Bentley Academy Charter School

Annual Monitoring Site Visit Report
(Report 2 of 2)

May 2016

AIR®
AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

Contents

About the School Monitoring Site Visit Process

The purpose of the Monitoring Site Visit and this report is to provide formative feedback regarding the school's progress in implementing its turnaround plan. The Monitoring Site Visit uses multiple sources of evidence—including interviews, focus groups, instructional staff surveys, documents, and classroom observations—to capture the progress the school has made toward implementing the turnaround plan. The Monitoring Site Visit focuses on the following four key turnaround practice areas and a set of indicators nested within each of these turnaround practice areas.[1]

Key Turnaround Practices
1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration
2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction
3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students
4. School Climate and Culture

A team from American Institutes for Research (AIR), contracted by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, collected evidence during a two-day Monitoring Site Visit and analyzed these data. The Monitoring Site Visit results in two documents: (1) this *Annual Monitoring Site Visit Report*, which is the final report that documents the team's findings, and (2) the *Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report* (SIOR) in Appendix F.[2]

Organization of the Report and Implementation Ratings

This report begins with background information on the school, including a school overview and a summary of district supports. The remainder of the report ("Findings") focuses on implementation of the turnaround practices and corresponding indicators. The Findings section begins with a summary of the holistic implementation ratings for each of the four turnaround practice areas, followed by a section for each practice area that includes ratings for corresponding indicators and selected evidence, including quotes that reflect the majority perspective, to support individual and overall ratings.[3]

The ratings are designed to provide formative feedback to the school, and, when used in tandem with the practice guides from the *Turnaround Practices in Action* document[4] and the *Turnaround Practices and Indicators Continuum* (see Appendix E), the school team will be able to assess areas of strength and areas for improvement to inform next steps.

---

[1] These practices are based on research on Massachusetts schools that have experienced rapid improvements in student outcomes. And the nested indicators are based on research on Massachusetts schools and other studies of school turnaround.

[2] For a summary of current-year SIOR scores, please see Appendix C.

[3] Although there is an implementation rating for each indicator nested within a turnaround practice area, the examples may focus on a particular aspect of the indicator.

[4] For more information see: *Turnaround Practices in Action: A Three-Year Analysis of School and District Practices, Systems, Policies, and Use of Resources Contributing to Successful Turnaround Efforts in Massachusetts' Level 4 Schools* http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/turnaround/practices-report-2014.pdf

Turnaround Practice Area Holistic Ratings and Indicator Implementation Ratings

Data from the Monitoring Site Visit were used to determine a holistic rating (on a 5-point continuum ranging from *limited evidence* to *coherent implementation*) for each of the turnaround practice areas (Table 1). These holistic ratings are derived from ratings for each indicator (on a 4-point continuum ranging from *limited evidence* to *sustaining*) within a turnaround practice area based on the level of implementation (Table 1.1). The process for assigning the ratings is as follows: (1) code data and analyze implementation for each indicator; (2) for relevant indicators, consider ratings from classroom observations and/or results from the instructional staff survey, along with key documents; (3) assign rating on the continuum for each indicator; (4) assign a holistic turnaround practice area rating based on ratings of specific indicators within a given turnaround practice area.

Table 1. Turnaround Practice Area Holistic Ratings

	Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining	Coherent Implementation
Turnaround Practices	Indicators for this turnaround practice area show limited or no evidence of implementation of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that all or most of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes related to this area exist on paper or are being tried but are not yet fully developed or implemented.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that related systems are functional, and their structures and processes are implemented consistently throughout the school; however, either communication or systemic decision making is limited.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that the organizational practices, structures, and processes are functioning effectively, and timely feedback systems are embedded to identify potential problems and challenges.	The organizational practices across all indicators within a turnaround practice are at the sustaining level and are working together to support one another in a way that is meaningful for staff and students.

Table 1.1. Indicator Implementation Ratings

	Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining
Indicators	Necessary organizational practices, structures, and/or processes are nonexistent, evidence is limited, or practices are so infrequent that their impact is negligible.	Organizational practices, structures, and/or processes exist on paper or are being tried but are not yet fully developed or implemented consistently.	Systems are functional, and their structures and processes have been implemented consistently throughout the school; however, either communication between systems may be lacking or systems do not contribute to systemic decision making.	Systems, practices, structures, and processes are functioning effectively, and timely feedback systems are embedded to identify potential problems and challenges. Feedback systems include progress checks to inform timely course corrections. The practice is embedded into the school culture.

Background

The following provides important context for the Findings presented in the next section. The School Overview section briefly describes the characteristics of the school, along with the school's current turnaround priorities. The District Support section briefly describes staff perceptions about how the district currently supports the school, particularly with regard to the school's turnaround priorities.

School Overview

Bentley Elementary is a Horace Mann charter school located in Salem, Massachusetts. The school was designated Level 4 in 2011. The current principal is in his second year at the school. Last year, the school operated only Grades 3–5, while primary grades operated as a separate school in the same building under a different administrator. The current, 2015–16, school year saw the transition to the in-district charter status as well as the unification of Grades K–5 as a single school under the leadership of the same principal who led Grades 3–5 in 2014–15. Bentley operates in close partnership with, and receives support from, Blueprint Schools Network.

In 2015–16, the school serves 254 students in Grades K–5.[5] Approximately 19 percent of all students in all grades have identified disabilities, and 13 percent of all students are English language learners (ELLs). See Appendix A for an overview of the school's performance from 2012 through 2015.

According to the School Redesign Grant application from the fall of 2014 and confirmed in interviews during the 2015–16 site visit, the turnaround priorities for the current school year are based on the operating principles of the Blueprint Schools Network, including:

- Demonstrate excellence in leadership and instruction.
- Increase instructional time.
- Maintain a culture of high expectations.
- Use data to improve instruction.
- Utilize daily tutoring.

According to participants, improving instructional rigor and data use have been the priorities that have received the most attention in the past year. A challenge the school has experienced in the past year has been trying to create a unified, cohesive culture among staff who have only worked together since September 2015.

District Support

Since the transition to an in-district Horace Mann charter school, Bentley's relationship to the Salem Public Schools has notably changed. Direct oversight and governance is handled by the school's independent board of directors. Blueprint Schools provides coaching and instructional guidance for the principal. A local community organization, 1647, works with staff on conducting family and community outreach. The school's closest relationship is with Blueprint, which provides math fellows who tutor

---

[5] Based on 2015–16 data available on the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education website.

some students, coaching support for the principal, and regular school site visits, to gather data and provide feedback to school leaders.

The Salem school district does provide transportation, human resources, support for special education, and budget guidance and funding, although the school enjoys significant budget autonomy. Scheduling, curriculum, assessment, and ultimate staffing decisions are made at the school level. Several Bentley staff members are part of districtwide professional learning communities. For example, the school's counselor attends training and regular meetings with other counselors in the district, the principal is part of a school leaders' community, and the school's deans participate in the assistant principals' community.

Findings

Holistic Ratings for Turnaround Practice Areas

The holistic ratings for each turnaround practice area for Bentley Elementary School are included in Table 2. These ratings take into account the implementation-level ratings for each of the indicators within a given turnaround practice area. More details about the findings for turnaround practice areas and indicators follow. For a summary of all current-year ratings, see Appendix D.

Table 2. Holistic Rating for Each Turnaround Practice Area

Turnaround Practice	Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining	Coherent Implementation
1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration			•		
2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction			•		
3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students			•		
4. School Climate and Culture			•		

Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration

Table 3. Turnaround Practice 1 Implementation Ratings, 2015–16

Turnaround Practice and Indicators		Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining	Coherent Implementation
1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration				•		
1.1	Use of Autonomy				X	
1.2	High Expectations and Positive Regard		X			
1.3	Vision/Theory of Action and Buy-In				X	
1.4	Monitoring Implementation and School Progress				X	
1.5	Trusting Relationships (formerly 4.5)			X		
1.6	Time Use for Professional Development and Collaboration				X	
1.7	Communication With Staff			X		
1.8	Sustainability				X	

Bentley Elementary School received a holistic rating of *providing* for Turnaround Practice 1 (Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration). Data collected during the Monitoring Site Visit suggest that school leaders are actively using autonomy to implement the school's turnaround priorities and have a defined vision. Bentley does allow adequate time throughout the week for professional development and collaboration across grade-level teams. However, the findings also suggest some room for improvement, particularly in terms of structures for communication between classroom teachers and specialists. And, although Bentley leaders have fostered a positive culture at Bentley, there are still some issues related to trust among some staff and mechanisms for fostering high expectations and positive regard between administrators and staff.

The paragraphs below include specific examples that provide context for the overall turnaround practice rating and support the individual indicator ratings provided in Table 3. These ratings are a result of coding and triangulation of the evidence collected during the Monitoring Site Visit, including interview/focus group, instructional staff survey,[6] and classroom observation data. The examples and quotes used throughout are intended to illustrate these ratings, and reflect the majority perspective, but in no way capture all of the information collected.[7]

---

[6] Survey data from items with a response rate of 50 percent or more were used to inform the final Monitoring Site Visit ratings.

[7] Please refer to Appendix E, Turnaround Practices and Indicators Continuum for Bentley Elementary School, to identify areas in which the school could enhance its efforts.

1.1 Use of Autonomy (Sustaining)

Consistent with the *sustaining* rating for this indicator, school leaders maintain complete autonomy over staffing, scheduling, professional development, curriculum, and the school's budget. Reports from interviews and focus groups indicate school leaders are actively using these autonomies to implement their turnaround plan. For example, one school leader reported autonomy over staffing *"is helpful in terms of finding the folks [in hiring] who are in line with our mission and vision."*

School leaders also are using their flexibility under the charter to improve the quality of teaching and learning at Bentley. Autonomy over scheduling allowed school leaders to extend both the school day and school year [see Indicator 4.3 Expanded Learning]. According to one school leader, autonomy over scheduling led to *"extra time with teachers over the summer,"* which helped to *"really onboard new staff."* In addition, scheduling autonomy allowed school leaders to schedule a half-day each month, starting in January, to allow for additional professional development. Although Bentley does use the Salem School District's science curriculum, one school leader reported, *"Most of the professional development and curriculum is generated, created, or provided by the school itself."* Not only do school leaders have autonomy over the curriculum at Bentley but, according to one school leader, this autonomy is then conferred to the teachers, with school leaders allowing *"teachers to choose the concept that they want to teach"* based upon state standards.

Multiple interview participants reported the school's independent school board has complete autonomy over Bentley's finances. Specifically, this financial autonomy allows school leaders to make *"choices in terms of providing supplies in school for our students,"* as well as to provide a stipend for teachers teaching Saturday school.

1.2 High Expectations and Positive Regard (Developing)

School leaders at Bentley value high expectations and positive regard and have implemented strategies to ensure these elements are in place. However, reports from interviews, focus groups, and the instructional staff survey indicate that, on average, instructional staff have mixed opinions about whether school leadership makes high expectations and positive regard a priority.

School leaders conduct weekly formal and informal classroom observations and provide regular feedback as a strategy to ensure high expectations are communicated to staff. School leaders at Bentley also have implemented the Family Engagement Leadership Team (FELT), in which, according to respondents, teachers participate on a volunteer basis to *"create a positive place for our students and their families."* Although there are some strategies in place, one participant did report that *"there's been some ebbs and flows with how folks are feeling, as far as morale goes."*

Staff members at Bentley had mixed reports as to whether the school leadership makes high expectations and positive regard a priority. One staff member reported, *"There's a degree of lack of trust between teachers and administrators."* Staff members attributed this lack of trust to high teacher turnaround rate, which one staff member reported *"kills morale."* Furthermore, another staff member reported, *"When there are a lot of initiatives rolled out all at the same time, there seems to be a lot of stress and responsibility placed on the shoulders of teachers,"* which has led to *"high tension between teachers and administrators."*

Reports from interviews and focus groups indicate that staff maintain positive regard for other staff members. One staff member described relationships among staff as *"respectful"* and reported, *"The students have a really great sense of the core values."* Consistent with these reports, responses on the instructional staff survey indicate that, on average, instructional staff agree that high expectations and positive regard for students are a priority for the majority of staff.

1.3 Vision/Theory of Action and Buy-In (Sustaining)

School leaders at Bentley have a defined vision that has been communicated to most staff members. School leaders and many staff commonly described Bentley's priorities as: rigorous curriculum, data-driven instruction, excellence in leadership, family and community engagement, and a culture of high achievement. In addition, Bentley has a schoolwide goal of *"80 percent proficiency or 20 percent growth"* on the power standards from the Common Core–aligned Massachusetts Frameworks [see Indicator 2.1 Instructional Expectations]. Most staff members understand the theory of action driving Bentley's priorities for this year. Many staff members reported the school's priorities were driven by *"growth areas given to the school last year"* from the Massachusetts Monitoring Site Visit report and reports from regular Blueprint site visits. Another staff member reported the school then used these reports to create a *"strategic implementation plan around accountable talk and metacognition"* in classrooms. To monitor progress of the implementation of the school's priorities, school leaders engage in regular classroom observations, weekly professional development with grade-level teams, as well as analysis of academic and behavioral data. Furthermore, one teacher reported that communication of priorities has helped staff members to *"understand what our strengths are"* and *"understand what we need to work on,"* indicating staff members are aware of the next level of work to be done at Bentley.

The majority of staff share a common sense of urgency and take ownership for the success of all students at Bentley. One example of staff taking ownership of the school's progress is all staff members take part in either the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) or FELT. According to one school leader, staff members on the ILT had the opportunity to take part in *"creating the strategic implementation plan that's directly related to the whole-school priorities."* Staff members also have autonomy to set SMART goals within their classrooms which, *"allows them to feel invested in what they're doing."*

School leaders and staff members reported a high level of buy-in by the teachers at Bentley. One school leader reported, *"Across the board, our educators are really on that vision and mission with us,"* and a staff member reported, *"Teachers seem very bought-in."* Reports from the instructional staff survey indicate that, on average, instructional staff agree that the majority of staff have a sense of shared responsibility for student success.

1.4 Monitoring Implementation and School Progress (Sustaining)

School leaders at Bentley are actively engaged in monitoring turnaround efforts and use this information to prioritize initiatives and strategies at the school. The school leadership team meets formally every Monday and Friday. School leaders described the Monday meetings as focused on *"academic information, data, or we're talking through some operational pieces."* One interview participant reported school leaders at Bentley regularly look at *"classroom observation data and assessment data, student demographics and attendance"* to monitor in the implementation of schoolwide goals, including rigorous curriculum, data-driven instruction, and a culture of high achievement. Friday meetings are used for consultancies, which were described by one school leader as meetings where *"one of the members of the leadership team brings in a problem of practice,"* and the rest of the team uses the *"consultancy*

protocol" from Reform for Schools to provide advice and feedback. School leaders then meet informally *"every morning and most afternoons"* to discuss strategies for dealing with day-to-day issues at the school.

School leaders conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs using a defined *"walkthrough rubric"* that helps to monitor whether teachers are working toward the goals that leadership team members set at the beginning of the school year. After the observation has concluded, schools leaders provide written feedback, via *"a common template,"* and verbal feedback, in which one staff member reported, *"We go over the observation and we tie it into our overarching goals."*

To monitor excellence in leadership and family and community engagement, all staff members take part in either the climate team or ILT. The implementation of the ILT also provides evidence to suggest school leaders regularly communicate to the staff and also seek input from staff members. The ILT meets once per month with school leaders to discuss any progress or challenges teachers are facing. In addition, school leaders lead weekly professional development with certain grade-level teams, during which they discuss items such as student work and lesson plans.

1.5 Trusting Relationships (Providing)

Most staff members share trusting relationships with other staff members. In addition, evidence from interviews and focus groups suggest staff members engage in frequent collaboration. One staff member reported having weekly meetings with the staff member's teacher leader and leadership coach, during which they can "*bounce ideas off of each other."* An instructional staff member reported the instructional coaches *"are very public and open about data, we always have been and I think that that also builds trust."* Teacher leaders also are supported by an outside coach from T3, who meets with them individually and on a weekly basis.

