist model was the primary mode of instruction, and the other teacher monitored the work of individual students or small groups of students.
- The school said that differentiating a lesson in inclusive classrooms can include:
 - Support materials such as word lists, graphic organizers, calculators, process charts, scaffolding, visual aids, one-on-one assistance, peer-to-peer tutoring, and read-aloud: The special education specialist noted the use of calculators, process charts and one-on-one assistance.
 - Guided reading instruction: The special education specialist did not see guided reading instruction in either of the two English Language Arts classes observed.
 - Students working on a variety of activities/projects within classes: The special education specialist noted students working on the computer and independently at desks with one-on-one assistance.

Instruction for English Language Learners

Prior to the two-week QSR window, Friendship PCS - Collegiate completed DC PCSB's English Language Learners (ELL) Questionnaire. The questionnaire captures critical aspects of the school's ELL program. During the QSR window an ELL specialist looked for evidence of fidelity to the school's self-reported ELL program. Because the ELL specialist

only observed one of the school's three ELL students,³ the ELL specialist was not able to conclude whether the school is implementing the program with fidelity. The ELL Questionnaire stated that, "ELL students receive both pull-out and push-in services based on their individual proficiency levels and needs." However the school later informed the QSR team that students only receive push-in services.

- According to the ELL Questionnaire, the school uses both pull-out and push-in ELL instruction, differentiating depending on student proficiency levels and need. The QSR team observed a push-in observation, where an ELL teacher was working with a student to complete a reading comprehension and writing task. The teacher supported the student by mapping out a plan to accomplish the task, reading content aloud, and clarifying vocabulary.
- The school said DC PCSB would see general education teachers using flexible grouping and cross-content application of concepts to build content knowledge. The QSR team observed students working in small groups, whole groups, and individually in the general education setting. The QSR team also saw cross-content instruction delivered through in-class writing assignments covering a variety of topics, including literature, science, and public policy.
- The school reported that ELL teachers would check for understanding by asking strategic questions and monitoring work. The QSR team observed these strategies in the push-in setting. Specifically, the ELL specialist observed the ELL teacher ask questions periodically about the content of an article being read aloud and double-checked a student's written responses.
- Finally, in the ELL Questionnaire the school reported that ELLs would have access to technology such as Chromebook and Promethean boards to support learning through listening activities and speech-to-text programs. The ELL specialist observed students using Chrome Books and Promethean boards in the general education setting but did not observe students participating in listening activities or using speech-to-text programs.

³ The ELL Coordinator for Friendship PCS services ELL students at Friendship PCS – Collegiate one day per week, and was absent for one of the days scheduled for Friendship PCS – Collegiate during the two-week window. The school rearranged her schedule to be present during a day when DC PCSB's ELL observer was present, thus the ELL visit was announced. During the ELL session, Friendship PCS's ELL coordinator worked with one student and it was unclear where the other ELL students were.

CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

This table summarizes qualitative evidence related to the goals and academic achievement expectations as detailed in the school’s charter and subsequent charter amendments. Some charter goals can only be measured quantitatively. The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team recorded evidence of what the school is doing on the ground to meet these quantitative goals. During the 5-year charter review, 10-year charter review, or 15-year charter renewal process, DC PCSB staff will use quantitative data to assess whether the school met those goals.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>Mission:</p> <p>The mission of Friendship Public Charter School is to provide a world-class education that motivates students to achieve high academic standards, enjoy learning, and develop as ethical, literate, well-rounded, and self-sufficient citizens who contribute actively to their communities.</p>	<p>There is some evidence that Friendship PCS – Collegiate is meeting its mission. As described in further detail in this report, the QSR team rated 64% of observations as proficient or distinguished in the Instruction domain. In some observations students were highly engaged with the learning tasks as teachers presented content clearly and asked questions designed to promote student thinking. At times classroom management prevented the effective delivery of instruction, as when students ignored the teachers’ directions, socialized, listened to music, and kept their heads on their desks despite the teacher’s protests. In some observations students used profanity with no consequence from the teacher. Most students demonstrated respect for their peers and their teachers, as detailed further in the Respect and Rapport element in which the QSR team rated 71% of observations as proficient or distinguished.</p> <p>The QSR team saw some evidence of the school developing students as well-rounded and self-sufficient citizens who contribute actively to their communities. Posters in hallways for Speak your Soul, Open Mike Night, Culture Team, and Meet the Black Greeks advertised extra-curricular activities.</p>
<p>Goals:</p>	
<p>PMF Indicator #1: Student Progress – Academic improvement over time</p>	<p>The QSR team saw evidence that the school is supporting students in progressing and</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p><i>Effective instruction supporting student academic progress in reading</i></p> <p>PMF Indicator #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards <i>Moving students to proficient and advanced levels in reading</i></p>	<p>achieving proficiency and advanced levels in reading. Students had multiple opportunities to apply reading skills to writing activities, participating in the Knights Right to Write initiative where all classes across the school responded to a writing prompt using a common rubric, correcting and re-writing essays, rewriting scenes from Othello in modern times, and writing essays in Social Studies using the Main idea, Evidence, Analyze, Link (MEAL) framework.</p> <p>In reading intervention classes teachers used small groups to target instruction while other groups of students read independently or worked on a reading intervention program on the computer. In another English class, students analyzed and evaluated online sources for accuracy and relevancy, though some students were not engaged when the teacher was not working directly with them. Many classrooms beyond English Language Arts had reading nooks with reading materials for students. In a Social Studies class, the teacher asked students to read short chunks of text from Wilson’s Fourteen Points speech and worked with students to paraphrase.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator #1: Student Progress – Academic improvement over time <i>Effective instruction supporting student academic progress in math</i></p> <p>PMF Indicator #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards <i>Moving students to proficient and advanced levels in math</i></p>	<p>The QSR team saw some evidence that the school is supporting students in progressing and achieving proficiency and advanced levels in math. Students practiced identifying side and angle measurements in a geometry class and had the opportunity to self-assess by looking at “model” work on the board and comparing it to their own. Students also worked on triangle measurements in a pre- calculus class where the teacher effectively used visuals to walk students through measurements, and another geometry class where students practiced finding the area.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>In one math observation with two different groups of students, the rigor and teacher-student relationships varied greatly. Students worked on solutions to polynomial equations over a set of complex numbers. With one group, the teacher modeled how to solve a math problem as students worked, students participated in the explanation of content by explaining the answer, and participation of all students was high, with students staying after the bell to finish problems. The next group of students was disrespectful and not engaged with the work. The teacher attempted to solve math problems together with students but few paid attention as the teacher talked over the noise.</p> <p>Classroom management challenges prevented the effective delivery of math instruction in other observations as well. In one math observation there were significant content errors.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator # 3: Gateway – Outcomes aligned to college and career Readiness</p>	<p>The QSR team observed strong evidence of the school promoting a college-going culture. Observers saw celebrations of college acceptances displayed on bulletin boards, advertisements for colleges in hallways and classrooms, and posters displaying deadlines for applications for scholarships and ACT/SAT test dates. The school displayed several pictures of students in graduation regalia. The corner of one classroom included the “College of the Week” with facts about Niagara University, including the application deadline, size of the school, percent of students that graduate within six years, tuition and financial aid information. An alumni board displayed in the hallway included a list of student alumni, the year they graduated, and their university.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator #4: School Environment –</p>	<p>DC PCSB measures attendance to evaluate</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>Predictors of future student progress and achievement</p>	<p>the climate of a school. DC PCSB believes that if students are not in school, they lose opportunities for learning. The school's attendance rates on the days we visited were above 82%, which is the floor of the Performance Management Framework.</p> <p>In-seat attendance on the days the QSR team conducted observations:</p> <p>Visit 1: February 6, 2017 – 94.1%</p> <p>Visit 2: February 7, 2017 – 91.7%</p> <p>Visit 3: February 8, 2017 – 92.8%</p> <p>Visit 4: February 9, 2017 – 90.9%</p> <p>Visit 5: February 10, 2017 – 90.4%</p> <p>Visit 6: February 13, 2017 – 91.2%</p>

