




UNDERSTANDING AND ASSESSING QUALITY IN PARTNER PROGRAMS

High-quality instructional practice at the classroom or program level is fundamental to building student success skills. In Washington’s classrooms, high-quality practice is largely defined by the teacher evaluation frameworks authorized by the State’s Teacher and Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP) – Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching, the 5D+ Framework from the Center for Educational Leadership and the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model. In youth programs, quality is defined by the Center for Youth Program Quality’s Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA). The common themes within these frameworks represent broad agreement on what constitutes a high-quality learning environment for young people.

CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGH-QUALITY INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE

The Center for Youth Program Quality’s “Pyramid of Program Quality” (pictured below) loosely parallels Maslow’s hierarchy of needs.¹ The pyramid provides a way to think about the complex job of a classroom teacher or youth development professional. In addition, this approach offers a common language for those who work with young people to engage in meaningful dialogue about how to create productive learning environments. This document uses Youth PQA pyramid as an organizing principle for our discussion of high-quality practice both in and out of school. For a more detailed breakdown of how YPQA indicators correspond to elements of the TPEP frameworks, see *Figure 1*.



© Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality

¹ Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–96. Retrieved from <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Maslow/motivation.htm>



- **Safe Environment** – The safety of young people is necessary if they are to have an opportunity to learn. Safety is important in all of its aspects: physical, emotional and psychological. The Youth PQA assesses physical and emotional safety and includes indicators aimed at reducing bias in programs. One of the basic criteria in Washington State’s TPEP (detailed in all three evaluation frameworks) is that teachers foster safe, positive learning environments.
- **Supportive Environment** – Supportive environments provide students with opportunities to meet and overcome challenges. When adults consistently offer encouragement rather than praise, they can help young people to develop a growth mindset. Supportive environments also recognize and address the social and emotional challenges that students face in school or in youth programs. All three teaching frameworks and the Youth PQA promote individualized instruction, and the establishment of classroom and program environments that respect students’ cultures, values, and diverse learning needs.
- **Interaction** – Young people, like all people, need to experience positive relationships with adults and peers. When they feel alienated, young people are more likely to seek out unhealthy or unsafe relationships in their search for connection. Developing exciting, challenging, and purposeful opportunities for young people to learn and interact with each other inside and outside of school will increase their capacity to learn and grow. The Youth PQA details expectations for building peer-to-peer and youth-to-adult relationships in programs. Teacher quality frameworks outline practices that build mutual respect and rapport (Danielson), and teach conversation and inquiry techniques that deepen understanding (5D+, Marzano).
- **Youth Engagement** – When young people feel safe and experience a sense of belonging, this enables them to experience challenge and deepen their learning. Youth engagement is at the top of the Youth PQA pyramid and consists of two main ideas: voice and choice in programming at all levels and opportunities to set goals, make plans, and to reflect on experiences. All of the teacher quality frameworks approved by OSPI incorporate student engagement in learning as an outcome of effective instructional practice. The 5D+ framework integrates student voice and choice into both instruction and assessment domains. The Marzano framework makes student engagement a component of effective teaching practice. The Danielson framework describes a learning culture in which students are highly engaged, and take responsibility for their own and others’ learning.


Taken together, the classroom practice and evaluation frameworks above define a way of working with young people that is essential for their growth, development and success, regardless of the specific content being taught. Research suggests that programs that reach the higher domains of the quality pyramid (positive interaction and engagement) can have significant positive effects on youth outcomes.²

ASSESSMENT AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

² Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P. & Pachan, M. K. (2010). A meta-analysis of afterschool programs that seek to promote personal and social skills in children and adolescents. *American Journal Community Psychology*, 16, 294-309. doi: 10.1007/s10464-010-9300-6.



The frameworks described above both define quality practice and provide a means of assessing it and improving it. While TPEP focuses on the teacher and the principal as the object of evaluation, the YPQA focuses on the program environment as a whole. We believe that all of the tools described here should be used in the context of a continuous improvement system as shown below:



© Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality

Just as TPEP has components related to professional growth and development, the YPQA improvement system includes not only assessments but aligned trainings that can be used for professional development for youth workers, with the ultimate goal of improving outcomes for students.

FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT YOUTH PROGRAM QUALITY:

- **School's Out Washington** - <http://schoolsoutwashington.org/>
School's Out Washington supports implementation of the Youth Program Quality Intervention across Washington State by offering training and technical assistance.
- **David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality** - <http://cypq.org/>
The Weikart Center, in conjunction with stakeholders around the country including partners in Washington State, developed the Youth PQA to assess, plan, and improve program environments for young people.

FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT TEACHER EVALUATION FRAMEWORKS:

- **Center for Educational Leadership's 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric** – <http://www.k12-leadership.org/>
Developed by the Center for Educational Leadership at the University of Washington, the 5D+ rubric is based on the 5 Dimensions of teaching and learning: purpose, student engagement, curriculum and pedagogy, assessment, and environment and culture.
- **Danielson's Framework for Teaching** - <http://www.danielsongroup.org/>
The Danielson framework is based on a constructivist approach to teaching and learning, and is used by many districts locally for evaluation and professional development.
- **Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model** - <http://www.marzanoevaluation.com/>
The Marzano framework explicitly aligns teacher practice with student growth. Also includes a leadership component.

Created by Youth Development Executives of King County (2010-2023) for public use



- **Washington State Teacher/Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP)** - <http://tpep-wa.org/>
Washington State's resource for teacher and principal evaluation process. TPEP specifies broad evaluation criteria and recommends evaluation tools for school districts to use.

FIGURE 1: QUALITY FRAMEWORKS COMPARISON MATRIX

This matrix uses four program domains and three organizational domains of the Program Quality Assessment (PQA) to highlight key similarities between the quality assessment tool most commonly used in partner programs and the teacher quality assessments used in Washington State. Understanding these elements of common practice can help partners to collaborate more effectively.

I. BASED ON YOUTH PROGRAM QUALITY ASSESSMENT, FORM A: PROGRAM OFFERINGS

Program Quality Assessment (PQA)	Danielson Framework for Teaching	5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric	Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model
Safe Environment (Washington State Criteria 5: Fostering and Managing a Safe, Positive Learning Environment)			
Accommodating Environment: Space is sufficient and suitable for program activities, flexible, and contains enough furniture for participants.	Organizing Physical Space: Classroom is inviting, accessible, and arranged in a way that is suitable for learning activities (2e).	Use of Physical Environment-Arrangement of Classroom: Environment is safe, and is arranged to support student learning (CEC1).	Organizing the Physical Layout of the Classroom: Classroom is organized to facilitate movement and focus on learning (Domain 1, Element 5).
Emotional Safety: Staff models and promotes a positive emotional climate; program environment is free of bias.	Environment of Respect and Rapport: Teachers' interactions with students, and students' interactions with one another are respectful (2a). Managing Student Behavior: Expectations for student conduct are clear and consistently implemented (2d).	Classroom Culture, Norms for Learning: Classroom norms are evident and encourage risk taking, collaboration, and respect for divergent thinking and for student culture (CEC7).	Establishing and Maintaining Classroom Rules and Procedures: Teacher reviews expectations regarding rules and procedures to ensure their effective execution (Domain 1, Element 4). Acknowledging Adherence to Rules and Procedures: Noticing and responding to violations (Domain 1, Elements 33-35).
Supportive Environment			
Warm Welcome: Staff are friendly, respectful, and greet all participants by name when they arrive.	Environment of Respect and Rapport: Teachers' interactions with students, and students' interactions with one another are respectful (2a).	Use of Classroom Environment-Accessibility and Use of Materials: Materials are accessible and intentionally used to support learning (CEC2).	Using Verbal and Nonverbal Behaviors that Indicate Affection for Students: Teachers convey interest and care for students (Domain 1, Element 37).
Session Flow: Session flow is planned, presented, and paced for youth. Materials are readily available, time is adequate, and activities are clearly explained.	Managing Classroom Procedures: Routines and procedures are seamless; students take initiative in handling materials and transitions (2c). Engaging Students in Learning: Activities, assignments and grouping strategies support active engagement in learning; materials are appropriate to learning objectives; lesson is structured and paced to promote student enthusiasm, interest, thinking and problem-solving; teacher invites students to reflect (3c).	Classroom Routines and Rituals, Use of Learning Time: Transitions are student-managed, efficient, and maximize instructional time (CEC4).	Planning and Preparing for Lessons and Units: Lessons are planned and prepared to effectively convey content and understanding (Domain 2, Elements 1-3).
Encouragement: Staff supports participants with encouragement, using non-evaluative language and open-ended questions.		Intellectual Work, Quality of Questioning: Teacher asks questions to probe for deeper understanding; teacher assists students in clarifying their thinking with one another (SE1).	Helping Students Elaborate on New Information: Teachers asks questions that require elaboration beyond what was explicitly taught (Domain 1, Element 11).
Active Engagement: Activities support active engagement, balancing concrete experiences with abstract learning; participants have opportunities to reflect on learning.		Engagement Strategies, Support for Participation and Meaning Making: Variety of strategies and structures support participation and meaning making for students; routines are often student-led (SE5).	Lesson Segments Addressing Content: Organizing students to integrate new content, deepen their understanding through active engagement, and reflect upon and refine their learning (Domain 1, Elements 6-23).