There is evidence that Bentley staff collaborate to develop standards-based units, examine student work, and analyze student performance. Staff members work together to plan appropriate interventions for students, with one school leader explaining the decisions surrounding interventions occur through collaborations between school leaders and the classroom teachers. School leaders and staff members engage in whole-school meetings where, one staff member reported, *"conversations take place about what works and what doesn't work. It's a lot of shared best practices."* There are also reports of less formal structures by which staff can share their strengths and struggles, in the spirit of helping each other continually improve their practice. One staff member reported, *"I think that there's a lot of trust, particularly among the teachers, and I think we look to each other as support,"* and another staff member reported the staff member's team is *"always communicating with one another, and asking for help, and not afraid to ask for help, and there's a deep level of trust."* Reports from interviews and focus groups are consistent with instructional staff survey results. Survey responses indicate that on average, instructional staff agree that relationships between all staff are trusting and nonjudgmental. Tensions between some staff and administrators [see Indicator 1.2 High Expectations and Positive Regard] prevented the school from achieving a higher rating for this indicator.

1.6 Time Use for Professional Development and Collaboration (Sustaining)

The schedule at Bentley allows adequate time for professional development and collaborative opportunities for teachers, and there is a process in place for evaluating the schedule. Teachers at Bentley engage in grade-level common planning, review of students in need of support, or professional development two days per week for 60 minutes. On two of the other days of the week, teachers have 60 minutes built into their

schedules for personal planning time, and on the remaining day, teachers have 110 minutes (a 1 hour block and a 50 minute block) for personal planning. Teachers also receive afterschool professional development sessions once per month. In addition, one staff member noted that all teachers at Bentley *"are asked to join either the climate team or the Instructional Leadership Team,"* which meet once per month.

School leaders at Bentley use reports from Blueprint site visits and feedback from the ILT to determine any changes that need to be made to the professional development schedule. One school leader reported, *"We have shifted the way in which we do our weekly meetings with staff. That came from teacher input."* Another example of school leaders revising the schedule was their midyear implementation of the district half-day schedule. After hearing feedback from the ILT, school leaders realized that staff needed more professional development, *"so we brought that back."* ILT members also play a large role in providing professional development to their peers, with one school leader reporting *"a lot of the whole school PD [professional development] comes out of the ILT, which consists of teacher leaders and teachers."* ILT members also work with other staff members during weekly common planning time meetings, during which staff *"work with our teacher leader coach to develop the scope and sequence for the week."* In return, there are opportunities for teachers to observe their peers, with one teacher reporting the teacher *"went and observed the teacher leader"* at the teacher's grade level. There were also reports of teachers engaging in less formal collaboration; one staff member said, *"There are constantly teachers seeking out extra feedback, collaborating with teachers both on their grade team as well as on other grade teams."* Consistent with reports from interviews and focus groups, responses to the instructional staff survey indicate that, on average, instructional staff agree that there is sufficient and adequate time for collaboration and professional development.

1.7 Communication With Staff (Providing)

Consistent with a *providing* rating, there are some formal structures in place for fostering staff input into school decisions. However, there is evidence of some barriers to communication between administrators and staff. Many school leaders and staff members reported the ILT as being an integral structure for facilitating communication between administrators and staff. One staff member reported that ILT serves as *"a bridge between teachers and the head of school."* According to one school leader, school leaders also have sent out at least two staff surveys to staff *"to figure out what are the systems and structures that are working, which ones need to be tweaked or changed."* In addition, school leaders reported regular professional development meetings and e-mail as the informal structures most often used for communication with staff.

There are some barriers to communication at Bentley, specifically in regard to formal structures for communication across grade-level teams. One staff member reported that, aside from one whole-school professional development at the beginning of the year, "*there is no vertical planning"* between teachers at different grade levels. Other staff members reported that the absence of an ELL or special education team member at common planning meetings is a major barrier to communication. However, one school leader did report, *"We had a consultancy where one of the members led us through how we can improve with our organization and communication system,"* indicating school leaders have recently taken steps to improve communication with staff. Responses from the instructional staff survey indicate that, on average, instructional staff have mixed opinions about whether there is a system in place to foster open, two-way communication.

1.8 Sustainability (Sustaining)

School leaders at Bentley have implemented specific strategies for ensuring improvement efforts will be sustained under new leadership, and the majority of staff are able to describe these strategies. Many school leaders and staff members reported distributed leadership as being integral to sustainability. One school leader reported the leadership group had been working hard in "*giving teacher autonomy and leadership opportunities to support the whole-school growth.*" More specifically, to encourage teacher leadership, school leaders asked that teachers participate on either the ILT or the climate team. One staff member reported, *"There's been a significant amount of teacher input as to what we want to see the structure look like for next year."* For example, the school's accountability plan for next year was created in partnership among school leaders, school board members, and teachers at Bentley. The school has created new structures and roles for deans, to be implemented next year. This was done with staff input and also has been done with the intention of creating *"a more sustainable workload for administrators."* This new structure has been well received by staff members, who helped to shape the new structure and will now have an assigned dean to their grade level, leading to more targeted professional development and feedback. In addition, school leaders also listed their multiple partnerships with outside providers as being integral to maintaining Bentley's mission. Responses from the instructional staff survey indicate that, on average, instructional staff agree that there are strategies in place that can and will sustain efforts over time.

Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction

Table 4. Turnaround Practice 2 Implementation Ratings, 2015–16

Turnaround Practice and Indicators		Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining	Coherent Implementation
2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction				•		
2.1	Instructional Expectations			X		
2.2	Instructional Schedule			X		
2.3	Identifying and Addressing Student Academic Needs				X	
2.4	Classroom Observation Data Use				X	
2.5	Student Assessment Data Use (for schoolwide decision making)				X	
2.6	Student Assessment Data Use (for classroom instruction)				X	
2.7	Structures for Instructional Improvement			X		

Bentley Elementary School received a holistic rating of *providing* for Turnaround Practice 2 (Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction). Several structures are in place to support instruction. These structures include twice-a-week common planning times, during which teachers and administrators gather to plan instruction aligned to schoolwide priorities as well as identify students, based on academic performance data, for differentiated instruction during intervention blocks. There also have been regular professional development sessions to guide teachers on implementing and monitoring high expectations for students, focusing on areas such as metacognition, close reading, and specific standards on the Achievement Network (ANet) test, among others. Administrators at the school also conduct regular observations with teachers and provide feedback after observations. After the initial feedback, administrators also follow up with teachers for further support.

The paragraphs below include specific examples that provide context for the overall turnaround practice rating and support the individual indicator ratings provided in Table 4. These ratings are a result of coding and triangulation of the evidence collected during the Monitoring Site Visit, including interview/focus group, instructional staff survey, and classroom observation data. Specifically, aggregate classroom observation ratings were in the middle range for the Instructional Support domain and in the high range for the Classroom Organization domain. In addition, classrooms sometimes do not receive the support during interventions due to staffing issues. These factors contributed to the holistic *providing* rating for Turnaround Practice 2. The examples and quotes used throughout are intended to illustrate these ratings, and reflect the majority perspective, but in no way capture all of the information collected.

2.1 Instructional Expectations (Providing)

All stakeholders in the school communicated high expectations for instruction at Bentley. However, the mixed results on the instructional staff survey as well as from the classroom observations suggest that, although high expectations are communicated, there may be room for improvement in their implementation.

Major academic foci for the school this year include higher-order thinking, such as metacognition, accountable talk, evidence-based response from readings, and allowing students to take ownership of their learning. One schoolwide goal is to have "*80 percent proficiency or 20 percent growth*" on the power standards from the Common Core–aligned Massachusetts Frameworks. The school also has identified stretch goals, such as four levels of growth—compared to the average three levels per year—on the STEP (Strategic Teaching and Evaluation of Progress) test, a literacy assessment for K–3 students.

To monitor the implementation of high expectations throughout the school, administrators perform walkthroughs on a weekly basis to observe the level of instructional rigor in classrooms. Teachers are also expected to have up-to-date objectives in the classrooms as well as visual trackers of student progress. One teacher reports writing goals every six to eight weeks, then "*tracking progress towards the goal, making targeted re-teach and remediation plans, and support plans*" with instructional leaders.

Although there is evidence of high expectations in the school, perhaps not all expectations are fully implemented. Responses on the instructional staff survey indicate that, on average, instructional staff have mixed opinions about whether there is a clear process in place for identifying, monitoring, and implementing instructional expectations. Similarly, classroom observation scores in the middle range for the Instructional Support domain also reveal that teachers sometimes focus the lesson on presentation of discrete pieces of information without connecting to prior concepts or emphasizing the application of knowledge.

2.2 Instructional Schedule (Providing)

The instructional schedule includes large chunks of time for instruction, and teacher input is often considered when making changes to the schedule. However, the level of coordination between teachers and support staff varies across grades.

At Bentley, there are long blocks of instructional time for both English language arts (ELA) and math. Specifically, a teacher reported that the ELA block lasts "*almost two hours*" and the math block lasts "*an hour and a half.*" In addition to general instruction time for these two subjects, Grades 1–5 also have two Whatever-I-Need (WIN) intervention blocks, one block for ELA and one block for math. Teachers spoke highly of the instructional schedule as having "*solid chunks of content time*" and commented that blocked instructional time is "*one of the biggest strengths in terms of the schedule.*"

In general, teachers also said they had been included in the process of making changes to the schedule. One teacher described the schedule modifications at the beginning of the year: "*We were able to sit down as a team and make adjustments to the schedule that we were given and bring it back to admin for them to approve.*" Although most staff are satisfied with the amount of time blocked off for instruction, first-grade and kindergarten teachers sometimes have difficulty coordinating schedules for differentiated learning because they share many of the same support staff. To begin to address this

need, the kindergarten team has "*decided to move their [intervention time] half an hour later,*" after some support staff finish working with first graders. Administrators at the school are aware of this problem and plan to hire separate support staff for each grade starting the next school year. Consistent with these findings, responses from the instructional staff survey indicate that, on average, instructional staff have mixed opinions about whether the instructional schedule meets student needs and is monitored and revised in collaboration with teachers.

2.3 Identifying and Addressing Student Academic Needs (Sustaining)

Several formal collaboration processes are in place at Bentley for teachers to review student data and to address student learning needs. For example, all teachers attend data meetings with administrators after every interim test in each core content area, as well as after STEP assessments. A teacher indicated that these data meetings occur during common planning time "*at least every six* weeks." According to a school administrator, during these meetings, administrators and teachers collaborate to look at STEP data and ANet standards–based data to "*form data action plans.*" In addition, teachers also review interim assessments and classroom data to identify and adjust student grouping for different interventions during WIN block. Because of the collaborative nature of the data meetings, administrators and teachers are both on the same page with next steps to address student needs. Responses from the instructional staff survey corroborate these findings. On the survey, respondents agree that, on average, student needs are identified and addressed in a systematic, collaborative manner.

2.4 Classroom Observation Data Use (Sustaining)

On average, teachers are observed by administrators regularly and attend weekly coaching sessions with their observers, during which they receive specific feedback about their teaching. According to a school leader, the frequency of observations varies across teachers based on "*what they might need,*" although the standard frequency is *"an observation every other week."* Most teacher respondents also agree that observations are at least that often. Often, the feedback is given in face-to-face meetings as well as in written form. Teachers also agree that they receive *"immediate feedback"* after observations and that "*a lot of the feedback has been actionable.*" Teachers meet formally with their observers every week, in-between the biweekly observations, with the first meeting focused on talking about strengths and weaknesses in what was observed and then following up in the second week on how the teacher has implemented changes since the previous week. Teachers also are observed and given feedback when they re-teach material as part of their data action plans.

Notably, the observation and feedback process is very structured at Bentley in an effort to ensure consistency among administrators who conduct observations. The principal has trained the administrative staff in how to perform observations using a standards-based observation template. He also has modeled how to give observation feedback to ensure high-quality and structured coaching sessions for teachers regardless of who their observers are.

Although teachers said that observation feedback is often specific and actionable, both teachers and administrators acknowledge that observations sometimes have an evaluative tone. Some participants said this fact makes risk taking and focusing on improvement a challenge at times. Administrators talk about continuous improvements in the observation structure to address this issue, including changes in observer roles in the next school year, where coach and evaluator roles will be separate. In addition, teacher leaders in every grade have already begun to conduct informal observations and give feedback to teachers, and this process will be formalized next year as part of the observation system at Bentley.

2.5 Student Assessment Data Use (for schoolwide decision making) (Sustaining)

At Bentley, data from assessments are routinely used to make schoolwide decisions. At the school level, administrators hold data meetings with teachers after every ANet assessment, four times each year. According to respondents, staff look at assessment data to "*focus on our power standards*" and determine which areas need the most focus. A school leader describes one instance when data revealed a common student struggle with "*multistep word problems.*" To address this issue, teachers in Grades 2–5 collaborated to set up a "*common tool, [although] the language is a bit different*" to provide students with support for solving multistep word problems. One teacher also recounted a time when a review of STEP data resulted in the decision that struggling students needed smaller intervention groups. She says that struggling students are now able to receive "*more individualized attention*" because "*the groups are much, much smaller.*" According to a school leader, student progress on the STEP and ANet assessments are tracked on an online platform where "*we can see exactly where every kiddo is.*"

In addition, the principal presents schoolwide assessment data to board members on a monthly basis, and, together, they compare the data with data from other schools in the district, in Boston, and in the Blueprint network to identify strengths and weaknesses. The leadership team meets every week to talk about STEP and ANet assessment data. In fact, there is a visual "*STEP data wall*" in an administrator's office, tracking each student's achievement on the STEP test. Teacher leaders also are present at these meetings to participate in making decisions about the school. Then teacher leaders, who lead common planning meetings with teachers "*would go through specific data with grade levels, specific data in terms of actual classroom progress.*" This process supports the external partner's statement about "*[data analysis] going on at all levels*" in the school.

2.6 Student Assessment Data Use (for classroom instruction) (Sustaining)

Teachers at Bentley use a variety of assessment data to plan lessons, set goals for students, and monitor student progress. Schoolwide, teachers and administrators hold data meetings after every ANet and STEP assessment to track progress, plan action steps, and set goals for the next cycle, with each cycle lasting six to eight weeks. For example, one teacher used STEP assessment data to "*organize my class into guided reading groups based on their STEP level.*" This teacher focused on doing "*word work and phonics and sight words*" to provide individualized help for students who struggled on the previous STEP test. Another teacher discussed having developed a math goal related to "*deeper conceptual understanding*" and how student progress would be monitored by comparing the baseline assessment to "*quizzes throughout to see their progress.*" In addition to weekly math quizzes, teachers also administer a wide variety of other classroom assessments, such as "*spelling quizzes,*" "*big social studies, science assessments,*" or writing assessments to "*check for comprehension and use of text evidence.*" Some teachers also give "*a pre-test, a mid-unit assessment, and then a post, end-of-unit assessment*" for each content unit.

Student scores on these assessments are monitored through Kickboard, the school's online data tracking system, and are examined during common planning times to help teachers make decisions about whether certain students need more intervention or enrichment time or which concepts may need to be retaught to the entire class. A school leader echoes that teachers track other assessment data in-between STEP assessments to "*create data action plans*" and "*lesson plans.*" To further monitor student growth in the lower grades, visualizations of student data are displayed in each K–3 classroom. The observation and feedback routine at Bentley provides another way to monitor the way teachers use assessment data to make action plans and set goals [see Indicator 2.4 Classroom Observation Data Use].

In addition, administrators and teachers also mentioned a recently created monitoring spreadsheet for students who struggle the most on STEP tests.

2.7 Structures for Instructional Improvement (Providing)

Bentley has strong structures in place for improving instruction, including professional development sessions that are aligned with the school's major instructional goals, structured agendas for common planning times, as well as regular observations and individual coaching for teachers and teacher leaders. However, the mid-range classroom observation scores in the Instructional Support domain show that there may be room for further improvement.

Teachers participated in afterschool professional development during most of the school year, but the school transitioned, in March, to having half-day professional development sessions during the Salem district's early release times for students, averaging about once a month. This change was in response to staff needing more frequent professional development sessions. Professional development sessions often are led by members of the ILT, which consists of both teachers and administrators. Most of the professional development has focused on the school's major instructional priorities, including "*accountable talk, metacognition, [and] higher-order thinking skills.*" Other professional development sessions focused on guided reading, Lemov teaching techniques, and conducting home visits. The school also had a full-day professional development session on the STEP test, as well as two weeks of professional development, before the start of the school year, on the power standards.

