



November 29, 2016

Jason Andrian, Board Chair
Achievement Prep Public Charter School – Wahler Place Middle School
908 Wahler Place SE
Washington, DC 20032

Dear Mr. Andrian:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, DC PCSB shall monitor the progress of each school in meeting the goals and student academic achievement expectations specified in the school's charter. Your school was selected to undergo a Qualitative Site Review during the 2016-17 school year for the following reason:

- School eligible for 10-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Achievement Prep Public Charter School – Wahler Place Middle School between September 26, 2016 through October 7, 2016. Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report focuses primarily on the following areas: charter mission and goals, classroom environments, and instructional delivery.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at Achievement Prep Public Charter School– Wahler Place Middle School.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Naomi DeVeaux.

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: School Leader

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: November 29, 2016

Reason for visit: School eligible for 10-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year

Campus Information

Campus Name: Achievement Prep Public Charter School – Wahler Place Middle School

Ward: 8

Grade levels: 4-8

Total enrollment: 469

Students with Disabilities enrollment: 82

English Language Learners enrollment: 0

Quality Site Visit Information

Two-week window: September 26, 2016- October 7, 2016

QSR team members: 2 DC PCSB staff including 1 special education specialist, 2 consultants

Number of observations: 23

In-seat attendance during the two-week window:

Visit 1: September 27, 2016- 95.1%

Visit 2: September 29, 2016- 95.5%

Visit 3: October 3, 2016- 93.8%

Visit 4: October 4, 2016-95.3%

Summary

The mission of Achievement Prep- Wahler Place Middle School is to prepare students in grades four through eight to excel as high achieving scholars and leaders in high school, college and beyond and the school chose to use the Performance Management Framework as its goals and student academic achievement expectations.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching to examine classroom environments and instruction delivery (see Appendix I). The QSR team scored 51% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. This highest rated component was Creating and Environment of Respect and Rapport with 53% distinguished or proficient. In these observations students and teachers demonstrated respect for each other by actively listening, inquiring about each other's well being and caring for their classrooms. The lowest rated component was Managing Student Behavior with 39% of these observations rated as proficient. Student misbehavior was a school-wide problem with only a few teachers successfully managing their classrooms.

The QSR team scored 38% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The highest rated component was Using Assessment in Instruction with 45% of observations rated proficient. In these classes teacher assessed student knowledge through individual questioning and by walked around during student work time giving students immediate feedback. However 32% of observations also received an unsatisfactory score in the same component. The lowest rated component was Using Questioning and Discussion techniques with only 29% of observations rated as proficient. Observers saw little use of high-level or open-ended questions within the learning environment. Additionally there was no evidence of academic discussion between students.

A DC PCSB staff member joined the Achievement Board of Trustees meeting in person on November 2, 2016. Several members of the board and staff were present, including Shantelle Wright, Nikki Diamantes, Barbara Nolphin, Jason Andrean and Maia Blankenship. They also welcomed two new board members: Harlyn Pacheco and Stephanie Oliveras. The focus of the meeting was the school's PARCC performance and the impact on the school's PMF ranking. They also analyzed the school's PARCC scores relative to the city, other charters and other schools in Ward 8. The staff discussed in detail its plans for improving PARCC scores and its PMF ranking for Achievement Prep students going forward. The board transitioned into Executive Session after the meeting.

Prior to the two-week window, Achievement Prep PCS–Middle provided answers to specific questions posed by DC PCSB regarding the provision of instruction to students with disabilities. The reviewed who conducted special education-specific observations noted the following evidence:

- Based on the special education questionnaire, the reviewer expected to see the following differentiation strategies in action during the observation: ongoing formative assessments, recognition of diverse learners, group work, and problem solving. The observer saw group work in pull-out sessions however there was limited evidence that these small groups allowed students to engage with each other. The observer saw limited evidence of ongoing formative assessments with the exception of individual feedback in small groups. There was no evidence of problem solving.
- The school described using the following types of resources to support the learning of students with disabilities in the general education classrooms: math manipulatives, access to leveled texts, and use of assistive technology devices. In the general education classrooms, the observer did not see the use of math manipulates or assistive-technology and only a handful of classes had leveled libraries.

- Student-teacher relationships differed from the inclusion classrooms to the small group pull-out sessions. In the pull-out observations students and teachers sat in close proximity to each other and generally had respectful and warm interactions. In small groups students demonstrated higher level of commitment and teachers pushed students to do their best. Teacher-student interactions in inclusion settings lacked warmth or the level of rapport typically necessary to gain student buy-in.
- The questionnaire stated that special education teachers and general education teachers collaborate. Students in pull-out sessions worked on the same assignments as grade-level classrooms however in inclusion settings special education teachers were minimally involved in content delivery.

CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

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

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>Mission: Achievement Preparatory Academy prepares students in grades four through eight to excel as high achieving scholars and leaders in high school, college and beyond.</p>	<p>The QSR team saw mixed evidence that the school is meeting its mission. To build a culture of excellence, students at Achievement Prep are referred to as scholars, but observers did not hear this consistently in all classrooms and grade levels. However the team observed other culture-building strategies. In some observations students could earn a PhD, Masters, or Bachelor’s degree based on mastery of skills. In a few observations teachers gave classroom DREAM (determination, respect, enthusiasm, accountability, mastery) scores. Observers heard some teachers refer to cohorts of students as college names such as Howard University and Bennett College. In one grade level teachers referred to pay checks students could earn for being prepared and</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>completing learning tasks.</p> <p>As described later in this report, the QSR team scored 38% of observations as proficient or distinguished in the Instruction domain. In many observations students had their heads down on desks or participated in off task behaviors without teacher intervention. Learning activities consisted primarily of whole class instruction with little differentiation. In most observations questioning was of the recall type and there was no evidence of student discussion about the content. In two observations teachers were not prepared to deliver lessons (i.e. they didn't know the answers to questions, or couldn't remember the page they left off with in their book) that led to content errors and classroom management issues.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator #1: Student Progress – Academic Improvement over time</p>	<p>The QSR team observed mixed evidence of effective instruction. Student engagement in many observations was lacking. In some observations students with completed work sat quietly without additional direction and students without completed work sat with their heads down on the desks. Teachers primarily asked low-level questions with one correct response and did not facilitate discussions.</p> <p>There were pockets of effective instruction. In two English classes students read grade-appropriate novels. In one observation the teacher integrated high-level vocabulary by effectively modeling how to use context clues. In the other the teacher engaged students in a game of “name that emotion” as they began to talk about determining unstated character traits in text.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards</p>	<p>The QSR team saw mixed evidence that students are moving to proficient and</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>advanced levels of academic achievement. Many classrooms have PhD, Masters, and Bachelors boards to indicate student mastery of material. Some classrooms had reading and math strategies posted but these were rarely referenced during observations.</p> <p>Some reading teachers asked students to site evidence from the reading to justify answers or to explain their thinking on grade-appropriate texts. In many observations however teachers assigned handouts to be completed individually or in pairs with little explanation of content or assessment of learning. Observers documented students waiting for the teacher to give direction while classmates distracted the learning process. The majority of learning activities in both reading and math appeared to lack rigor, opportunity for student collaboration, and high-interest content for the age group being served.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator#3: Gateway – Outcomes in key subjects that predict future educational success</p>	<p>The QSR team limited their observations to 8th grade math instruction for the purposes of this indicator, given that grades served by the campus span forth through eighth grade.</p> <p>The QSR team did not see consistent, high-quality math instruction. One math teacher had a strong observation – every student was cognitively engaged and the teacher provided clear explanations and direct, specific feedback to students. One teacher made a significant content error that was repeated throughout the lesson. The level of instruction was very low and student interest and engagement was not high as demonstrated by lack of completed work and low student participation.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
PMF Goal #4: School Environment – Predictors of future student progress and achievement	<p>In-seat attendance during the two-week window:</p> Visit 1: September 27, 2016- 95.1% Visit 2: September 29, 2016- 95.5% Visit 3: October 3, 2016- 93.8% Visit 4: October 4, 2016-95.3%

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT¹

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Classroom Environments domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of “distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” and “unsatisfactory” are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 51% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	The QSR team scored 53% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations students and teachers demonstrated mutual respect and caring. Teachers made efforts to make personal connections with students inquiring about the well-being of a student’s siblings and asking about favorite classes. Students and teachers sat comfortably in close proximity of one another. Teachers greeted students by name and referred to students as “scholars” or “ladies and gentlemen.” In one observation a student asked, “May I talk to my partner so I can help her?” The teacher smiled and gave permission. Overall teachers addressed students in a respectful manner maintaining students’ dignity.	Distinguished	9%
		Proficient	44%