Skill-Building: Staff makes skill-building focus clear to youth, supports skill development by modeling, scaffolding, and encouraging effort.	Setting Instructional Outcomes: Learning outcomes are clear, represent high-level learning, and are differentiated to student needs (1c).	Scaffolds for Learning, Scaffolds the Task: Teacher supports the development of targeted concepts or skills (CP6).	Providing Clear Learning Goals and Scales: Students are aware of learning goals and their own progress toward meeting them (Domain 1, Element 1).
Reframing Conflict: Staff use youth-centered approaches to reframe conflict, seeking input from those involved and helping youth to generate solutions.	Managing Student Behavior: Students actively monitor their own behavior; response to misbehavior respects students' needs and dignity (2d).	Classroom Routines and Rituals, Discussion, Managing Student Behavior: Students manage themselves; teachers handle student misbehavior according to established routines (CEC5).	Establishing and Maintaining Classroom Rules and Procedures: Students follow clear routines and manage own behavior (Domain 1, Element 4). Acknowledging Adherence to Rules and Procedures: Noticing and responding to violations (Domain 1, Elements 33-35).
Interaction			
Belonging: Participants have opportunities to develop a sense of belonging (e.g. structured opportunities to get to know and appreciate one another); behavior is inclusive.	Environment of Respect and Rapport: Teachers' interactions with students, and students' interactions with one another are respectful (2a).	Classroom Routines and Rituals, Discussion, Collaboration, and Accountability: There are routines for discussion and collaborative work; students take ownership of their learning and support the learning of others (CEC3).	Understanding Students' Interests and Backgrounds: Teacher knowledge of students' interests produces a climate of acceptance and community (Domain 1, Element 36).
Collaboration: Participants have opportunities to work toward shared goals in teams or groups with interdependent roles.	Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques: High-level discussion is promoted; students formulate questions, initiate topics, and challenge one another's thinking (3b). Engaging Students in Learning: Activities, assignments and grouping strategies support active engagement in learning; students initiate learning; students may serve as resources for one another (3c).		Classroom Culture, Student Status: Patterns of interaction indicate all are valued; teacher creates opportunities for student status to be elevated (CEC6).
Leadership: Participants have opportunities to act as group facilitators and mentors.		Scaffolds for Learning, Gradual Release of Responsibility: Teacher uses strategies to gradually release responsibility to students (CP7).	Demonstrating High Expectations: Ensuring all students participate by valuing and actively involving "low expectancy" students (Domain 1, Elements 39-41).
Adult Partners: Youth have opportunities to partner with adults; responsibility is shared.			
Engagement			
Planning: Participants have multiple opportunities to plan projects or activities.	Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness: Teacher enhances student learning by building on student interests and addressing student needs (3e).	Intellectual Work, Ownership of Learning: Teacher provides student with opportunities and strategies for students to take ownership of their learning (SE2).	Engagement of Students: Teacher uses multiple strategies to promote active engagement in students (Domain 1, Elements 24-32).
Choice: Participants have opportunities to make content and process choices based on their interests.			
Reflection: Staff provides structured opportunities to intentionally reflect on experiences and provide feedback on program activities.	Using Assessment in Instruction: Assessment is fully integrated into instruction; students contribute to criteria and have opportunities to reflect on their own learning (3d).	Self-Assessment of Learning: Students consistently assess their own learning and understand where they are in reference to learning targets (A1).	Reviewing Content: Teacher engages students in review of content (Domain 1, Element 14).