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT⁴

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Classroom Environments 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 68% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	<p>The QSR team scored 71% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teacher and student interactions demonstrated respect and encouragement, as when teachers commended students saying, “Excellent!” and “Good job!” In a few distinguished observations, teachers joked with students good-naturedly and connected with students by leaning down to eye-level as students worked.</p>	Distinguished	10%
	<p>In minor cases of disrespect, students apologized for their behavior, corrected behavior with gentle encouragement from the teacher, and one student told another, “Don’t disrespect my favorite teacher.” Student representatives greeted QSR team members in some observations by introducing themselves and explaining what they were working on.</p>	Proficient	61%
	<p>The QSR team scored 27% of the observations as basic in this component. In some observations student interactions with each other and with the teacher were disrespectful. Students cursed or insulted each other with ineffective intervention from the teacher, and occasionally ignored the teachers’ instructions to put phones away, talked back to teachers, and talked over teachers’ instructions.</p>	Basic	27%

⁴ Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	2%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team scored 68% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers demonstrated expectations of high quality work from students, encouraging students to be specific in writing, justify their answers, and answer in complete sentences. Teachers recognized students putting forth good effort, saying, "I see some of you highlighting. I think we're on the right track," and "I see Student X writing with focus and looking at an outside source. That's what I like to see!" Teachers thanked students for their effort, saying things like "I appreciate your grind!"	Distinguished	5%
	Teachers ensured that all students were working by circulating the room and giving a gentle nudge by calling on students to share their work, whispering to students to get back on task, and asking students to sit up to pay attention. Students demonstrated enthusiasm for content, proudly sharing their answers with the class and continuing to work on a problem after the bell at the end of class.	Proficient	63%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as basic in this component. Students' apparent commitment to learning was inconsistent in some observations, as when teachers had to repeatedly remind students what they were supposed to be doing, students ignored the teacher's directions to take headphones off during instruction, and students played with their phones for the entire class period (with no connection to academic content). In some observations only a handful of students completed academic work while the rest of the class socialized or kept their heads down on their desks.</p>	Basic	29%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	2%
Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>The QSR team scored 70% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers had established routines for handing in work, with different bins assigned to different class periods, and students knew where to get missing worksheets without interrupting the teacher. Teachers had hand-outs and movie clips prepared ahead of time to minimize the loss of instructional time as they switched activities, and used agendas and timers to stay on schedule.</p> <p>In several observations teachers notified students about remaining time to complete learning tasks. A couple of observers noted posters in classrooms telling students what they should be doing for the "First Five" minutes and "Last Five" minutes of class. Teachers also performed classroom routines, like taking attendance, while students worked.</p>	Distinguished	2%
		Proficient	68%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 27% of the observations as basic in this component. Classroom routines functioned unevenly in some observations. Teachers repeated directions multiple times about passing in assignments and students shouted out answers and interrupted the teacher to say they did not have materials or supplies. In some observations students sat and did nothing (for over ten minutes) after they had finished their learning task.</p>	Basic	27%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	2%
Managing Student Behavior	<p>The QSR team scored 63% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In most observations students followed directions the first time asked. Teachers redirected behavior effectively by whispering to students to get back on task and reminding students about the rules. Teachers monitored behavior by circulating the room and by involving all students in the discussion.</p>	Distinguished	7%
		Proficient	56%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 32% of the observations as basic in this component. In some observations teachers ignored students who were off-task and focused on the students who were paying attention. Off-task students kept headphones in, had their heads on their desks, socialized, or watched silently without taking notes (despite the teachers' directions). Teachers' attempts to focus students on academic work were not consistently effective, resulting in some students who continued off-task behavior (socializing, listening to music, heads on their desks), and some students who were on-task. In some observations there was no apparent consequence for ignoring the teacher's directions or using profanity.</p>	Basic	32%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	5%

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 64% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Instruction domain.