Teachers also have common planning time twice a week. On Tuesdays, the focus is on out-of-classroom issues, such as response to intervention (RTI), and Thursdays are instructionally focused sessions led by teacher leaders. During common planning times, teachers share and brainstorm "*research-based practices*" for instructional improvement and set goals for instruction. For example, one teacher "*brought in a bunch of resources for making thinking visible*" when the instructional focus was on metacognition. Teacher leaders also are supported by an outside coach from T3, who meets with them individually and in groups on a weekly basis. Together, teachers and teacher leaders develop a strategic plan to implement instructional improvements, outlining goals for common planning time each week. Teacher leaders also meet every two weeks with the administrators to discuss schoolwide and teacher needs.

Coaching for teachers also is available in math and science, although coaching is not available in ELA. Specifically, a schoolwide math consultant runs professional development sessions and observations a few times each year, and a part-time science coach meets with fourth- and fifth-grade teachers every two weeks. Outside of regularly scheduled professional development and common planning times, administrators often observe teachers and provide feedback about instruction [see Indicator 2.4 Classroom Observation Data Use]. One teacher said, *"I feel like there is a lot of support here."*

However, the mid-range CLASS observation score for the Instructional Support domain suggests that teachers do not always provide opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking and that students have only occasional opportunities to brainstorm or create. Furthermore, when such opportunities are available, these opportunities may be brief or involve only some students. These observation scores show that, although several types of instructional support are available at the school, these supports have not yet resulted in rigorous instruction for all students, keeping this indicator from reaching the *sustaining* rating.

Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students

Table 5. Turnaround Practice 3 Implementation Ratings, 2015–16

Turnaround Practice and Indicators		Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining	Coherent Implementation
3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students				•		
3.1	General Academic Interventions and Enrichment			X		
3.2	Teacher Training to Identify Student Needs (academic and nonacademic)			X		
3.3	Determining Schoolwide Student Supports (academic interventions and enrichment)				X	
3.4	Multitiered System of Support (academic and nonacademic)			X		
3.5	Academic Interventions for English Language Learners			X		
3.6	Academic Interventions for Students With Disabilities		X			

Bentley Elementary School received a holistic rating of *providing* for Turnaround Practice 3 (Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students). Data collected during the Monitoring Site Visit suggest that the school actively uses data to provide differentiated learning for students with different needs. For example, students are grouped in intervention blocks of varying size and level and are reassigned to groups throughout the year. The school also uses a structured multitiered RTI system for students who are struggling academically as well as behaviorally. However, students may not always be supported as much as possible due to a lack of specialized staff in areas such as English language learning and special education. Consistent with this need for additional services for ELLs, coaching often is provided for teachers on how to work with the general student population but is lacking on how to work with struggling students, ELL students, and students with disabilities.

The paragraphs below include specific examples that provide context for the overall turnaround practice rating and support the individual indicator ratings provided in Table 5. These ratings are a result of coding and triangulation of the evidence collected during the Monitoring Site Visit, including interview/focus group, instructional staff survey, and classroom observation data. The examples and quotes used throughout are intended to illustrate these ratings, and reflect the majority perspective, but in no way capture all of the information collected.

3.1 General Academic Interventions and Enrichment (Providing)

Every day at Bentley, students in Grades 1–5 receive intervention for ELA and math, in two 30-minute periods called the *"Whatever-I-Need,"* or *"WIN,"* block. Based on individual student needs, students are split up into either small groups for additional support or larger groups for enrichment, such as more challenging extension work. According to one teacher, the WIN intervention block is effective for struggling students because it provides "*really intentional small-group work with the most specialized teacher on that team.*" The Blueprint network also staffs two full-time math fellows for the fourth grade.

They are "*in the classroom all the time*" to provide differentiated support. Because of this additional math support, fourth graders have one ELA WIN block and no math block, instead of one block each for ELA and math. One school administrator mentioned a lack of specialized support staff for interventions. The administrator hopes that there will be more staff next year "*who have concrete experience with literacy, people who have some specific training, or other intervention programs available, to do more of that work with more kids.*"

3.2 Teacher Training to Identify Student Needs (academic and nonacademic) (Providing)

Teachers at Bentley receive training on identifying and addressing student needs through professional development, common planning time, and additional certification. However, there is some confusion among staff on how to use the school's RTI process.

Professional development sessions support teachers in identifying student needs and are led by school administrators and fellow teachers alike. On the academic side, teachers generally feel confident in identifying student needs due to extensive professional development in how to use data from assessments such as STEP and ANet. According to a teacher, professional development also has focused on nonacademic issues, such as "*wraparound services*" and reading individualized education programs to identify "*accommodations and modifications*" for students. A number of additionally certified teachers also are available across the school. Most notably, nearly half of all teachers have a RETELL (Rethinking Equity and Teaching for English Language Learners) certification for working with ELL students. Some teachers at the school also are certified in Safety Care and Wilson instruction, and school leaders often direct less experienced teachers to learn from their more experienced colleagues. For example, one teacher described a specific instance when teachers teamed up to "*use each other as resources.*" She described her conversation with another teacher during an RTI meeting during which a student was transferred to another WIN block to receive a more appropriate intervention. During common planning times, as well as in observation feedback meetings every week, teachers are supported by administrators to write action plans and make specific decisions for individual students and groups of students.

However, there is a consensus between administrators and teachers that more training is needed for the new RTI process that was adopted this year. Currently, although the Dean of Curriculum supports teachers in RTI meetings, one school leader described going through the process and following specific RTI protocols as the only type of informal training teachers receive in this area. Therefore, it seems that, although there is strong evidence for ongoing teacher training and support to identify student needs, teachers may not clearly understand the RTI process for helping students with higher levels of need.

3.3 Determining Schoolwide Student Supports (academic interventions and enrichment) (Sustaining)

Student progress is monitored closely at Bentley, and students are regularly reassigned to interventions and enrichment throughout the year as needed. At least every six weeks, teachers meet formally on grade-level teams to reassign students to WIN blocks based on STEP and ANet assessment scores as well as in-class assessment data. However, more frequent informal decisions to make adjustments are possible in-between meetings, because teachers are tracking student progress continuously through Kickboard, the school's data management platform. A teacher says that, for "*students who are making a lot of progress, as a team we send an e-mail or meet*" to discuss the possibility of moving these students to a different WIN group. Also, administrators hold data meetings with teachers after every round of

major assessment, including STEP tests and four ANet tests each for ELA and math. Together, staff analyze the data, look for trends, and identify areas of improvement schoolwide. One administrator also talked about a recent initiative to pinpoint "*five kids in every single teacher's classroom*" who struggle the most, place them in smaller intervention groups, and closely monitor them for the next cycle. These processes ensure that supports to students are customized to individual student needs.

3.4 Multitiered System of Support (academic and nonacademic) (Providing)

At Bentley, a multitiered RTI system is in place for staff to identify, support, and monitor students who need additional assistance. Although distinct protocols are in place for both students who are struggling academically and those students struggling behaviorally and a team has a consistent set of forms and procedures for assessing identified students, teachers were not always clear about entry and exit criteria at various levels of the system or how to monitor progress. Therefore, more training may be needed in this area.

For a student who is struggling academically, a teacher can start the RTI process by formulating a *"Scholar on Radar"* support plan for the student. Teachers raise this issue during *"RTI time that happens roughly every other week per grade level,"* where grade-level teams discuss past student assessment data and brainstorm an intervention for the student. Students then are assigned to and monitored in an intervention. In instances when students continue to struggle, teachers then submit a *"Written Request for an Intervention Support Team Meeting (WRIST)"* form to the guidance counsel, at which point students may be assigned a *"Scholar on Radar"* plan or be referred more quickly to Instructional Support Team if the grade-level team is *"really concerned in a number of areas"* and *"nothing is working."* Although the system is comprehensive, respondents reported a lack of consistency in making determinations about students' progress. As one respondent explained, *"That is an area in which we could definitely improve as well in terms of setting up those benchmarks beforehand and making them a little bit more consistent and clear to everyone."*

In the behavioral system, teachers refer to a *"consequence ladder,"* which gives guidance about *"the level of [mis]behaviors and the steps to take after these behaviors are exhibited."* According to an administrator, the steps outlined on the consequence ladder are effective for *"the majority of our students."* For those students who still misbehave, the next step of the process is for teachers to submit a formal request for the director of student success to observe the classroom and work with the student to either make *"behavioral recommendations"* or more formally *"create a tailored plan to that student."* Teachers also can request the same help from the director of student success if a student is continuously missing out on Friday choice time due to misbehavior. An administrator noted that there has been particular success with giving students break cards that they can use at their discretion for *"a five-minute break to walk around, get a drink of water, and come back"* but admitted that *"a lot of it is trial and error."* Similar to the academic RTI, there is no clearly defined criteria for exiting the system. For example, if a student stops misbehavior, decisions are made by the director of student success and counselor on a case-by-case basis to slowly discontinue the behavior interventions.

3.5 Academic Interventions for English Language Learners (Providing)

Supports for ELL students are clearly defined and regularly provided. However, supports are limited due to challenges related to designated ELL staff and time—specifically for ELL interventions.

Currently, all students at Bentley are grouped in WIN blocks, including ELL students, who work with ELL specialists for two 30-minute WIN blocks every day. In addition, specialists also work with students for either 45 or 90 minutes every day, depending on the level of student need. When this happens, the ELL specialists often push in and co-teach with the classroom teacher so that students are learning the same material as their same-age peers. For example, an ELL support staff member can work on reading with ELL students using the same text that is used in mainstream classrooms as part of supporting their students. One teacher said, *"We do a really good job of the inclusion, pushing in."* Sometimes, ELL specialists also pull students out of the regular classroom to teach additional ELL-specific material. During ELL-specific pull-out times, specialists use practices such as *"accountable talk and using accountable talk sentence starters"* to complement the regular curriculum.

Another key strategy is the coordination and planning between classroom teachers and ELL specialists. According to school leaders, the majority of the teachers have, or are obtaining, RETELL certification, which also supports ELL students. For example, several classroom teachers reported providing differentiated learning for ELL students using techniques such as *"manipulatives and nonverbals," "more visual supports," "hand signals,"* and giving students *"one-on-one feedback for their writing."* Teachers also sometimes assist ELL students to read their tests, in order to better gauge understanding in the content area. Still, respondents indicated a need for more support for ELL students. For example, a few respondents suggested that there should be an ELL-specific intervention block in addition to the math and ELA WIN blocks. In addition, with only three ELL specialists in the school servicing six different grade levels, respondents reported that is difficult to coordinate schedules across grades and allow teachers to obtain the level of support needed for ELL students in their classrooms. Responses on the instructional staff survey corroborate these concerns; the responses indicate mixed opinions among staff about whether there are adequate resources and time to support ELL students. These limitations keep this indicator from being rated more highly.

3.6 Academic Interventions for Students With Disabilities (Developing)

Bentley has an inclusive approach for serving students receiving special education services. Students receive support in general education. Often, teachers for these classrooms have specialized certification and have a paraprofessional to help. Special education specialists also help classroom teachers to scaffold instruction for students and reteach learning gaps to ultimately allow them to work independently. Teachers assess the effectiveness of these interventions through daily exit tickets and through *"conferencing"* with the student to talk about the student's progress. Teachers also work closely with special education specialists to plan lessons for students with special needs. One teacher said, *"We're on the same page about what the lessons are and the skills that we're doing in class,"* and another teacher agreed, *"No one is ever left out. We always receive information, and we're always in the loop."* For students with social-emotional needs, specialists use a variety of strategies *"very tailored to individual students,"* such as *"movement breaks," "noise-canceling headphones,"* and *"buddy zones."* The school adjustment counselor also provides *"individualized therapy with some of our heavier diagnosed children."*

Staff noted, however, that *"one of the biggest challenges"* is having enough staff to support the needs of all students with individualized education programs. Currently, specialists are able to do push-in sessions, during which they co-teach with the classroom teacher, or pull-out sessions, during which they do a separate intervention. However, there are no sub-separate classrooms for *"kids whose needs are sufficiently great."* Other teachers cited issues with high teacher turnover as well, giving the example of having gone through three K–1 special education specialists this school year. According to some

respondents, the variation in both level of need and range in numbers of students assigned to each specialist also poses a challenge. In addition, coaching support provided to special education staff does not focus on specific special education–related strategies. Also, the current special education staff are new to the profession, making it challenging for them to adjust to their roles and balance the multiple demands of staff and students. Finally, responses to the instructional staff survey align with the sentiments of interview and focus group participants; responses indicate that there are mixed opinions about whether adequate resources and time are available to support students with disabilities.

Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture

Table 6. Turnaround Practice 4 Implementation Ratings, 2015–16

Turnaround Practice and Indicators	Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining	Coherent Implementation
4. School Climate and Culture			•		
4.1 Schoolwide Behavior Plan				X	
4.2 Adult–Student Relationships			X		
4.3 Expanded Learning				X	
4.4 Wraparound Services and External Partners			X		
4.5 Family and Community Engagement (formerly 4.6)				X	

Bentley Elementary School received a holistic rating of *providing* for Turnaround Practice 4 (School Climate and Culture). Data collected during the Monitoring Site Visit suggest that most staff at Bentley consistently implement the schoolwide behavior plans. In addition, the school maintains multiple expanded learning opportunities for all students, and staff members make family engagement a priority. However, the findings suggest some room for improvement, particularly in terms of establishing systems for monitoring staff and student relationships and for establishing a system for providing wraparound services to students and their families.

The paragraphs below include specific examples that provide context for the overall turnaround practice rating and support the individual indicator ratings provided in Table 6. These ratings are a result of coding and triangulation of the evidence collected during the Monitoring Site Visit, including interview/focus group, instructional staff survey, and classroom observation data. The examples and quotes used throughout are intended to illustrate these ratings, and reflect the majority perspective, but in no way capture all of the information collected.

4.1 Schoolwide Behavior Plan (Sustaining)

The schoolwide behavior plans at Bentley include positive behavioral supports that are aligned to a defined set of expectations. In addition, there is evidence to suggest most staff members implement the behavior plans and use data to monitor implementation.

Bentley has implemented two different behavior plans: a "stop-light" system for Grades K–2 and the "Bentley bucks" system for Grades 3–5, based on the use of merits and demerits. One school leader reported, *"Our Bentley bucks system is tied to our core values, so [it] is a way to ensure that students are reaching those core value markers."* Each system maintains a set of structures for positive behavioral supports. For the K–2 stop-light system, students are rewarded for positive behavior by moving to certain colors on the stop light and receiving credit at the school store. The Grades 3–5 Bentley bucks

system rewards positive student behavior with Bentley bucks, or mock dollars, which students can redeem at the school store.

Most staff members reported widespread use of the schoolwide behavior plans. One staff member reported that, although there may be *"slight variations in how a teacher interprets the system,"* that *"everyone uses it."* Another staff member reported the systems are *"not only consistent just to discipline, but also to praise."*

School leaders monitor the implementation of the behavior systems by discussing data during professional development sessions with staff members. School leaders and staff members reported using Kickboard as a way to track the behavioral data (e.g., demerits in the upper grades), with one staff member reporting the data allow staff members to pull students aside midweek to discuss strategies for how the student can turn around his or her behavior. Consistent with reports from interviews and focus groups, responses from the instructional staff survey indicate that, on average, instructional staff agree that the schoolwide behavior plan is consistently implemented and monitored to provide clear expectations and positive behavioral supports. In addition, classroom observation scores were in the middle-high range for Behavior Management, which suggests a few instances of misbehavior took time away from instruction, but most students were well behaved, behavior expectations were explicit and clear, and teachers frequently monitored the classroom and intervened before any problems occurred.

4.2 Adult–Student Relationships (Providing)

Bentley has structures in place to support relationships among staff and students; however, there is little evidence to suggest a defined system exists for monitoring these supports. Bentley has implemented many schoolwide programs, such as the Fifth-Grade Ambassadors, in which fifth graders work with a school leader year-round to plan and lead different activities for the school (e.g., their graduation ceremony). There is also a Friday Choice Time, during which one staff member reported, *"Teachers and staff really get to bring in what they enjoy doing and relate that to the students."* Teachers at Bentley also are responsible for monitoring an organized recess *"where a teacher has to be playing the game and make sure that they're involved."* In addition, there is time set aside each Friday for a whole-school assembly, called Town Hall.