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

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team rated 30% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations students did not talk respectfully to all class members. Although the teachers attempted to address disrespectful behavior, they had uneven results, in which the students sometimes complied, but disregarded in other instances. In one observation students were disrespectful to the teacher and to each other, laughing when the teacher talked and yelling at each other to "shut-up." The teacher responded to most incidents with uneven results. Sometimes the students responded positively and stopped interrupting the class, other times students continued talking.</p>	Basic	30%
	<p>The QSR team scored 17% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In some observations the students were disrespectful to each other. They said things like, "y'all are retarded," "shut up", used profanity, and threatened others with statements like, "beat the breaks off". One student cursed at the teacher, "...didn't even _____ do nothing, bruh..." after the teacher asked him to step into the hallway. In one observation the teacher said to a student, "this attitude is not cute" and the student yelled back, "no, the attitude that is not cute is yours!" There was no additional attempt made by the teacher in this classroom to redirect loud and disrespectful behavior for the duration of the observation.</p>	Unsatisfactory	17%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 48% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations students put forth good effort to complete their work and teachers demonstrated high regard for student ability. The teachers maintained a sense of urgency. In one observation the teacher shared that students were "working like a storm" and encouraged</p>	Distinguished	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>students to focus on the quality of their work. In another observation the teacher said, "I have high expectations, I think everyone here can score 80% or higher on this quiz." Students in these observations eagerly participated and demonstrated their desire to complete work often working before class time even began.</p>	Proficient	48%
	<p>The QSR team rated 35% of observations as basic in this component. Teachers prompted students to complete tasks, without recognition of effort or persistence. Students frequently had their heads down and were not re-directed or encouraged to participate. In one observation the teacher repeatedly addressed one student that refused to do his classwork but ignored other disengaged students.</p>	Basic	35%
	<p>The QSR team scored 17% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations students demonstrated little to no pride in their work and teachers did not communicate high expectations for all students. In one observation a student asked why he should do the assignment. The teacher responded, "These are easy points. Just copy down the text and definitions." In another observation students did not complete any work during the 40-minute observation.</p>	Unsatisfactory	17%

Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>The QSR team scored 48% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations there were clear procedures and routines in place with little to no loss of instructional time. In one distinguished observation students had classroom jobs and completed them with no direction from the teacher. One student distributed binders to the class and another collected books at the end of the lesson. These jobs were posted on the blackboard. Teachers used signals such as 3-2-1 countdowns, chants, timers and clapping sequences to begin and end transitions. Structures were in place for students to enter the classrooms and start the warm-up without direction from teacher. In one observation the teacher reminded students of classroom procedures, resulting in 100% participation from students.</p>	Distinguished	4%
		Proficient	44%
	<p>The QSR team scored 35% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations transitions between activities took several minutes resulting in lost instructional time. In one observation students were directed to work in small groups but they did not know how to move about the classroom safely and quietly. Students ran, jumped over chairs and spoke loudly to each other throughout the transition. After the second rotation the teacher brought the class back together to explain the procedure of moving around and students responded appropriately. In several classrooms students spent time arguing over whose turn it was to use the bathroom. One teacher used a timer to facilitate transitions, but there were several students not working and the teacher had to continually remind students not to be out of their seats.</p>	Basic	35%

	<p>The QSR team scored 17% of observations as unsatisfactory. In these observations there was significant loss of instructional time. In one observation students repeatedly shouted that they needed to use the bathroom and looked for pencils throughout the lesson. In another observation one student yelled out, "you didn't give everyone a packet" after the teacher had distributed materials. In one observation at least five students did not have any materials out during work time and the teacher did not address the lack of work.</p>	Unsatisfactory	17%
<p>Managing Student Behavior</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 39% of observations as distinguished or proficient in Managing Student Behavior. In these observations behavior was almost always appropriate. Teachers used attention getting techniques and positive narration to manage classrooms. Using proximity and quick glances most teachers were able to quickly redirect or prevent any off task behavior. Some teachers used a clipboard system and referred to "earning your paycheck" when students behaved appropriately or needed quick redirection.</p>	Distinguished	9%
	<p>In two observations teachers had quiet and private conversations with off-task students resulting in immediate change in behavior. In a distinguished observation the teacher moved around the room saying words like "chair" to remind students how to sit while working and students were on task during the entire observation.</p>	Proficient	30%

	<p>The QSR team rated 48% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers attempted to maintain order but the results were uneven. In one observation the teacher redirected the same student several times without any change in behavior or consequence. The lessons in these observations were interrupted frequently while teachers addressed student behavior. There did not appear to be systems in place to track student behavior or the system was not used effectively. Students in one classroom got up and left the room as they wished while the other students just walked around the room talking while the teacher unsuccessfully tried to use attention-getting signals. In another classroom the teacher walked around asking each individual student to be on task during the entire observation with very limited success.</p> <p>Observers noted that teachers in these observations generally remained calm during the outbursts, without raising voices or seeming frustrated although the class was chaotic.</p>	Basic	48%
	<p>The QSR team scored 13% of observations as unsatisfactory. Teachers in these observations did not effectively respond to student misbehavior. In one observation a student slammed down a chair and then lightly kicked another student and the teacher did not comment. In one observation the teacher did not address any student misbehavior except for a fight that almost broke out in the room. In two of these observations teachers asked a student to step outside to cool off, but the student refused and remained in the class without any further action from the teacher.</p>	Unsatisfactory	13%

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of “distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” and “unsatisfactory” are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 38% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Instruction domain.