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
<p>Communicating with Students</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 71% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Most teachers posted objectives on the board and referred to them throughout the lesson. Objectives were clear and teachers asked students to participate in presentations of content. Teachers asked students to explain their answers to classmates, scaffolded instruction when students struggled to get the right answer, and asked students to write their answers with work on the board so other students could check their own work.</p>	Distinguished	10%
	<p>Teachers generally aligned learning activities to the instructional purpose. In one observation students watched a movie clip and discussed character foils before moving on to foils in Antigone. In a distinguished observation, the teacher explained content clearly, using rich, subject-specific vocabulary. In some observations teachers modeled the learning process, as in one where the teacher walked the class through designing a city before having students do so on their own.</p>	Proficient	61%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 24% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers referred to the learning objective in passing, without explanations for how the activities or agenda items aligned to those objectives. In one observation a teacher gave directions to the class about a group project but students were confused and the teacher had to walk around and explain directions again to each individual small group. In another observation students and the teacher were confused about whether the students had notes to complete a task.</p>	Basic	24%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	5%
<p>Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 56% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Questioning in some observations connected to students' lives and interests, as in an observation where students responded to a prompt about the purpose of high school and in another where the class compared a book character to a Marvel Comics character.</p>	Distinguished	2%
	<p>Teachers made effective use of wait time as they asked questions to guide students to the correct answers or to the next step in a process. Teachers asked questions with multiple correct answers designed to promote student thinking and prodded students to think more deeply, saying things like "What else?" and "Go deeper." In two observations students invited questions from their classmates about credible sources of information and the concept of materialism without prompting from the teacher.</p>	Proficient	54%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 41% of the observations as basic in this component. Some questions were designed to promote student thinking, but most questioning required only recall of facts with one correct answer.</p> <p>In these observations students had limited opportunities to speak directly with each other or share their own ideas as teachers dominated discussion. In other observations few students were involved in the discussion as other students socialized or put their heads on their desks.</p>	Basic	41%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	2%
Engaging Students in Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 56% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In many observations all students were intellectually engaged in the learning task. Students explored words from Othello through a vocabulary game, filled out valence electrons on a worksheet in pairs or independently, and acted out scenes from a play. Teachers supported engagement by giving students tools to participate in discussions, like sentence starters and word banks, and by connecting Do Nows to student lives, like</p>	Distinguished	5%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>asking students to describe the advantages and disadvantages of living in Washington, DC.</p> <p>Teachers used a mix of different types of groupings, as in a couple of observations where the teacher started with whole group instruction, and then split the class up into small groups for direct instruction, independent reading, and working on a reading intervention program on the computer. Students enthusiastically participated in classroom discussion. In many of these observations, students needed no reminders to stay on task.</p>	Proficient	51%
	<p>The QSR team scored 41% of the observations as basic in this component. Engagement was weak in some observations, as students had their heads on their desks, kept headphones in, socialized, or watched silently without taking notes (despite the teachers' directions) as fellow classmates presented. Pacing was too rushed or too slow in some observations, as when students had three minutes to write a summary but most students did not finish, and in another when over 15 minutes remained at the end of class and students had nothing to do.</p>	Basic	41%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	2%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Using Assessment in Instruction	<p>The QSR team scored 73% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers elicited evidence of student understanding. Observers saw teachers ask each student a comprehension question, walk around and ask students to explain answers, look at individual student work and provide specific feedback where needed, and administer exit tickets.</p>	Distinguished	2%
	<p>Teachers addressed student misunderstanding by asking additional questions to lead students to correct answers, and adjusted instruction based on exit tickets from the day before. Teachers invited students to assess their own work by comparing it to a rubric and by looking at "model" work on the board.</p>	Proficient	71%
	<p>The QSR team scored 24% of the observations as basic in this component. While teachers assessed student learning in some observations, they made no attempt to engage students in self or peer assessment. Teachers checked on progress of some students as they worked independently by circulating throughout the class or by asking for global indications of understanding, but ignored students that had their heads on their desks.</p> <p>In a few observations teachers did not assess student understanding, as in one where an exit ticket may have been planned (as indicated by the agenda on the board) but the class never got to it, and in another where the teacher wrote answers to math problems on the board for the entire class without asking questions or checking student work.</p>	Basic	24%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	2%

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 many of the high-level questions and assume responsibility for the participation of all students in the discussion.
Engaging Students in Learning	Students are not at all intellectually engaged in significant learning, as a result of inappropriate activities or materials, poor representations of content, or lack of lesson structure.	Students are intellectually engaged only partially, resulting from activities or materials or uneven quality, inconsistent representation of content or uneven structure of pacing.	Students are intellectually engaged throughout the lesson, with appropriate activities and materials, instructive representations of content, and suitable structure and pacing of the lesson.	Students are highly engaged throughout the lesson and make material contribution to the representation of content, the activities, and the materials. The structure and pacing of the lesson allow for student reflection and closure.
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.