The school also maintains individual classroom structures to support adult–student relationships. For example, each classroom participates in a morning meeting *"where teachers and students come together to start the day."* In addition, one staff member reported an increase in one-on-one meetings with students due to *"more conferencing happening through our guided reading initiatives."* Staff members also reported an increase in conversations with students related to behavior management. One staff member reported that meeting with certain students each Friday to set behavior goals has *"been really successful so far."* The staff member explained these meetings are used to discuss questions such as *"Did we meet our goal this week? Where did we lose the most Bentley bucks? Where did we earn Bentley bucks? What can we do differently?"* Most staff members reported having positive relationships with their students, with one staff member reporting the positive adult–student relationships as being a *"benefit of having a pretty small school."* Another staff member reported, *"In general, teachers here are very dedicated to their students' success and are interested in building that personal relationship with them."* This description of strong of teacher-student connection is consistent with classroom observation scores in the high range for the Emotional Support domain, which suggest students are comfortable seeking support and sharing their ideas with the teachers, teachers and students share

supportive relationships with one another, listen when another person was speaking, and work collaboratively with one another.

Although teacher–student relationships were reported by many respondents as positive, responses to the instructional staff survey indicate that, on average, instructional staff have mixed opinions about whether there are structures in place to support adult–student relationships and deliver social-emotional support to students.

4.3 Expanded Learning (Sustaining)

Expanded learning opportunities are well defined, and all students have access to these opportunities at Bentley. In addition, high-need students are targeted for participation in expanded learning. Bentley maintains a Saturday Scholars program, which occurs every other Saturday. Although students struggling in math and ELA are targeted for this program, staff members reported that it is *"accessible for all of our students."* Staff members described the referral process for this program as *"the same process that we would use for IST, RTI."* Furthermore, school leaders at Bentley used their autonomy to extend the school day, to run from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., which has allowed for the extension of uninterrupted blocks during the school day for math and ELA.

Bentley also provides academically focused Vacation Academies during February and April vacations, during which students are provided with extra instruction in math and ELA. In addition, the local YMCA provides services specifically targeted toward students with behavioral and social-emotional disabilities. One staff member reported, *"We just started creating behavior plans with the YMCA,"* which have received positive reviews from parents of students receiving this additional support. All students at Bentley also participate in a 30-minute enrichment block each Friday, during which they can choose to take part in activities such as gym, play time, and music.

4.4 Wraparound Services and External Partners (Providing)

Leaders and staff at Bentley are aware of the needs of families and consistently provide resources to families, as needed. However, the school lacks a formal system for connecting students and families to the services that Bentley offers. Wraparound services at Bentley are targeted toward homeless families and include transportation services from Salem charities, a shoe donation program during the holidays, home therapy services, parenting skills services, and babysitting services. Bentley also provides a food bag program, in which certain students receive food each Friday to take home in their backpacks *"in a very nonintrusive way so the other kids don't know."*

School leaders and staff regularly assess the needs of students and families throughout the year, and all staff at Bentley are able to refer students for wraparound services. One staff member reported school leadership members *"ask for us to identify the students"* who will receive shoes, food, and toys around the holidays. Bentley also has a school counselor who comes in to provide therapy for students in need. Furthermore, one staff member is responsible for supervising the list of homeless families and coordinating with the district to support these families. In addition, families of students at Bentley are able to request wraparound services by filling out a *"request wraparound service sheet."*

4.5 Family and Community Engagement (Sustaining)

School leaders and staff at Bentley make family and community engagement a priority. One school leader as well as the staff members who make up the FELT are primarily responsible for coordinating family and community engagement activities. Regular social events are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members. These events include literacy night, field day, a Halloween celebration called Boo Bash, a winter holiday celebration, a fall barbecue, and several open houses. In addition, regular activities are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members in planning for and collaborating in the implementation of academic and nonacademic supports. The major activity in place is the parent teacher association (PTA), which the school moved to a neighborhood where many of the students at Bentley live. At the PTA meetings, one school leader reported, "*We have dinner available, daycare available, and translation available to get more of the families involved.*" Outside of PTA meetings*,* parents and community members have the opportunity to present fund-raising ideas for school activities to the school board. In addition, members from the community volunteer to lend academic support in the classrooms at Bentley. One staff member reported one community member is providing a *"session on plant growing with the first and second graders,"* to support lessons in science.

At Bentley, staff members routinely reach out to families to communicate information about their children's progress and needs. At teacher conferences, parents are given pamphlets, which one staff member reported help parents to *"understand what area of help their students need"* by explaining how to read and comprehend the content of their child's report card. In addition to parent–teacher conferences, most teachers have participated in *"home visits,"* during which they have an opportunity to get to know the families of their students. In addition, a school leader reported, *"Parents receive a positive phone call at least, or text message or e-mail or letter home, once a month to discuss their student."* Furthermore, communications with families are made available in multiple languages (including English, Spanish, and Portuguese), as needed.

Appendix A. School Performance Data

2015 Accountability Data—Bentley Elementary School

Organization Information			
District:	Salem (02580000)	School type:	Elementary School
School:	Bentley (02580005)	Grades served:	K,01,02,03,04,05
Region:	Northeast	Title I status:	Title I School (SW)

Accountability Information	About the Data

Accountability and Assistance Level

Level 4	Among lowest achieving and least improving schools

This school's overall performance relative to other schools in same school type (School percentiles: 1-99)

All students:	13
Lowest performing	Highest performing

This school's progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps (Cumulative Progress and Performance Index: 1-100)

Student Group (Click group to view subgroup data)	On Target = 75 or higher - ■			View Detailed 2015 Data
	Less progress		More progress	
All students			72	Did Not Meet Target
High needs			73	Did Not Meet Target
Econ. Disadvantaged			-	
ELL and Former ELL			80	Met Target
Students w/disabilities			-	
Amer. Ind. or Alaska Nat.			-	
Asian			-	
Afr. Amer./Black			-	
Hispanic/Latino			76	Met Target
Multi-race, Non-Hisp./Lat.			-	
Nat. Haw. or Pacif. Isl.			-	
White			70	Did Not Meet Target

For more detailed information about MCAS and/or PARCC scores, visit: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/

Enrollment Data (2015–16)

Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity (2015-16)			
Race	% of School	% of District	% of State
African American	10.6	10.6	8.8
Asian	3.1	3.1	6.5
Hispanic	44.1	44.1	18.6
Native American	0.0	0.0	0.2
White	39.0	39.0	62.7
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	0.0	0.0	0.1
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	3.1	3.1	3.2

Enrollment by Gender (2015-16)			
	School	District	State
Male	137	137	488,472
Female	117	117	464,957
Total	254	254	953,429

Selected Populations (2015–16)

Title	% of School	% of District	% of State
First Language not English	28.3	28.3	19.0
English Language Learner	12.6	12.6	9.0
Students With Disabilities	19.7	19.7	17.2
High Needs	74.8	74.8	43.5
Economically Disadvantaged	59.4	59.4	27.4

Indicators (2014–15)

Bentley:

	School	District	State
Attendance Rate	93.6	93.4	94.7
Average # of days absent	10.8	11.1	9.0
Absent 10 or more days	44.7	43.0	32.0
Chronically Absent (10% or more)	21.4	20.9	12.9
Unexcused Absences > 9	19.1	26.6	12.5
Retention Rate	0.0	1.4	1.5

Horace Mann Lab:

	School	District	State
Attendance Rate	94.9	93.4	94.7
Average # of days absent	8.9	11.1	9.0
Absent 10 or more days	36.7	43.0	32.0
Chronically Absent (10% or more)	12.8	20.9	12.9
Unexcused Absences > 9	15.3	26.6	12.5
Retention Rate	0.0	1.4	1.5

Appendix B. Data Sources

The American Institutes for Research team completed the following activities as part of the Monitoring Site Visit of Bentley Elementary School. The team conducted 20 classroom observations on April 14, 2016, and held interviews and focus groups on April 28, 2016. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the school and the district:

- Principal
- School board member
- Other school leaders, including all of the school's Deans of curriculum, operations, and student success
- Teachers at all grade levels
- Special education specialists
- English language learner (ELL) specialists
- External service providers
- School adjustment counselor

In addition, the team administered a voluntary survey to all instructional staff and reviewed relevant school documents, including previous Monitoring Site Visit reports and the school's current turnaround plan, as well as the current school profile data provided by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. At Bentley Elementary School, 31 of 39 total instructional staff members completed the survey, for an overall response rate of 79.5 percent.

Appendix C. Overview of Schoolwide Instructional Observations

Table 1. Summary of Number of Observed Classrooms Scoring at Each Level and Average Ratings for Each Dimension, Grades K–3 (*n* = 13)

This table shows an overview of classroom observation data from the *Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report*. For descriptions of the domains and indicators, please refer to the full report in Appendix F.

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		Average Scores*
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	
Emotional Support Domain	**1**	**1**	**3**	**8**	**9**	**14**	**16**	**5.5**
Positive Climate	1		1	2	3	5	1	4.9
Negative Climate**						4	9	6.7
Teacher Sensitivity			1	1	3	2	6	5.8
Regard for Student Perspectives		1	1	5	3	3		4.5
Classroom Organization Domain		**1**		**5**	**9**	**13**	**11**	**5.7**
Behavior Management		1		1	3	2	6	5.8
Productivity				1	3	5	4	5.9
Instructional Learning Formats				3	3	6	1	5.4
Instructional Support Domain		**6**	**13**	**4**	**8**	**7**	**1**	**4.0**
Concept Development		3	7	1	1	1		3.2
Quality of Feedback		2	2	2	3	3	1	4.5
Language Modeling		1	4	1	4	3		4.3

*The school average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the school average is computed as: ([1 x 1] + [3 x 1] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 5] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 13 observations = 4.9

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 4] + [7 x 9]) ÷ 13 observations = 6.7

Table 2. Summary of Number of Observed Classrooms Scoring at Each Level and Average Ratings for Each Dimension, Grades 4–5 (*n* = 7)

This table shows an overview of classroom observation data from the *Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report*. For descriptions of the domains and indicators, please refer to the full report in Appendix F.

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Emotional Support Domain				2	4	9	6	**5.9**
Positive Climate				1	1	1	4	6.1
Teacher Sensitivity					1	4	2	6.1
Regard for Student Perspectives				1	2	4		5.4
Classroom Organization Domain					3	7	11	**6.4**
Behavior Management					3	2	2	5.9
Productivity						3	4	6.6
Negative Climate**						2	5	6.7
Instructional Support Domain			3	1	13	11	7	**5.5**
Instructional Learning Formats					3	4		5.6
Content Understanding			1		2	3	1	5.4
Analysis and Inquiry			1		4	2		5.0
Quality of Feedback			1		1	1	4	6.0
Instructional Dialogue				1	3	1	2	5.6
Student Engagement					3	4		**5.6**

*The school average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the school average is computed as: ([4 x 1] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 1] + [7 x 4]) ÷ 7 observations = 6.1

** Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 2] + [7 x 5]) ÷ 7 observations = 6.7

Appendix D. Overview of Turnaround Practices and Indicators

Table 1. Overview of Turnaround Practice Area and Indicator Implementation Ratings

Turnaround Practice and Indicators		Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining	Coherent Implementation
1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration		■	■	•		
1.1	Use of Autonomy				X	
1.2	High Expectations and Positive Regard		X			
1.3	Vision/Theory of Action and Buy-In				X	
1.4	Monitoring Implementation and School Progress				X	
1.5	Trusting Relationships (formerly 4.5)			X		
1.6	Time Use for Professional Development and Collaboration				X	
1.7	Communication With Staff			X		
1.8	Sustainability (NEW)				X	
2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction		■	■	•		
2.1	Instructional Expectations			X		
2.2	Instructional Schedule			X		
2.3	Identifying and Addressing Student Academic Needs				X	
2.4	Classroom Observation Data Use				X	
2.5	Student Assessment Data Use (for schoolwide decision making)				X	
2.6	Student Assessment Data Use (for classroom instruction)				X	
2.7	Structures for Instructional Improvement			X		
3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students		■	■	•		
3.1	General Academic Interventions and Enrichment			X		
3.2	Teacher Training to Identify Student Needs (academic and nonacademic)			X		
3.3	Determining Schoolwide Student Supports (academic interventions and enrichment)				X	
3.4	Multitiered System of Support (academic and nonacademic)			X		
3.5	Academic Interventions for English Language Learners (NEW)			X		
3.6	Academic Interventions for Students With Disabilities (NEW)		X			
4. School Climate and Culture		■	■	•		
4.1	Schoolwide Behavior Plan				X	
4.2	Adult–Student Relationships			X		
4.3	Expanded Learning				X	
4.4	Wraparound Services and External Partners			X		
4.5	Family and Community Engagement (formerly 4.6)				X	

Appendix E. Turnaround Practices and Indicators Continuum for Bentley Elementary School

This document identifies a set of indicators within each of Massachusetts' four key turnaround practices:

- Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration

- Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction

- Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students

- School Climate and Culture

These indicators are described in a continuum of implementation, and data from the School Monitoring Visit (interviews, focus groups, survey data, document review, and classroom observations) have informed the holistic implementation rating for each of these turnaround practices in your school. The shading in the following tables shows the implementation rating achieved by your school based on data collected from the 2015–16 Monitoring Site Visit. These implementation ratings are described in the *Annual Monitoring Site Visit Report.*

Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration

The school has established a community of practice through leadership, shared responsibility for all students, and professional collaboration.

TURNAROUND PRACTICE 1—HOLISTIC RATING

Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining	Coherent Implementation
Indicators for this turnaround practice area show limited or no evidence of implementation of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that all or most of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes related to this area exist on paper or are being tried but are not yet fully developed or implemented.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that related systems are functional, and their structures and processes are implemented consistently throughout the school; however, either communication or systemic decision making is limited.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that the organizational practices, structures, and processes are functioning effectively, and timely feedback systems are embedded to identify potential problems and challenges.	The organizational practices across all indicators within a turnaround practice are at the sustaining level and are working together to support one another in a way that is meaningful for staff and students.

	Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration				
	Indicators	**Limited Evidence**	**Developing**	**Providing**	**Sustaining**
1.1	Use of Autonomy	School leaders have little to no autonomy (e.g., staffing, school schedule) to make decisions about key elements of the school, such as staffing, length of the school day.	School leaders have some autonomy to make decisions about key elements of the school (e.g., staffing, school schedule) but have not yet used this autonomy or are uncertain how best to use it.	School leaders have the autonomy (e.g., staffing, school schedule) to make decisions about key elements of the school day and have begun to use this autonomy to make changes in the school.	School leaders use the autonomy (e.g., staffing, school schedule) and authority to focus work on implementing their turnaround plan or other improvement efforts to improve the quality of teaching and learning at the school.

	Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration				
	Indicators	**Limited Evidence**	**Developing**	**Providing**	**Sustaining**
1.2	High Expectations and Positive Regard	There is little to no evidence that the school makes high expectations and positive regard between leadership, staff, and students a priority.	School leaders understand the importance of high expectations and positive regard between leadership, staff, and students but do not implement any strategies or activities to ensure that these elements are in fact in place.	School leaders understand the importance of high expectations and positive regard between leadership, staff, and students and implement strategies or activities to ensure that these elements are in fact in place.	School leaders understand the importance of high expectations and positive regard between leadership, staff, and students and implement strategies or activities to ensure that these elements are in fact in place. A majority of staff believe leadership, staff, and students have high expectations and demonstrate positive regard.
1.3	Vision/Theory of Action and Buy-In	School leaders have a loosely defined theory of action or vision along with established goals and interim benchmarks to guide dramatic school improvement, but the goals and benchmarks are not used to inform the school's work. There is little to no sense of urgency or collective responsibility for realizing school improvement.	School leaders have a defined theory of action or vision along with established goals, and interim benchmarks have been communicated to some staff. A common sense of urgency and shared ownership for the success of all students exists among some staff and leaders, but not all staff members share this responsibility.	School leaders have a defined and communicated theory of action or vision along with established goals and interim benchmarks to drive priorities related to turnaround efforts, and these goals and benchmarks are understood and implemented consistently by most staff. A common sense of urgency and purpose for improvement is evident among a majority of staff members, but ownership and responsibility for success of all students may still be centralized at the principal or leadership team level.	School leaders and most staff members understand the theory of action or vision driving the priorities related to turnaround efforts, are familiar with the goals and interim benchmarks used to consistently monitor progress (e.g., at least once a month), and identify and prioritize the next level of work. A common sense of urgency and ownership for the success of all students is shared among most staff, as demonstrated through staff discourse and actions.

Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration					
	Indicators	Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining
1.4	Monitoring Implementation and School Progress	School leaders rarely prioritize improvement initiatives for implementation nor are there processes or protocols in place for systemic implementation.	School leaders prioritize improvement initiatives for implementation; however, processes and protocols for systemic implementation are emerging or not well defined.	School leaders prioritize improvement initiatives; processes and protocols for systemic implementation are well defined. A majority of staff members are aware of the priorities, and some monitoring of these initiatives takes place.	School leaders are actively engaged in monitoring implementation of turnaround efforts, use this information to prioritize initiatives and strategies, communicate progress and challenges and seek input from staff, and continuously and systematically monitor progress.
1.5[8]	Trusting Relationships	Relationships between teachers and instructional supports (e.g., coaches) are not guided by trust; teachers feel coaching and instructional support is judgmental, and evidence of collaboration among staff is limited.	Some relationships between teachers and instructional supports (e.g., coaches) are guided by trust, and some teachers feel instructional support is nonjudgmental, but this is inconsistent throughout the school. Some groups of teachers may collaborate with colleagues to share strategies, such as developing standards-based units, examining student work, analyzing student performance, and planning appropriate interventions. However, this is not consistent among all staff.	Most relationships between teachers and instructional supports (e.g., coaches) are guided by trust, and most teachers feel that instructional support is nonjudgmental. There is evidence that most staff at least occasionally use collegial relationships to share strategies in such work as developing standards-based units, examining student work, analyzing student performance, and planning appropriate interventions.	Most staff members share a relational, trust-focused culture with each other and their instructional supports (e.g., coaches) that is solution oriented and focused on improvement as exemplified by frequent collaboration in developing standards-based units, examining student work, analyzing student performance, and planning appropriate interventions. Educators regularly share their strengths and struggles, in the spirit of helping each other continually improve their practice.

---

[8] Instructional Leadership and Improvement (formerly Indicator 1.5 in the 2014–15 Monitoring Site Visit report) was removed and the content incorporated into Indicator 2.4 for the 2015–16 Monitoring Site Visit report. Trusting Relationships (formerly Indicator 4.5 in the 2014–15 Monitoring Site Visit report) is now reflected in Indicator 1.5.

	Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration				
	Indicators	**Limited Evidence**	**Developing**	**Providing**	**Sustaining**
1.6	Time Use for Professional Development and Collaboration	The schedule includes little or no time for professional development or collaboration between teachers.	The schedule does not include adequate time for professional development opportunities, collaboration time for teachers is limited, and/or the available time is not used effectively to improve teaching and learning.	The schedule includes adequate time for professional development opportunities and collaboration for most teachers. Use of time is generally used well to improve teaching and learning.	The schedule includes adequate time for professional development opportunities and collaboration for most teachers. There is a process in place for evaluating the schedule based on collected data to maximize opportunities for teacher professional development and ensure it helps all educators continually improve their practice (e.g., targeted coaching, peer observations) and collaboration time.
1.7	Communication With Staff	Structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions and initiatives are informal, are not well defined, or do not exist.	Formal structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions and initiatives are defined but may not be used to effectively build relationships and two-way communication across staff and school teams.	Formal structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions and initiatives are in place and are used effectively to build relationships and two-way communication across staff and school teams. However, there are some barriers to communication between administrators and staff.	Formal structures are in place to build effective staff relationships balanced with transparency and open, two-way communication across staff and school teams and between administrators and staff.

	Indicators	Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining
1.8[9]	Sustainability	There is little to no evidence that school leadership prioritizes building staff capacity to sustain improvement efforts.	School leadership is aware of the importance of planning for sustainability. However, there is little to no evidence that improvement efforts will be sustained over time or under new leadership.	School leadership implements specific strategies (e.g., succession plan, distributed leadership, new funding streams) for ensuring improvement efforts will be sustained over time or under new leadership.	School leadership implements strategies (e.g., succession plan, distributed leadership, new funding streams) for ensuring improvement efforts will be sustained over time or under new leadership. Majority of staff believe and can describe specific strategies that will enable the school to continue to improve, even with changes in staff or school leadership.

Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration

---

[9] Sustainability (Indicator 1.8) is a new indicator for the 2015–16 Monitoring Site Visit report.

Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction

The school employs intentional practices for improving teacher-specific and student-responsive instruction.

TURNAROUND PRACTICE 2—HOLISTIC RATING

Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining	Coherent Implementation
Indicators for this turnaround practice area show limited or no evidence of implementation of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that all or most of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes related to this area exist on paper or are being tried but are not yet fully developed or implemented.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that related systems are functional, and their structures and processes are implemented consistently throughout the school; however, either communication or systemic decision making is limited.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that the organizational practices, structures, and processes are functioning effectively, and timely feedback systems are embedded to identify potential problems and challenges.	The organizational practices across all indicators within a turnaround practice are at the sustaining level and are working together to support one another in a way that is meaningful for staff and students.

	Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction				
	Indicators	Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining
2.1	Instructional Expectations	Expectations for teachers' classroom practices are not articulated by school leaders.	Expectations for teachers' classroom practices are communicated, but the expectations may not be specific, are not understood by most staff, and/or may not be actively monitored by school leaders.	Specific or precise expectations for teachers' classroom practices are consistently communicated, understood by most staff and faculty, and monitored throughout the school year.	Specific or precise expectations for high-quality instruction are communicated and understood by most staff, monitored by school leaders, and consistently implemented by most teachers.

	Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction				
	Indicators	**Limited Evidence**	**Developing**	**Providing**	**Sustaining**
2.2	Instructional Schedule	Existing instructional schedules lack consistency or do not include uninterrupted blocks of schoolwide learning time for students.	Existing instructional schedules include uninterrupted blocks of schoolwide learning time. However, instructional support staff are not coordinated and aligned across grade levels and content areas to provide students with differentiated access to high-quality core instruction.	Existing instructional schedules include uninterrupted blocks of schoolwide learning time. Content instruction and instructional support staff are coordinated or systematically organized and aligned across grade levels and content areas.	Instructional schedules are developed in collaboration with teachers and ensure that instructional support staff are coordinated and aligned across grade levels and content areas to provide students with differentiated access to high-quality core instruction. There is an effective process in place for evaluating the schedule based on collected data related to the quality of instruction and student needs across grade levels and content areas.
2.3	Identifying and Addressing Student Academic Needs	No formal data collection process is in place for identifying individual students' academic needs. Specific protocols for using data and identifying actions to address student academic needs are not in place.	Formal strategies and processes (e.g., instructional leadership team, collaborative planning, professional learning communities) are in place, with protocols for using data and identifying actions to address individual students' academic needs. However, the protocols may not be consistently used or followed.	Formal strategies and processes (e.g., instructional leadership team, collaborative planning, professional learning communities) and protocols for using data and identifying actions to address individual students' academic needs are in place and consistently used, but communication among all staff about action steps is limited.	Formal teaming and collaboration strategies, processes (e.g., instructional leadership team, collaborative planning, professional learning communities), and protocols are consistently used to address individual students' academic needs by: (1) using data, (2) identifying actions to address student learning needs, and (3) regularly communicating action steps among all staff and teams to build and sustain a professional culture of learning.

Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction					
	Indicators	**Limited Evidence**	**Developing**	**Providing**	**Sustaining**
2.4	Classroom Observation Data Use	Instructional leaders rarely or never conduct class observations (e.g., learning walkthroughs). Evidence that specific and actionable feedback on the quality and effectiveness of instruction is being provided to individual teachers is limited or nonexistent.	Instructional leaders conduct occasional or routine classroom observations (e.g., learning walkthroughs), primarily as a function of the principal role and with little to no timely feedback focused on strengthening teachers' instructional practices. Observation and feedback may be focused only on a few grades or subject areas.	Instructional leaders conduct regular classroom observations (e.g., learning walkthroughs) to gauge the quality of instructional practices and provide specific and actionable feedback on the quality and effectiveness of instruction. However, this information or data do not inform instructional conversations or the provision of targeted and individualized supports (e.g., coaching) for teachers, as needed.	Instructional leaders conduct weekly or daily classroom observations (e.g., learning walkthroughs) focused on strengthening teachers' instructional practices and provide specific and actionable feedback on the quality and effectiveness of instruction to individual teachers and teacher teams. These data inform instructional conversations and the provision of targeted and individualized supports (e.g., coaching) for teachers, as needed.
2.5	Student Assessment Data Use (for schoolwide decision making)	Building and teacher leaders use limited to no student assessment data to make decisions related to schoolwide practices.	Building and teacher leaders consider only student results on state assessments when making decisions regarding schoolwide practices.	Building and teacher leaders occasionally consider student results on benchmark and common assessments in addition to state assessments when making decisions regarding schoolwide practices.	Building and teacher leaders consistently use student results on benchmark and common assessments and state assessments to make decisions regarding schoolwide practices.

Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction					
	Indicators	**Limited Evidence**	**Developing**	**Providing**	**Sustaining**
2.6	Student Assessment Data Use (for classroom instruction)	There is little or emerging awareness of best practices for analyzing student performance data to inform instruction and assessing progress toward intended student outcomes, or the effect of these practices is negligible.	Some teachers are aware of the importance of using a variety of assessment data to inform instruction and for employing research-based instructional strategies to determine progress toward intended student outcomes. However, not all staff consistently use this practice.	Most teachers are aware of their roles and responsibilities for using a variety of assessment data to inform instruction and for employing research-based instructional strategies to determine progress toward intended student outcomes. However, there are some barriers to using data effectively to improve instruction.	Most teachers work individually and collaboratively to use a variety of assessment data (e.g., common assessment data, student work) to determine progress toward intended student and school outcomes, determine appropriate action steps, and monitor the results of those actions.
2.7	Structures for Instructional Improvement	Structures, practices, and use of resources (e.g., collaborative meeting time, coaching, supports for implementing the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks) to support the use of assessment data, research-based instructional strategies, and differentiation and to ensure rigor and relevance are limited, do not exist, or are having negligible impact.	Structures, practices, and use of resources (e.g., collaborative meeting time, coaching, supports for implementing the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks) to support the use of assessment data, research-based instructional strategies, and differentiation to ensure rigor and relevance are in place but may be poorly defined, inefficient, or ineffective.	Structures, practices, and use of resources (e.g., collaborative meeting time, coaching, supports for implementing the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks) to support the use of assessment data to guide and select research-based instructional strategies and differentiation are clearly defined but are not always used consistently throughout the school.	Structures, practices, and use of resources (e.g., collaborative meeting time, coaching, supports for implementing the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks) to support data-driven instruction, the use of research-based instructional strategies, and differentiation are in place and consistently implemented, resulting in rigorous instruction, reflective of the shifts in cognitive demand for the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, that meets the needs of each student.

Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students

The school is able to provide student-specific supports and interventions informed by data and the identification of student-specific needs.

TURNAROUND PRACTICE 3—HOLISTIC RATING

Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining	Coherent Implementation
Indicators for this turnaround practice area show limited or no evidence of implementation of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that all or most of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes related to this area exist on paper or are being tried but are not yet fully developed or implemented.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that related systems are functional, and their structures and processes are implemented consistently throughout the school; however, either communication or systemic decision making is limited.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that the organizational practices, structures, and processes are functioning effectively, and timely feedback systems are embedded to identify potential problems and challenges.	The organizational practices across all indicators within a turnaround practice are at the sustaining level and are working together to support one another in a way that is meaningful for staff and students.

	Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students				
	Indicators	**Limited Evidence**	**Developing**	**Providing**	**Sustaining**
3.1	General Academic Interventions and Enrichment	Structured academic interventions and enrichment opportunities (e.g., tiered system of support) are not in place. Or, if interventions and enrichment are provided, they are not based on research or promising practices.	Specific, research-based interventions and enrichment experiences are defined and planned but may not be consistently or systematically implemented (e.g., tiered system of support) or available to all students.	Specific, research-based interventions and enrichment experiences are defined and planned and regularly provided, although student participation is not systematic (e.g., tiered system of support), or interventions are not comprehensive (e.g., available for both English language arts and mathematics). Barriers may include scheduling conflicts or other structural challenges.	All students experience research-based academic interventions appropriate for their specific needs. These best practices and enrichment opportunities are implemented systematically during regularly scheduled school time and for all core content areas through a robust tiered system of support.

	Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students				
	Indicators	**Limited Evidence**	**Developing**	**Providing**	**Sustaining**
3.2	Teacher Training to Identify Student Needs (academic and nonacademic)	Staff members are provided with little to no training or support on how to identify and address student needs.	Some staff members are provided with training and support regarding how to identify and address at least one area of student need. However, training is not provided to all appropriate staff members or is not provided for all areas of student need (e.g., both academic and nonacademic).	Most staff members are provided with training and support to ensure that they can identify both academic and nonacademic student needs. However, staff do not receive training or support on how to respond appropriately to those cues, or staff fail to consistently respond to those cues despite training.	Most staff members are provided with training and support to ensure that they: (1) identify cues when students need additional assistance (both academic and nonacademic) and (2) respond appropriately to those cues.
3.3	Determining Schoolwide Student Supports (academic interventions and enrichment)	Specific student academic intervention and enrichment needs are neither identified nor diagnosed.	Specific student academic intervention and enrichment needs are diagnosed and identified annually or once a semester.	Student academic performance is reviewed regularly throughout the school year to monitor progress and to identify emerging needs; however, students are not reassigned to interventions as needed throughout the school year.	Student learning and academic performance is regularly reviewed (at least once a month) throughout the school year, using a wide array of ongoing assessments to identify student-specific and schoolwide emerging needs. Students are reassigned to interventions, enrichment, and supports, as needed, throughout the school year.

	Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students				
	Indicators	**Limited Evidence**	**Developing**	**Providing**	**Sustaining**
3.4	Multitiered System of Support (academic and nonacademic)	No system is in place to guide how to identify students in need of support or the necessary interventions and supports for those students. Leaders have not defined entry and exit criteria to identify struggling students in interventions. Students are assigned to interventions, using a wide range of information and processes that are not consistent across the school.	Leaders have defined but not clearly communicated entry and exit criteria for identified struggling students. Students are assigned to interventions with a limited application of the entry criteria, and student progress is not consistently or systemically monitored during the school year. The system meets one of the following three conditions: (1) Staff members follow consistent rules and procedures that identify when students are in need of additional assistance; (2) a team of appropriate staff and stakeholders makes decisions about needed interventions and supports; or (3) staff members follow consistent rules and procedures when monitoring the delivery and effectiveness of interventions and supports.	Leaders and teachers understand and use systems with criteria and protocols for identifying students for interventions and enrichment. Students are assigned to interventions, but this system meets only two of the following three conditions: (1) Staff members follow consistent rules and procedures when identifying students in need of additional assistance; (2) a team of appropriate staff and stakeholders makes decisions about needed interventions and supports; or (3) staff members follow consistent rules and procedures when monitoring the delivery and effectiveness of interventions and supports.	Leaders and teachers actively use established systems with criteria and protocols for identifying students for interventions and enrichment. This system meets all of the following conditions: (1) staff members follow consistent rules and procedures when identifying students in need of additional assistance; (2) a team of appropriate staff and stakeholders makes decisions about needed interventions and supports; and (3) staff members follow consistent rules and procedures when monitoring the delivery and effectiveness of interventions and supports.

		Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students			
	Indicators	**Limited Evidence**	**Developing**	**Providing**	**Sustaining**
3.5[10]	Academic Interventions for English Language Learners	Specific, research-based interventions for English language learners are not in place. Or, if interventions are provided, they are not based on research or promising practices.	Specific, research-based interventions for English language learners are defined and planned but may not be consistently or systematically implemented (due to staffing, scheduling, or other barriers) or designed to meet students' specific needs.	Specific, research-based interventions for English language learners are defined and planned and regularly provided. However, student participation is not always systematic, and supports are not always aligned for students' specific needs.	All English language learners experience research-based academic interventions appropriate for their specific needs. These supports are implemented systematically in the school.
3.6[11]	Academic Interventions for Students With Disabilities	Specific, research-based interventions for students with disabilities are not in place. Or, if interventions are provided, they are not based on research or promising practices.	Specific, research-based interventions for students with disabilities are defined and planned but may not be consistently or systematically implemented (due to staffing, scheduling, or other barriers) or designed to meet students' specific needs.	Specific, research-based interventions for students with disabilities are defined and planned and regularly provided. However, student participation is not always systematic, and supports are not always aligned for students' specific needs.	All students with disabilities experience research-based academic interventions appropriate for their specific needs. These supports are implemented systematically in the school.