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
<p>Communicating with Students</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 39% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers had error-free presentations of content and gave clear directions. In one distinguished observation the teacher anticipated student misunderstanding and tried to stump the students with common mistakes they may make such as transposing numbers incorrectly or forgetting to use a comma. The teacher often invited student participation in the explanations of problems. In another observation the teacher engaged students with a learning task to explain how textual evidence proved their analysis of a character. The teacher modeled two examples for students and provided evidence from the text supporting her answer. In these observations teachers communicated learning objectives to students and also posted objectives on the board. Both students and teachers used age-appropriate vocabulary such as: snubbed, steadfast, boisterous, intramural, and inference. In one observation the teacher used a creative analogy to explain the difference between first and third person point of view.</p>	Distinguished	9%
		Proficient	30%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 48% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations students did not know what was expected of them and content explanation was not clear. In one observation the purpose of the lesson directed students to compare the rights of women in the Middle East to the rights of women in the United States. The delivery of the lesson content was not entirely clear and the definition of a metaphor was not correct leaving students with a misunderstanding about the material; however, a classroom volunteer corrected the misunderstanding. In another observation the teacher used a video to explain science concepts. Vocabulary introduced to students via the video was not pre-taught by the teacher leaving students guessing about what words actually meant. While the lesson objective was both on the students' assignment and on the board, the teacher did not refer to it during the observation.</p> <p>Students in these observations did not demonstrate that they understood directions. One student yelled out, "what are we supposed to be doing?" after the teacher told them to start working. In another observation the teacher directed students to start the science stations without stating what they should be learning or doing at each station.</p>	Basic	48%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 13% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations observers saw content errors and/or little to no explanation of content. In one observation the teacher stated, "in scientific notation, I need to write any non-zero digits after the decimal." This error in a critical component of the content was repeated throughout class. In another observation students demonstrated confusion during a review of the warm-up saying, "huh?" and "wait are you sure that is correct?" as the teacher switched answers. The teacher then incorrectly stated that there are multiple answers to each question. The lesson objective was printed on students' handout with an error.</p>	Unsatisfactory	13%

Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as proficient in this component. Teachers asked open-ended questions and had a high level of student engagement. In one classroom the teacher asked a series of questions such as: "What is the difference between the literary text and the informational text?" and "Who can tell me how we know something is an opinion?" as a way to activate prior knowledge and introduce a new genre. She asked the students questions about the text clarifying misunderstandings and prompting students to explain their thinking. In another observation the teacher asked, "Who have I not heard from?" One teacher allowed students to "phone a friend" when they were stuck in an effort to bring more students into the discussion. Teachers in these observations asked students to explain their thinking and use evidence to support their answers.</p>	<p>Distinguished</p>	<p>0%</p>
		<p>Proficient</p>	<p>29%</p>
	<p>The QSR team scored 44% of observations as basic in this component. Teachers relied primarily on recall type questioning leading students down a single path of inquiry. A few students participated and the teacher did not make an effort to involve other students. In another observation the teacher asked four low-level questions in quick succession not waiting for students to respond. Overall questioning in these observations supported dialogue only between the students and the teacher. The QSR team did not observe discussion between students about the content.</p>	<p>Basic</p>	<p>44%</p>

	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations there were few to no questions asked of students. In one classroom the teacher asked a few questions but did not give students time to answer. One student sitting in the front of the room dominated the discussion but others sat passively. In one observation the student discussion time was limited to students copying each other's answers. After the video was over, the teacher gave students time to get answers that they missed. Students were copying each other's answers and not discussing what they learned. In one observation the students' misbehavior prohibited the teacher from asking any questions.</p>	Unsatisfactory	29%
<p>Engaging Students in Learning</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 39% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations students needed few reminders to stay focused and were intellectually engaged throughout the lesson. Students participated in a variety of groupings and pacing and had grade-appropriate materials and resources. In one observation the teacher used one instructional grouping and it was successful at achieving the learning objective. In one observation the teacher asked students to "turn and talk" to their neighbor when discussing gender stereotypes. The students eagerly discussed the phrase "like a girl" and debated if that is a fair phrase. Students demonstrated high level of engagement sharing stories about girls who play football and connecting it to a story they read the day before.</p>	Distinguished	4%
		Proficient	35%