II. BASED ON YOUTH PROGRAM QUALITY ASSESSMENT, FORM B: ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

Program Quality Assessment (PQA)	Danielson Framework for Teaching	5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric	Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model
Cultural Competency and Responsiveness (Washington State Criteria 3: Differentiating to Meet Individual Student Learning Needs)			
There are policies and practices in place that are directly related to making programs welcoming and accessible to all youth and families.	Demonstrating Knowledge of Students: Teacher is aware of students' linguistic and cultural heritage and uses knowledge to plan instruction; teacher participates in community cultural events; teacher provides opportunities for families to share their heritage (1b).	Teaching Point(s) are Based on Student Learning Needs: Teacher bases teaching points on the learning needs – academic background, life experiences, culture, and language – for groups of students and individual students (P3). Engagement Strategies that Capitalize on the Learning Needs of Students: Teachers build on the learning needs of students – academic background, life experiences, culture, and language – for groups of students and individual students (SE4).	Understanding Students' Interests and Backgrounds: Teacher uses knowledge of students' interests and backgrounds to produce a climate of acceptance and community (Domain 1, Element 36). Planning and Preparing for Special Needs of Students: Including language and learning needs (Domain 2, Elements 6-9). Providing Students with Opportunities to Talk about Themselves: Students have opportunities to relate what is being taught in class to their personal interests (Domain 1, Element 31).
Staff know and understand the cultures of participating youth and are responsive to cultural needs, interests, feelings and abilities.			
All participants are encouraged to share about their family culture and are provided with opportunities to learn more through a variety of activities.			
Assessment, Planning, and Improvement (Washington State Criteria 6: Using Data Elements to Improve Instruction)			
The organization employs strategies for program improvement based on data and shares evaluation data with stakeholders.	Designing Student Assessments: Teacher has an assessment plan that includes authentic, formative assessment; students are actively involved in designing assessments and collecting information (1f). Reflecting on Teaching: Teacher assesses lesson effectiveness and makes adjustments based on assessment (4a).	Teacher Use of Formative Assessment Data: Data is used to make adjustments, modify future lessons, and give targeted feedback (A6). Collection Systems for Formative Assessment Data: Teacher has a system and routines for collecting and recording data from multiple sources (A4).	Identifying Strengths and Weaknesses in Practice, and Evaluating Effectiveness: Identifies strengths and weaknesses and evaluates the effectiveness of lessons and strategies on certain groups of students (Domain 3, Elements 1-3). Developing and Implementing a Professional Growth and Development Plan: The teacher develops a plan with goals, action steps, and timelines (Domain 3, Elements 4-5).
The organization formally solicits feedback from multiple types of stakeholders.			
Program has a systematic and standardized way of collecting data and using it for quality improvement.			
Family, School, and Community Connections (Washington State Criteria 7: Communicating and Collaborating with Parents and the School Community)			
Program engages families in the planning, implementation, management, evaluation, and/or improvement of the program.	Communicating with Families: There is frequent two-way communication with families and opportunities for families to engage in the learning process (4c).	Communication and Collaboration, Parents and Guardians: There is frequent 2-way communication on student needs, goals, and progress (PCC3).	Promoting Positive Interactions about Students and Parents: Teacher fosters positive home-school relationships through positive interaction with parents (Domain 4, Element 2).
There is regular communication with schools and other organizations involved with youth to better coordinate supports.	Participating in the Professional Community: Teachers collaborate with colleagues to share and plan for student success (4d).	Professional and Collegial Relationships: Teacher sustains relationships for the purposes of student, staff, or district growth (PCC 2).	Mentoring Other Teachers and Sharing Ideas and Strategies: Collaborating to support professional growth and student learning (Domain 4, Element 4).

III. NOTES ON QUALITY FRAMEWORKS

For more information about Washington’s Teacher and Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP), see <http://tpep-wa.org/>. For more information on the quality frameworks highlighted in this document (descriptions from the websites listed):

Program Quality Assessment

The PQA is a research validated instrument designed to assess the quality of youth programs for the purposes of accountability, evaluation, and program improvement. The instrument has been used in a wide variety of settings including after-school, community-based, camp, drop-in, and mentoring programs. The PQA is both an evaluation tool and a learning tool. The PQA is currently being used nationally in numerous state-wide and county-wide accountability, evaluation, and improvement systems.

<http://www.cypq.org/downloadpqa>

Pursuant to RCW 28A.405.100, the school districts in Washington must adopt one of the three frameworks below:

The Framework for Teaching by Charlotte Danielson

The Framework for Teaching identifies those aspects of a teacher’s responsibilities that have been documented through empirical studies and theoretical research as promoting improved student learning. The Framework Consists of 4 Domains – Planning and Preparation, The Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities – which are divided into 22 components. While the Framework is not the only possible description of practice, these responsibilities seek to define what teachers should know and be able to do in the exercise of their profession.

<http://tpep-wa.org/resources/instructional-frameworks/danielson-framework/> or <https://www.danielsongroup.org/framework/>

Center for Educational Leadership 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric

The 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric is based on the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning (5D) instructional framework, which is derived from an extensive study of research on the core elements that constitute quality instruction. These core elements have been incorporated into the 5D framework and 5D+ rubric as five dimensions – Purpose (P), Student Engagement (SE), Curriculum & Pedagogy (CP), Assessment for Student Learning (A), and Classroom Environment & Culture (CEC) – which are divided into 13 subdimensions. The 5D+ rubric also includes Professional Collaboration and Communication, which is based on activities and relationships that teachers engage in outside of classroom instruction.

<http://tpep-wa.org/resources/instructional-frameworks/uwcel-5d/> or <https://www.k-12leadership.org/content/service/5-dimensions-of-teaching-and-learning>

Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model

The Marzano model describes a set of practices that have been shown to affect student outcomes. The model consists of four domains – Classroom Strategies and Behaviors, Planning and Preparing, Reflecting on Teaching, and Collegiality and Professionalism – and 60 elements that build upon one another. A defining characteristic of the model is its unique granular approach that allows for specific feedback to teachers and specific guidance to teachers that can be provided by administrators and instructional coaches. Finally, the model is designed to help teachers systematically improve on weakness in their instructional practices over an extended period of time.

http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/Marzano_Teacher_Evaluation_Model.pdf or <http://www.marzanoevaluation.com/>