[10] High Standards (formerly Indicator 3.5 in the 2014–15 Monitoring Site Visit report) was removed and the content incorporated into Indicator 2.7 for the 2015–16 Monitoring Site Visit report. Academic Interventions for English Language Learners is now reflected in Indicator 3.5.

[11] Academic Interventions for Students With Disabilities (Indicator 3.6) is a new indicator for the 2015–16 Monitoring Site Visit report.

Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture

The school provides a safe, orderly, and respectful environment for students and a collegial, collaborative, and professional culture among teachers.

TURNAROUND PRACTICE 4—HOLISTIC RATING

Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining	Coherent Implementation
Indicators for this turnaround practice area show limited or no evidence of implementation of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that all or most of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes related to this area exist on paper or are being tried but are not yet fully developed or implemented.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that related systems are functional, and their structures and processes are implemented consistently throughout the school; however, either communication or systemic decision making is limited.	Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that the organizational practices, structures, and processes are functioning effectively, and timely feedback systems are embedded to identify potential problems and challenges.	The organizational practices across all indicators within a turnaround practice are at the sustaining level and are working together to support one another in a way that is meaningful for staff and students.

Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture					
	Indicators	Limited Evidence	Developing	Providing	Sustaining
4.1	Schoolwide Behavior Plan	No schoolwide behavior plan guides the consistent implementation of behavior management procedures. Or, if there is a behavior plan, it is not implemented consistently.	The schoolwide behavior plan includes a defined set of behavioral expectations, but there is not a clear system or set of structures for positive behavioral supports that is aligned to those expectations. In addition, there is limited evidence that any staff implement the procedures outlined in the schoolwide behavior plan.	The schoolwide behavior plan includes a defined set of behavioral expectations, and a system and set of structures for positive behavioral supports are aligned to those expectations. However, either there is no evidence that any staff implement the procedures outlined in the schoolwide behavior plan, or there is evidence that only some staff members implement the procedures outlined in the schoolwide behavior plan.	The schoolwide behavior plan includes a defined set of behavioral expectations, and the system and set of structures for positive behavioral supports are aligned to those expectations. In addition, most staff members implement the procedures outlined in the schoolwide behavior plan. Leaders monitor implementation using data.
4.2	Adult–Student Relationships	Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs) to support the development of strong, supportive relationships between adults and students are not in place or are inadequate.	Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs) to support the development of strong relationships are defined but may not be used consistently or may not be available to all students.	Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs) are in place to support relationships among students and adults and deliver social-emotional supports.	Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs) are in place to support relationships among students and adults and deliver social-emotional supports. These supports are monitored actively to determine whether they are meeting the needs of the school.

	Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture				
	Indicators	**Limited Evidence**	**Developing**	**Providing**	**Sustaining**
4.3	Expanded Learning	Students have limited to no opportunities to participate in expanded learning programs.	Opportunities for students to participate in expanded learning programs exist but may not be well defined, or awareness of and participation in the programs may be limited.	Structured opportunities for students to participate in expanded learning programs are in place and are well defined.	All students have access to expanded learning opportunities that are well defined and well supported. High-need students are targeted for participation in these programs.
4.4	Wraparound Services and External Partners	There is little or emerging leadership and staff awareness of strategies to increase the capacity of families to support education in the home through wraparound services (e.g., health, housing referrals).	Leaders and staff are aware of the needs of families to support education through wraparound services (e.g., health, housing referrals). However, there is no system to provide these services consistently.	Leaders and staff are aware of the needs of families to support education through wraparound services (e.g., health, housing referrals) and provide these resources to families, as needed.	Leaders and staff share individual and mutual responsibility for building the capacity of families to support education through a systemic system of wraparound services (e.g., health, housing referrals). Leaders and staff assess the needs of students and families throughout the school year.

	Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture			
	Indicators	**Limited Evidence**	**Developing**	**Providing**	**Sustaining**
4.5[12]	Family and Community Engagement	There is little to no evidence that the school makes family and community engagement a priority.	The school makes family and community engagement a priority, but only one or two of five conditions are met: (1) One or more staff members coordinate family and community engagement activities; (2) regular social events are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members; (3) regular activities are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members in planning for and collaborating in the implementation of academic and nonacademic supports; (4) staff members routinely reach out to families to communicate information about their children's progress and needs; and/or (5) communications with families are made available in multiple languages, as needed.	The school makes family engagement a priority, but only three or four of five conditions are met: (1) One or more staff members coordinate family and community engagement activities; (2) regular social events are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members; (3) regular activities are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members in planning for and collaborating in the implementation of academic and nonacademic supports; (4) staff members routinely reach out to families to communicate information about their children's progress and needs; and/or (5) communications with families are made available in multiple languages, as needed.	The school makes family and community engagement a priority and all of the following five conditions are met: (1) One or more staff members coordinate family and community engagement activities; (2) regular social events are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members; (3) regular activities are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members in planning for and collaborating in the implementation of academic and nonacademic supports; (4) staff members routinely reach out to families to communicate information about their children's progress and needs; and (5) communications with families are made available in multiple languages, as needed.

---

[12] Formerly Indicator 4.6 in the 2014–15 Monitoring Site Visit report.

Appendix F. Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report—2016

Monitoring Site Visit Report 1 of 2: Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report

Bentley Elementary
Salem Public Schools
Elementary Classroom Visits: Summary of Findings

April 2016

201 Jones Road
Waltham, Massachusetts
781-373-7000 | TTY 877.334.3499

www.air.org

Contents

Introduction

The *Schoolwide Instructional Observation Report* presents ratings for the classroom observations that were conducted by certified observers at American Institutes for Research (AIR) as part of the Monitoring Site Visit (MSV). This is one of two reports related to the MSV.

Bentley Elementary was visited by two observers on April 14, 2016. The observers conducted 20 observations in a sample of classrooms across the school, focused on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics. This sampling focuses on courses that contribute to the school's accountability determination (student outcomes). Additional courses that are highlighted or emphasized in the school's turnaround plan may also have been visited.

The classroom observations were guided by the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) for the Pre-K, K–3, and Upper Elementary levels. The CLASS protocol was developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) at the University of Virginia.

The Pre- K and K–3 protocols include 10 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support (listed in Table 1).

Table 1. CLASS Pre K and K–3 Domains and Dimensions

Emotional Support	Classroom Organization	Instructional Support
- Positive Climate - Negative Climate - Teacher Sensitivity - Regard for Student Perspectives	- Behavior Management - Productivity - Instructional Learning Formats	- Concept Development - Quality of Feedback - Language Modeling

The Upper Elementary protocol includes 11 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support (listed in Table 2), in addition to Student Engagement.

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary Domains and Dimensions

Emotional Support	Classroom Organization	Instructional Support
- Positive Climate - Teacher Sensitivity - Regard for Student Perspectives	- Behavior Management - Productivity - Negative Climate	- Instructional Learning Formats - Content Understanding - Analysis and Inquiry - Quality of Feedback - Instructional Dialogue
Student Engagement		

When conducting a visit to a classroom, the observer rates each dimension (including Student Engagement) on a scale of 1 to 7. A rating of 1 or 2 indicates that the dimension was never or rarely evident during the visit. For example, a rating of 1 or 2 on Teacher Sensitivity indicates that, at the time of the visit, the teacher was not aware of students who needed extra support

or attention, was unresponsive to or dismissive of students, or was ineffective at addressing students' problems; as a result, students rarely sought support from the teacher or communicated openly with the teacher. A rating of 3, 4, or 5 indicates that the dimension was evident but not exhibited consistently or in a way that included all students. A rating of 6 or 7 indicates that the dimension was reflected in all or most classroom activities and in a way that included all or most students.

Members of the MSV team who visited the classrooms all received training on the CLASS protocol in a two-day session and then passed a rigorous certification exam to ensure that they were able to accurately rate the dimensions. All observers must pass an exam annually to maintain their certification.

Research on CLASS protocol shows that students in classrooms that rated high using this observation tool have greater gains in social skills and academic success than students in classrooms with lower ratings (MET Project, 2010; CASTL, n.d.). Small improvements on these domains can affect student outcomes. "The ability to demonstrate even small changes in effective interactions has practical implications—differences in just over 1 point on the CLASS 7-point scale translate into improved achievement and social skill development for students" (CASTL, n.d., p. 3).

In this report, each CLASS dimension is defined, and descriptions of the dimensions at the high (6 or 7), middle (3, 4, or 5), and low levels (1 or 2) are presented. *(Definitions and rating descriptions are derived from the CLASS Pre-K, K–3, and Upper Elementary Manuals.)* For each dimension we indicate the frequency of classroom observations across the ratings and provide a schoolwide average of the observed classrooms. In cases where a dimension is included in Pre-K, K-3, and upper elementary classrooms, those results are combined on the dimension-specific pages. In the summary of ratings table following the dimension-specific pages the averages for every dimension are presented by grade group (Pre-K, K-3, or Upper Elementary). For each dimension, we indicate the grade levels for which this dimension is included.

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades Pre-K–5

Positive Climate reflects the emotional connection between the teacher and students and among students and the warmth, respect, and enjoyment communicated by verbal and nonverbal interactions (*CLASS Pre-K Manual,* p. 23, *CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 23, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 21). Table 3 (as well as tables for the remaining dimensions) includes the number of classrooms for each rating on each dimension and the school average for that dimension.

Table 3. Positive Climate: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 20, Grades Pre-K–5)

Positive Climate School Average*: 5.4

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations	1		1	3	4	6	5

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the school average is computed as: ([1 x 1] + [3 x 1] + [4 x 3] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 5]) ÷ 20 observations = 5.4

Ratings in the Low Range. All indicators are absent or only minimally present. Teachers and students do not appear to share a warm, supportive relationship. Interpersonal connections are not evident or only minimally evident. Affect in the classroom is flat, and there are rarely instances of teachers and students smiling, sharing humor, or laughing together. There are no, or very few, positive communications among the teacher and students; the teacher does not communicate encouragement. There is no evidence that students and the teacher respect one another or that the teacher encourages students to respect one another.

Ratings in the Middle Range. There are some indications that the teacher and students share a warm and supportive relationship, but some students may be excluded from this relationship, either by the teacher or the students. Some relationships appear constrained—for example, the teacher expresses a perfunctory interest in students, or encouragement seems to be an automatic statement and is not sincere. Sometimes, teachers and students demonstrate respect for one another.

Ratings in the High Range. There are many indications that the relationship among students and the teacher is positive and warm. The teacher is typically in close proximity to students, and encouragement is sincere and personal. There are frequent displays of shared laughter, smiles, and enthusiasm. Teachers and students show respect for one another (e.g., listening, using calm voices, using polite language). Positive communication (both verbal and nonverbal) and mutual respect are evident throughout the session.

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain, Grades Pre-K–5

Teacher Sensitivity encompasses the teacher's awareness of and responsiveness to students' academic and emotional needs. High levels of sensitivity facilitate students' abilities to actively explore and learn because the teacher consistently provides comfort, reassurance, and encouragement (*CLASS Pre-K Manual,* p. 32, *CLASS K–3 Manual,* p. 32, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 27).

Table 4. Teacher Sensitivity: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 20, Grades Pre-K–5)

Teacher Sensitivity School Average*: 5.9

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations			1	1	4	6	8

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the school average is computed as:
([3 x 1] + [4 x 1] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 6] + [7 x 8]) ÷ 20 observations = 5.9

Ratings in the Low Range. In these sessions, the teacher has not been aware of students who need extra support and pays little attention to students' needs. As a result, students are frustrated, confused, and disengaged. The teacher is unresponsive to and dismissive of students and may ignore students, squash their enthusiasm, and not allow them to share their moods or feelings. The teacher is not effective in addressing students' needs and does not appropriately acknowledge situations that may be upsetting to students. Students rarely seek support from the teacher and minimize conversations with the teacher, not sharing ideas or responding to questions.

Ratings in the Middle Range. The teacher is sometimes aware of student needs or aware of only a limited type of student needs, such as academic needs, not social-emotional needs. Or the teacher may be aware of some students and not of other students. The teacher does not always realize a student is confused and needs extra help or when a student already knows the material being taught. The teacher may be responsive at times to students but at other times may ignore or dismiss students. The teacher may respond only to students who are upbeat and positive and not support students who are upset. Sometimes, the teacher is effective in addressing students' concerns or problems, but not always.

Ratings in the High Range. The teacher's awareness of students and their needs is consistent and accurate. The teacher may predict how difficult a new task is for a student and acknowledge this difficulty. The teacher is responsive to students' comments and behaviors, whether positive or negative. The teacher consistently addresses students' problems and concerns and is effective in doing so. Students are obviously comfortable with the teacher and share ideas, work comfortably together, and ask and respond to questions, even difficult questions.

Regard for Student Perspectives

Emotional Support domain, Grades Pre-K–5

Regard for Student Perspectives captures the degree to which the teacher's interactions with students and classroom activities place an emphasis on students' interests, motivations, and points of view and encourage student responsibility and autonomy (*CLASS Pre-K Manual,* p. 38, *CLASS K–3 Manual,* p. 38, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 35).

Table 5. Regard for Student Perspectives: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 20, Grades Pre-K–5)

Regard for Student Perspectives School Average*: 4.8

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations		1	1	6	5	7	

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the school average is computed as:
([2 x 1] + [3 x 1] + [4 x 6] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 7]) ÷ 20 observations = 4.8

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the teacher exhibits an inflexible, rigid adherence to his or her plan, without considering student ideas or allowing students to make contributions. The teacher inhibits student enthusiasm by imposing guidelines or making remarks that inhibit student expression. The teacher may rigidly adhere to a lesson plan and not respond to student interests. The teacher does not allow students any autonomy on how they conduct an activity, may control materials tightly, and may offer few opportunities for students to help out with classroom responsibilities. There are few opportunities for students to talk and express themselves.

Ratings in the Middle Range. The teacher exhibits control at times and at other times follows the students' lead and gives them some choices and opportunities to follow their interests. There are some opportunities for students to exercise autonomy, but student choice is limited. The teacher may assign students responsibility in the classroom, but in a limited way. At times, the teacher dominates the discussion, but at other times the teacher allows students to share ideas, although only at a minimal level or for a short period of time.

Ratings in the High Range. The teacher is flexible in following student leads, interests, and ideas and looks for ways to meaningfully engage students. Although the teacher has a lesson plan, students' ideas are incorporated into the lesson plan. The teacher consistently supports student autonomy and provides meaningful leadership opportunities. Students have frequent opportunities to talk, share ideas, and work together. Students have appropriate freedom of movement during activities.

Negative Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades Pre-K – 3
Classroom Organization domain, Grades 4 – 5

Negative Climate reflects the overall level of expressed negativity in the classroom. The frequency, quality, and intensity of teacher and student negativity are key to this dimension (*CLASS Pre-K Manual,* p. 28, *CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 28, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 55). For the purposes of this report, we have inversed the observers scores, to be consistent with the range scores across all dimensions. Therefore a high range score in this dimension indicates an absence of negative climate, and a low range score indicates the presence of negative climate.[1]

Table 6. Negative Climate: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 20, Grades Pre-K–5)

Negative Climate School Average*: 6.7

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations						6	14

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the school average is computed as:
([6 x 6] + [7 x 14]) ÷ 20 observations = 6.7

Ratings in the Low Range. Negativity is pervasive. The teacher may express constant irritation, annoyance, or anger; unduly criticize students; or consistently use a harsh tone and/or take a harsh stance as he or she interacts with students. Threats or yelling are frequently used to establish control. Language is disrespectful and sarcastic. Severe negativity, such as the following actions, would lead to a high rating on negative climate, even if the action is not extended: students bullying one another, a teacher hitting a student, or students physically fighting with one another.

Ratings in the Middle Range. There are some expressions of mild negativity by the teacher or students. The teacher may express irritability, use a harsh tone, and/or express annoyance—usually during difficult moments in the classroom. Threats or yelling may be used to establish control over the classroom, but not constantly; they are used more as a response to situations. At times, the teacher and students may be sarcastic or disrespectful toward one another.

Ratings in the High Range. There is no display of negativity: No strong expressions of anger or aggression are exhibited, either by the teacher or students; if there is such a display, it is contained and does not escalate. The teacher does not issue threats or yell to establish control. The teacher and students are respectful and do not express sarcasm.

---

[1] When observers rate this dimension it is scored so that a low rating (indicating little or no evidence of a negative climate) is better than a high rating (indicating abundant evidence of a negative climate). To be consistent across all ratings, for the purposes of this report we have inversed this scoring.

Behavior Management

Classroom Organization domain, Grades Pre-K–5

Behavior Management refers to the teacher's ability to provide clear behavioral expectations and use effective methods to prevent and redirect misbehavior (*CLASS Pre-K Manual,* p. 44, *CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 45, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 41).

Table 7. Behavior Management: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 20, Grades Pre-K–5)

Behavior Management School Average*: 5.8

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations		1		1	6	4	8

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the school average is computed as: ([2 x 1] + [4 x 1] + [5 x 6] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 8]) ÷ 20 observations = 5.8

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the classroom is chaotic. There are no rules and expectations, or they are not enforced consistently. The teacher does not monitor the classroom effectively and only reacts to student disruption, which is frequent. There are frequent instances of misbehavior in the classroom, and the teacher's attempts to redirect misbehavior are ineffective. The teacher does not use cues, such as eye contact, slight touches, gestures, or physical proximity, to respond to and redirect negative behavior.

Ratings in the Middle Range. Although rules and expectations may be stated, they are not consistently enforced, or the rules may be unclear. Sometimes, the teacher proactively anticipates and prevents misbehavior, but at other times the teacher ignores behavior problems until it is too late. Misbehavior may escalate because redirection is not always effective. Episodes of misbehavior are periodic.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, the rules and guidelines for behavior are clear, and they are consistently reinforced by the teacher. The teacher monitors the classroom and prevents problems from developing, using subtle cues to redirect behavior and address situations before they escalate. The teacher focuses on positive behavior and consistently affirms students' desirable behaviors. The teacher effectively uses cues to redirect behavior. There are no, or very few, instances of student misbehavior or disruptions.

Productivity

Classroom Organization domain, Grades Pre-K–5

Productivity considers how well the teacher manages instructional time and routines, and provides activities for students so that they have the opportunity to be involved in learning activities (*CLASS Pre-K Manual,* p. 49, *CLASS K–3 Manual,* p. 51, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 49).

Table 8. Productivity: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average
(*n* = 20, Grades Pre-K–5)

Productivity School Average*: 6.2

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations				1	3	8	8

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the school average is computed as:
([4 x 1] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 8] + [7 x 8]) ÷ 20 observations = 6.2

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low level, the teacher provides few activities for students. Much time is spent on managerial tasks (such as distributing papers) and/or on behavior management. Frequently during the observation, students have little to do and spend time waiting. The routines of the classroom are not clear and, as a result, students waste time, are not engaged, and are confused. Transitions take a long time and/or are too frequent. The teacher does not have activities organized and ready and seems to be caught up in last-minute preparations.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At the middle range, the teacher does provide activities for students but loses learning time to disruptions or management tasks. There are certain times when the teacher provides clear activities to students, but there are other times when students wait and lose focus. Some students (or all students, at some point) do not know what is expected of them. Some of the transitions may take too long, or classrooms may be productive during certain periods but then not productive during transitions. Although the teacher is mostly prepared for the class, last-minute preparations may still infringe on learning time.

Ratings in the High Range. The classroom runs very smoothly. The teacher provides a steady flow of activities for students, so students do not have downtime and are not confused about what to do next. The routines of the classroom are efficient, and all students know how to move from one activity to another and where materials are. Students understand the teacher's instructions and directions. Transitions are quick, and there are not too many of them. The teacher is fully prepared for the lesson.

Instructional Learning Formats

Classroom Organization domain, Grades Pre-K –3
Instructional Support domain, Grades 4 –5

Instructional Learning Formats refer to the ways in which the teacher maximizes students' interest, engagement, and abilities to learn from the lesson and activities (*CLASS Pre-K Manual,* p. 55, *CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 57; *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 63).

Table 9. Instructional Learning Formats: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 20, Grades Pre-K–5)

Instructional Learning Formats School Average*: 5.4

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations				3	6	10	1

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the school average is computed as:
([4 x 3] + [5 x 6] + [6 x 10] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 20 observations = 5.4

Ratings in the Low Range. The teacher exerts little effort in facilitating engagement in the lesson. Learning activities may be limited and seem to be at the rote level, with little teacher involvement. The teacher relies on one learning modality (e.g., listening) and does not use other modalities (e.g., movement, visual displays) to convey information and enhance learning. Or the teacher may be ineffective in using other modalities, not choosing the right props for the students or the classroom conditions. Students are uninterested and uninvolved in the lesson. The teacher does not attempt to guide students toward learning objectives and does not help them focus on the lesson by providing appropriate tools and asking effective questions.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At the middle range, the teacher sometimes facilitates engagement in the lesson but at other times does not, or the teacher facilitates engagement for some students and not for other students. The teacher may not allow students enough time to explore or answer questions. Sometimes, the teacher uses a variety of modalities to help students reach a learning objective, but at other times the teacher does not. Student engagement is inconsistent, or some students are engaged and other students are not. At times, students are aware of the learning objective and at other times they are not. The teacher may sometimes use strategies to help students organize information but at other times does not.

Ratings in the High Range. The teacher has multiple strategies and tools to facilitate engagement and learning and encourage participation. The teacher may move around, talk and play with students, ask open-ended questions of students, and allow students to explore. A variety of tools and props are used, including movement and visual/auditory resources. Students are consistently interested and engaged in the activities and lessons. The teacher focuses students on the learning objectives, which students understand. The teacher uses advanced organizers to prepare students for an activity, as well as reorientation strategies that help students regain focus.

Concept Development

Instructional Support domain, Grades Pre-K –3

Concept Development refers to the teacher's use of instructional discussions and activities to promote students' higher order thinking skills and cognition and the teacher's focus on understanding rather than on rote instruction (*CLASS Pre-K Manual,* p. 62, *CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 64).

Table 10. Concept Development: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 13, Grades Pre-K–3)

Concept Development School Average*: 3.2

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**
Number of Observations		3	7	1	1	1	

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the school average is computed as: ([2 x 3] + [3 x 7] + [4 x 1] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 1]) ÷ 13 observations = 3.2

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the teacher does not attempt to develop students' understanding of ideas and concepts, focusing instead on basic facts and skills. Discussion and activities do not encourage students to analyze and reason. There are few, if any, opportunities for students to create or generate ideas and products. The teacher does not link concepts to one another and does not ask students to make connections with previous content or their actual lives. The activities and the discussion are removed from students' lives and from their prior knowledge.

Ratings in the Middle Range. To some extent, the teacher uses discussions and activities to encourage students to analyze and reason and focuses somewhat on understanding of ideas. The activities and discussions are not fully developed, however, and there is still instructional time that focuses on facts and basic skills. Students may be provided some opportunities for creating and generating ideas, but the opportunities are occasional and not planned out. Although some concepts may be linked and also related to students' previous learning, such efforts are brief. The teacher makes some effort to relate concepts to students' lives but does not elaborate enough to make the relationship meaningful to students.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, the teacher frequently guides students to analyze and reason during discussions and activities. Most of the questions are open ended and encourage students to think about connections and implications. Teachers use problem solving, experimentation, and prediction; comparison and classification; and evaluation and summarizing to promote analysis and reasoning. The teacher provides students with opportunities to be creative and generate ideas. The teacher consistently links concepts to one another and to previous learning and relates concepts to students' lives.

Content Understanding

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4–5

Content Understanding refers to the depth of lesson content and the approaches used to help students comprehend the framework, key ideas, and procedures in an academic discipline. At a high level, this dimension refers to interactions among the teacher and students that lead to an integrated understanding of facts, skills, concepts, and principles (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 70).

Table 11. Content Understanding: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 7, Grades 4–5)

Content Understanding School Average*: 5.4

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**
Number of Observations			1		2	3	1

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the school average is computed as: ([3 x 1] + [5 x 2] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 7 observations = 5.4

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the focus of the class is primarily on presenting discrete pieces of topically related information, absent broad, organizing ideas. The discussion and materials fail to effectively communicate the essential attributes of the concepts and procedures to students. The teacher makes little effort to elicit or acknowledge students' background knowledge or misconceptions or to integrate previously learned material when presenting new information.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At the middle range, the focus of the class is sometimes on meaningful discussion and explanation of broad, organizing ideas. At other times, the focus is on discrete pieces of information. Class discussion and materials communicate some of the essential attributes of concepts and procedures, but examples are limited in scope or not consistently provided. The teacher makes some attempt to elicit and/or acknowledge students' background knowledge or misconceptions and/or to integrate information with previously learned materials; however, these moments are limited in depth or inconsistent.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, the focus of the class is on encouraging deep understanding of content through the provision of meaningful, interactive discussion and explanation of broad, organizing ideas. Class discussion and materials consistently communicate the essential attributes of concepts and procedures to students. New concepts and procedures and broad ideas are consistently linked to students' prior knowledge in ways that advance their understanding and clarify misconceptions.

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4–5

Analysis and Inquiry assesses the degree to which students are engaged in higher level thinking skills through their application of knowledge and skills to novel and/or open-ended problems, tasks, and questions. Opportunities for engaging in metacognition (thinking about thinking) also are included (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 81).

Table 12. Analysis and Inquiry: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 7, Grades 4–5)

Analysis and Inquiry School Average*: 5.0

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations			1		4	2	

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the school average is computed as: ([3 x 1] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 2]) ÷ 7 observations = 5.0

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, students do not engage in higher order thinking skills. Instruction is presented in a rote manner, and there are no opportunities for students to engage in novel or open-ended tasks. Students are not challenged to apply previous knowledge and skills to a new problem, nor are they encouraged to think about, evaluate, or reflect on their own learning. Students do not have opportunities to plan their own learning experiences.

Ratings in the Middle Range. Students occasionally engage in higher order thinking through analysis and inquiry, but the episodes are brief or limited in depth. The teacher provides opportunities for students to apply knowledge and skills within familiar contexts and offers guidance to students but does not provide opportunities for analysis and problem solving within novel contexts and/or without teacher support. Students have occasional opportunities to think about their own thinking through explanations, self-evaluations, reflection, and planning; these opportunities, however, are brief and limited in depth.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, students consistently engage in extended opportunities to use higher order thinking through analysis and inquiry. The teacher provides opportunities for students to independently solve or reason through novel and open-ended tasks that require students to select, utilize, and apply existing knowledge and skills. Students have multiple opportunities to think about their own thinking through explanations, self-evaluations, reflection, and planning.

Quality of Feedback

Instructional Support domain, Grades Pre-K–5

Quality of Feedback refers to the degree to which the teacher provides feedback that expands learning and understanding and encourages continued participation in the learning activity (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 72). In the upper elementary classrooms, significant feedback also may be provided by peers (*CLASS Pre-K Manual,* p. 69, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 89). Regardless of the source, the focus of the feedback motivates learning.

Table 13. Quality of Feedback: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 20, Grades Pre-K–5)

Quality of Feedback School Average*: 5.0

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**
Number of Observations		2	3	2	4	4	5

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the school average is computed as: ([2 x 2] + [3 x 3] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 5]) ÷ 20 observations = 5.0

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the teacher dismisses incorrect responses or misperceptions and rarely scaffolds student learning. The teacher is more interested in students providing the correct answer than understanding. Feedback is perfunctory. The teacher may not provide opportunities to learn whether students understand or are interested. The teacher rarely questions students or asks them to explain their thinking and reasons for their responses. The teacher does not or rarely provides information that might expand student understanding and rarely offers encouragement that increases student effort and persistence.

Ratings in the Middle Range. In the middle range, the teacher sometimes scaffolds students, but this is not consistent. On occasion, the teacher facilitates feedback loops so that students may elaborate and expand on their thinking, but these moments are not sustained long enough to accomplish a learning objective. Sometimes, the teacher asks students about or prompts them to explain their thinking and provides information to help students understand, but sometimes the feedback is perfunctory. At times, the teacher encourages student efforts and persistence.

Ratings in the High Range. In this range, the teacher frequently scaffolds students who are having difficulty, providing hints or assistance as needed. The teacher engages students in feedback loops to help them understand ideas or reach the right response. The teacher often questions students, encourages them to explain their thinking, and provides additional information that may help students understand. The teacher regularly encourages students' efforts and persistence.

Language Modeling

Instructional Support domain, Grades Pre-K–3

Language Modeling refers to the quality and amount of the teacher's use of language stimulation and language facilitation techniques (*CLASS Pre-K Manual,* p. 75, *CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 79).

Table 14. Language Modeling: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 13, Grades Pre-K–3)

Language Modeling School Average*: 4.3

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations		1	4	1	4	3	

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the school average is computed as: ([2 x 1] + [3 x 4] + [4 x 1] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 3]) ÷ 13 observations = 4.3

Ratings in the Low Range. In the low range, there are few conversations in the classroom, particularly between the students and the teacher. The teacher responds to students' initiating talk with only a few words, limits students' use of language (in responding to questions), and asks questions that mainly elicit closed-ended responses. The teacher does not or rarely extends students' responses or repeats them for clarification. The teacher does not engage in self-talk or parallel talk—explaining what he or she or the students are doing. The teacher does not use new words or advanced language with students. The language used has little variety.

Ratings in the Middle Range. In this range, the teacher talks with students and shows some interest in students, but the conversations are limited and not prolonged. Usually, the teacher directs the conversations, although the conversations may focus on topics of interest to students. More often, there is a basic exchange of information but limited conversation. The teacher asks a mix of closed- and open-ended questions, although the closed-ended questions may require only short responses. Sometimes, the teacher extends students' responses or repeats what students say. Sometimes, the teacher maps his or her own actions and the students' actions through language and description. The teacher sometimes uses advanced language with students.

Ratings in the High Range. There are frequent conversations in the classroom, particularly between students and the teacher, and these conversations promote language use. Students are encouraged to converse and feel they are valued conversational partners. The teacher asks many open-ended questions that require students to communicate more complex ideas. The teacher often extends or repeats student responses. Frequently, the teacher maps his or her actions and student actions descriptively and uses advanced language with students.

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4−5

Instructional Dialogue captures the purposeful use of content-focused discussion among teachers and students that is cumulative, with the teacher supporting students to chain ideas together in ways that lead to deeper understanding of content. Students take an active role in these dialogues, and both the teacher and students use strategies that facilitate extended dialogue (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 97).

Table 15. Instructional Dialogue: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 7, Grades 4–5)

Instructional Dialogue School Average*: 5.6

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**
Number of Observations				1	3	1	2

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the school average is computed as: ([4 x 1] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 1] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 7 observations = 5.6

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, there are no or few discussions in the class, the discussions are not related to content or skill development, or the discussions contain only simple question-response exchanges between the teacher and students. The class is dominated by teacher talk, and discussion is limited. The teacher and students ask closed-ended questions; rarely acknowledge, report, or extend other students' comments; and/or appear disinterested in other students' comments, resulting in many students not being engaged in instructional dialogues.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At this range, there are occasional content-based discussions in class among teachers and students; however, these exchanges are brief or quickly move from one topic to another without follow-up questions or comments from the teacher and other students. The class is mostly dominated by teacher talk, although there are times when students take a more active role, or there are distributed dialogues that involve only a few students in the class. The teacher and students sometimes facilitate and encourage more elaborate dialogue, but such efforts are brief, inconsistent, or ineffective at consistently engaging students in extended dialogues.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, there are frequent, content-driven discussions in the class between teachers and students or among students. The discussions build depth of knowledge through cumulative, contingent exchanges. The class dialogues are distributed in a way that the teacher and the majority of students take an active role or students are actively engaged in instructional dialogues with each other. The teacher and students frequently use strategies that encourage more elaborate dialogue, such as open-ended questions, repetition or extension, and active listening. Students respond to these techniques by fully participating in extended dialogues.

Student Engagement

Student Engagement domain, Grades 4–5

Student Engagement refers to the extent to which all students in the class are focused and participating in the learning activity that is presented or facilitated by the teacher. The difference between passive engagement and active engagement is reflected in this rating (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 105).

Table 16. Student Engagement: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and School Average (*n* = 7, Grades 4–5)

Student Engagement School Average*: 5.6

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**
Number of Observations					3	4	

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the school average is computed as: ([5 x 3] + [6 x 4]) ÷ 7 observations = 5.6

Ratings in the Low Range. In the low range, the majority of students appear distracted or disengaged.

Ratings in the Middle Range. In the middle range, students are passively engaged, listening to or watching the teacher; student engagement is mixed, with the majority of students actively engaged for part of the time and disengaged for the rest of the time; or there is a mix of student engagement, with some students actively engaged and some students disengaged.

Ratings in the High Range. In the high range, most students are actively engaged in the classroom discussions and activities.

Summary of Average Ratings

**Table 17. Summary Table of Average Ratings for
Each Dimension in Classrooms, Grades Pre-K–3**

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		Average Scores*
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	
Emotional Support Domain	**1**	**1**	**3**	**8**	**9**	**14**	**16**	**5.5**
Positive Climate	1		1	2	3	5	1	4.9
Negative Climate**						4	9	6.7
Teacher Sensitivity			1	1	3	2	6	5.8
Regard for Student Perspectives		1	1	5	3	3		4.5
Classroom Organization Domain		**1**		**5**	**9**	**13**	**11**	**5.7**
Behavior Management		1		1	3	2	6	5.8
Productivity				1	3	5	4	5.9
Instructional Learning Formats				3	3	6	1	5.4
Instructional Support Domain		**6**	**13**	**4**	**8**	**7**	**1**	**4.0**
Concept Development		3	7	1	1	1		3.2
Quality of Feedback		2	2	2	3	3	1	4.5
Language Modeling		1	4	1	4	3		4.3

*The school average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the school average is computed as: ([1 x 1] + [3 x 1] + [4 x 2] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 5] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 13 observations = 4.9

**Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 4] + [7 x 9]) ÷ 13 observations = 6.7

**Table 18. Summary Table of Average Ratings for
Each Dimension in Classrooms, Grades 4–5**

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range		Average Scores*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Emotional Support Domain				2	4	9	6	**5.9**
Positive Climate				1	1	1	4	6.1
Teacher Sensitivity					1	4	2	6.1
Regard for Student Perspectives				1	2	4		5.4
Classroom Organization Domain					3	7	11	**6.4**
Behavior Management					3	2	2	5.9
Productivity						3	4	6.6
Negative Climate**						2	5	6.7
Instructional Support Domain			3	1	13	11	7	**5.5**
Instructional Learning Formats					3	4		5.6
Content Understanding			1		2	3	1	5.4
Analysis and Inquiry			1		4	2		5.0
Quality of Feedback			1		1	1	4	6.0
Instructional Dialogue				1	3	1	2	5.6
Student Engagement					3	4		**5.6**

*The school average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the school average is computed as: ([4 x 1] + [5 x 1] + [6 x 1] + [7 x 4]) ÷ 7 observations = 6.1

** Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 2] + [7 x 5]) ÷ 7 observations = 6.7

Sample Observations

Table 19. Sample Observation Comments for Each Dimension in Classrooms Grades Pre-K–3

Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Pre-K and K–3)	Sample Observation Comments
Emotional Support — Positive Climate ■ Relationships ■ Positive Affect ■ Positive Communication ■ Respect	■ Students sometimes share personal stories with teachers, such as talking about their families. Teachers are occasionally receptive to these conversations. ■ Teachers often join students in activities, but in some instances, remain distant. ■ Many teachers provide positive comments such as "thank you for being brave" and "I know you are going to be great" but do not always share these types of comments with most students.
Negative Climate ■ Negative Affect ■ Punitive Control ■ Sarcasm or Disrespect ■ Severe Negativity	■ In nearly all classrooms, there is no evidence of negative climate. ■ Teachers and students are not observed using harsh voices. ■ Teachers do not yell, punish, or physically control students. ■ Teachers and students are not sarcastic or disrespectful to each other.
Teacher Sensitivity ■ Awareness ■ Responsiveness ■ Addresses Problems ■ Student Comfort	■ Teachers are often aware of students' academic and emotional needs. For example, a teacher uses a very low whisper to talk to a student who was upset and asked if he felt like he needed another time out. ■ Teachers address problems quickly and effectively. ■ Teachers often acknowledge students' emotions, such as by saying, "That's okay," and pushing forward with the lesson if a student is unable to answer a question. ■ Students appear comfortable participating in classes. They frequently share their ideas and respond to the teachers.
Regard for Student Perspectives ■ Flexibility and Student Focus ■ Support for Autonomy and Leadership ■ Student Expression ■ Restriction of Movement	■ Students have some choice and autonomy, such as picking which classroom responsibility they would like. ■ There are some missed opportunities for flexibility, such as limiting the way students can complete an activity.

	Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Pre-K and K–3)	Sample Observation Comments
		- A few students have opportunities to lead an activity or pass out materials, but most students do not get these leadership opportunities. - Teachers occasionally ask students for their thoughts or ideas related to the lesson. At other times, the lesson is led entirely by the teacher, without the addition of student perspectives or ideas. - Teachers allow for some movement, such as when students get up to put things away. However, students are instructed to sit in "star position". In one situation a teacher moves a student's chair to be aligned with the table while the student is sitting in it in an effort to engage the student.
Classroom Organization	**Behavior Management** ■ Clear Behavior Expectations ■ Proactive ■ Redirection of Misbehavior ■ Student Behavior	- Teachers have consistent and clear expectations for behavior. - In a few instances of misbehavior, teachers resort to reactive strategies to redirect students. - Teachers frequently redirect misbehavior using subtle clues, such as holding a finger to the mouth and calling attention to the positive. - Students exhibit only minor instances of misbehavior.
	Productivity ■ Maximizing Learning Time ■ Routines ■ Transitions ■ Preparation	- Teachers maximize learning time by having activities for students to do the entire time. - Transitions between activities are brief. - Students know what to do during transitions, and there is no wandering. - Teachers have materials ready and accessible. - Students do not lose learning time while teachers complete managerial tasks (e.g., taking attendance, passing out worksheets). - Teachers offer students a choice of activities to do if they finish the main lesson or activity early (e.g., reading a book once they finish the worksheet). - In a few classrooms, instructional time is lost because of behavior management (e.g., "I am waiting for all eyes to be on me").

	Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Pre-K and K–3)	Sample Observation Comments
	Instructional Learning Formats ▪ Effective Facilitation ▪ Variety of Modalities and Materials ▪ Student Interest ▪ Clarity of Learning Objectives	▪ Teachers often actively facilitate activities to encourage interest, but primarily ask rote, closed-ended questions. ▪ Teachers often use multiple modalities and materials; however, they occasionally rely on non-hands-on modalities, such as lectures or presentations. ▪ The majority of students are engaged some of the time, but there are periods when their interest wanes. ▪ Teachers often use advanced organizers and explain the learning objectives. ▪ Teachers occasionally explain connections to previous lessons.
Instructional Support	Concept Development ▪ Analysis and Reasoning ▪ Creating ▪ Integration ▪ Connections to the Real World	▪ Students have few opportunities for analysis and reasoning. Teachers frequently ask how and why questions; however, they do not often require higher order thinking. ▪ Students have occasional opportunities to brainstorm or create, but these are brief or involve only a few students. ▪ Teachers sometimes connect concepts to each other and to previous learning (e.g., "Remember when we learned this last week?"). ▪ Teachers occasionally, but not consistently, relate concepts to students' lives.
	Quality of Feedback ▪ Scaffolding ▪ Feedback Loops ▪ Prompting Thought Processes ▪ Providing Information ▪ Encouragement and Affirmation	▪ Teachers frequently provide hints and scaffold, such as repeating a student's response or helping a student sound out a word while reading. However, at times, teachers just move on when a student does not have an answer. ▪ Teachers use some feedback loops, but these are abbreviated or do not involve most students. ▪ Teachers occasionally prompt thought processes, such as asking students to explain their thinking. ▪ Teachers occasionally provide additional information that expands students' understanding. ▪ Teachers consistently offer students encouragement to increase their involvement in the lesson. Teachers often make comments such as "I can see that [Name] is ready to learn" or "I love how she gave evidence from the text there."

Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Pre-K and K–3)	Sample Observation Comments
Language Modeling ■ Frequent Conversations ■ Open-Ended Questions ■ Repetition and Extension ■ Self- and Parallel Talk ■ Advanced Language	■ There are a mix of conversations in the classrooms. ■ Teachers ask closed-ended and open-ended questions. ■ Teachers sometimes repeat or extend student responses. ■ Teachers occasionally map the actions of themselves or the students using language or descriptions that help students connect words to actions. ■ Teachers sometimes use a variety of words and occasionally introduce synonyms to students to clarify misunderstandings.

Table 20. Sample Observation Comments for Each Dimension in Classrooms Grades 4–5

	Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Upper Elementary)	Sample Observation Comments
Emotional Support	Positive Climate • Relationships • Positive Affect • Positive Communications • Respect	▪ Teachers and students share supportive relationships with one another. They are often in close proximity with one another and appear interested in spending time with one another. ▪ Students often engage in social conversations with one another and support one another when a student is struggling. ▪ The classroom is a positive place to be with laughter, smiling, and enthusiasm. ▪ Teachers frequently make positive comments ("You're doing great," "You did an awesome job today," "Excellent") and positive gestures (high fives, pat on the back) to the majority of students. ▪ Teachers occasionally communicate positive expectations. ▪ Teachers and students are respectful to one another: They use respectful language ("please" and "thank you"), listen when another person is speaking, and work collaboratively with one another.
	Teacher Sensitivity • Awareness • Responsiveness to Academic and Social-Emotional Needs and Cues • Effectiveness in Addressing Problems • Student Comfort	▪ Teachers consistently monitor the classroom, walking around and checking in with students to see if anyone needs additional support. For example, during a small group activity the teacher moves around the classroom and asks each group "How are we doing?" ▪ Teachers frequently notice if multiple students are having trouble with a particular activity and review that problem as a group to make sure everyone understands. ▪ Teachers often anticipate problems. For example, teachers may tell the students, "This problem is a little tricky," in advance of them struggling with the problem. ▪ Students reach out to the teacher when they are struggling, and teachers often effectively address questions. Teachers often follow up with students to make sure they do not have any more questions.

	Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Upper Elementary)	Sample Observation Comments
	Regard for Student Perspectives ▪ Flexibility and Student Focus ▪ Connections to Current Life ▪ Support for Autonomy and Leadership ▪ Meaningful Peer Interactions	▪ Activities are often teacher led, however students are often asked to share their ideas with the class (e.g., A teacher leads a lesson at the rug and provides opportunities for students to respond to questions or make comments in front of their peers). ▪ Teachers sometimes make meaningful connections to the daily lives of students, but these are often quick connections that are not discussed. ▪ Teachers sometimes attempt to show students the value of the lessons as they relate to their lives. ▪ Students occasionally have some choices within assignments or in the ways they can complete tasks. For example, students may have the opportunity to select the task with which they would like to start. ▪ There are some opportunities for student leadership. For example, one group of students has the opportunity to stand at the board and explain how they solved a math problem. ▪ Students are often encouraged to work together, but these interactions do not always add meaning to the lesson and occasionally result in social conversation.
Classroom Organization	Behavior Management ▪ Clear Expectations ▪ Proactive ▪ Effective Redirection of Misbehavior ▪ Student Behavior	▪ Most teachers set clear behavior expectations before the start of an activity, asking student to use "indoor voices" and to "raise your hand if you have a question." ▪ Teachers frequently monitor the classroom and intervene before any problems occur. ▪ Teachers often note positive examples of behavior (e.g., "I love the way you are all sitting quietly and listening"). ▪ Teachers often use subtle cues to regain students' attention (e.g., eye contact, touch, physical proximity, using students' names, saying "track [Name]"). ▪ Students are often well behaved. Any behavioral disruptions are very brief and do not take away from instructional time.

	Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Upper Elementary)	Sample Observation Comments
	Productivity ▪ Maximizing Learning Time ▪ Routines ▪ Transitions ▪ Preparation	▪ Students have tasks to do throughout the whole observation. Students who finish early are given additional materials to work on. ▪ No time is lost on teachers completing managerial tasks. ▪ Students have clear instructions and know what they should be doing. There is little or no wandering in the classroom. ▪ Teachers provide time cues for transitions (e.g., "You have 30 seconds to turn in your packet and return to your desk"), and no instructional time is lost. ▪ Teachers are prepared for the lessons and have all materials out and easily accessible. ▪ In a few classrooms, instructional time is lost because of behavior management issues (e.g., the teacher says "I'll wait" when a student is talking out of turn and halts the class for a moment before resuming instruction).
	Negative Climate ▪ Negative Affect ▪ Punitive Control ▪ Disrespect	▪ In nearly all classrooms, there is no evidence of negative climate. ▪ Teachers and students are not observed using harsh voices. ▪ Teachers do not yell, punish, or physically control students. ▪ Teachers and students are not sarcastic or disrespectful to each other.
Instructional Support	Instructional Learning Formats ▪ Learning Targets and Organization ▪ Variety of Modalities, Strategies, and Materials ▪ Active Facilitation ▪ Effective Engagement	▪ Teachers often review learning targets or "objectives" before an activity begins, often reviewing once again during the activity. ▪ Teachers often use different modalities, instructional strategies, and materials to present information. ▪ Teachers are active facilitators. They often ask questions, scaffold, and extend student learning. Teachers appear interested in both the material and the students. ▪ Students interest is often high with most students remaining focused on the activity throughout the observation. For example, during one small group activity students remain engaged and focused on the content of the activity both during times of direct supervision and when the teacher is occupied helping other groups.

Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Upper Elementary)	Sample Observation Comments
Content Understanding ■ Depth of Understanding ■ Communication of Concepts and Procedures ■ Background Knowledge and Misconceptions ■ Transmission of Content Knowledge and Procedures ■ Opportunity for Practice of Procedures and Skills	■ Teachers sometimes focus the lesson on meaningful relationships of concepts, but sometimes the lesson is based on discrete bits of information. ■ Sometimes, teachers help students understand how to apply the lesson to real life events. ■ Teachers occasionally present essential components of procedures and skills. However, teachers do not always explain the conditions for how and when to use these components. ■ Sometimes, teachers attempt to utilize students' background information in lessons. ■ Most teachers are able to rephrase content for students who are struggling to understand the content. ■ Teachers often give students time for guided practice and offer feedback to students while they practice the skills and procedures learned.
Analysis and Inquiry ■ Facilitation of Higher Order Thinking ■ Opportunities for Novel Application ■ Metacognition	■ Teachers occasionally provide opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking. For example, students have brief opportunities to examine, analyze, or interpret information, or they are asked to solve problems that the teacher identifies for them. For example, students are asked what they can infer when analyzing text in an ELA class. ■ In most classrooms, students have at least some opportunities to solve problems without teacher supervision whether this be in the form of individual work, "turn and talk," or small group work. ■ Teachers often ask student to provide explanations for how they found an answer. Teachers ask questions such as: "What can we infer?" "Why?" and "Can you explain to me why you think that's important?"
Quality of Feedback ■ Feedback Loops ■ Scaffolding ■ Building on Student Responses ■ Encouragement and Affirmation	■ Teachers engage in frequent back-and-forth exchanges with students that encourage student engagement with the materials and deepen student understanding. For example, during a small group activity, students work together to solve word problems and engage in constant back-and forth exchanges with one another and the teacher.

Dimensions and Indicators (CLASS Upper Elementary)	Sample Observation Comments
	- Teachers often provide students with hints and assistance to help get them thinking in the right direction. - Teachers occasionally build on initial student responses and give specific feedback. - Teachers often encourage students' persistence by making comments such as, "Keep going," "You can do it," and "I love it, you're working hard!" These interactions result in higher student motivation and promote persistence.
Instructional Dialogue - Cumulative Content-Driven Exchanges - Distributed Talk - Facilitation Strategies	- There are frequent conversations between teachers and students, and between peers. These are usually meaningful conversations tied to content. - There is a balance of teacher and student talk in the classrooms. Students are provided with the opportunity to ask questions and make comments. The majority of students are involved in these discussions. - Teachers often ask open-ended questions and frequently make statements to which students can respond. - Teachers often repeat student answers, however; some teacher do not extend on these answers and move on. - Teachers and students actively listen to and engage with the speaker.
Student Engagement Active Engagement	- Most students are engaged in the lesson. Students are making eye contact, responding to teachers' questions, volunteering information, sharing their ideas, and working with materials. - Most students appear to be focused and on task.

References

Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). *Measuring and improving teacher-student interactions in PK–12 settings to enhance students' learning.* Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia. Retrieved from http://www.teachstone.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/class-mtp-pk-12-brief.pdf

MET Project. (2010). *The CLASS protocol for classroom observations.* Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from http://metproject.org/resources/CLASS_10_29_10.pdf

Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Mintz, S. (2012). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Upper Elementary.* Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.

Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, K–3.* Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Manual, Pre-K.* Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.