	<p>The QSR team scored 48% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations only a few students were engaged in learning tasks or the learning tasks required little thinking. In one observation the task was to copy down definitions and many students spent the class looking around the room after they finished. In another observation the students were reading a <i>New York Times</i> article and completing a T-chart in pairs. Most students did not have anything written on their paper by the end of the observation and those who were done sat with heads down. In another observation the teacher rushed students to finish a quiz and one class ended while students were working with no closure. In general students did not have choice in how to complete learning tasks and engagement was uneven with some students sitting quietly with complete work and some not attempting to complete assignments.</p>	Basic	48%
	<p>The QSR team scored 13% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations students frequently had heads down on tables with very few attempting to complete tasks without teacher intervention. In one classroom student misbehavior was so distracting that the students who were trying to work were unable to. One student quietly took her work and completed it in the hallway without permission and the teacher did not notice. The team observed students quietly wait for direction while classmates' misbehavior prohibited the teacher from teaching.</p>	Unsatisfactory	13%

Using Assessment in Instruction	<p>The QSR team scored 45% of observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers gave detailed specific feedback to students and provided support to help them understand their mistakes. Teachers gathered evidence of individual student understanding both by questioning students and walking around to monitor during student work time. In one observation the teacher provided real time feedback after students completed exit tickets; sharing that students did not master the skill since students were not providing evidence from the text. In three observations teachers referred to “show what you know” quizzes. While some of the questioning in these classrooms was global, teachers called randomly on students and addressed individual misconceptions on the spot.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	45%
	<p>The QSR team rated 23% of observations as basic. In these observations students were given limited feedback that did not instruct them how to improve their work. In one classroom the teacher gave individual feedback to students by marking problems that students got wrong but did not identify the student misconception or give instructions to help students improve their work. In other observations teachers moved on after receiving one correct answer from a student without determining whether other students understood the concept.</p>	Basic	23%

	<p>The QSR team rated 32% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations there was no evidence that students knew how they were being evaluated. Teachers in these observations did not gather evidence of learning or used only global questioning to assess the students. In one observation the teacher reviewed a warm-up but provided all the answers without explanation or review of students' answers. In another observation the teacher did not address a student misunderstanding of a vocabulary word (panting vs. painting). In another observation the students spent 30 minutes working individually and while the teacher stated she was walking around to give feedback she simply wandered from student to student commenting on behavior without collecting the work or giving students feedback.</p>	Unsatisfactory	32%
--	--	----------------	-----

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

The Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are negative or inappropriate and characterized by sarcasm, putdowns, or conflict.	Classroom interactions are generally appropriate and free from conflict but may be characterized by occasional displays of insensitivity.	Classroom interactions reflect general warmth and caring, and are respectful of the cultural and developmental differences among groups of students.	Classroom interactions are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring toward individuals. Students themselves ensure maintenance of high levels of civility among member of the class.
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The classroom does not represent a culture for learning and is characterized by low teacher commitment to the subject, low expectations for student achievement, and little student pride in work.	The classroom environment reflects only a minimal culture for learning, with only modest or inconsistent expectations for student achievement, little teacher commitment to the subject, and little student pride in work. Both teacher and students are performing at the minimal level to "get by."	The classroom environment represents a genuine culture for learning, with commitment to the subject on the part of both teacher and students, high expectations for student achievement, and student pride in work.	Students assumes much of the responsibility for establishing a culture for learning in the classroom by taking pride in their work, initiating improvements to their products, and holding the work to the highest standard. Teacher demonstrates as passionate commitment to the subject.

The Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Managing Classroom Procedures	Classroom routines and procedures are either nonexistent or inefficient, resulting in the loss of much instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures have been established but function unevenly or inconsistently, with some loss of instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures have been established and function smoothly for the most part, with little loss of instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures are seamless in their operation, and students assume considerable responsibility for their smooth functioning.
Managing Student Behavior	Student behavior is poor, with no clear expectations, no monitoring of student behavior, and inappropriate response to student misbehavior.	Teacher makes an effort to establish standards of conduct for students, monitor student behavior, and respond to student misbehavior, but these efforts are not always successful.	Teacher is aware of student behavior, has established clear standards of conduct, and responds to student misbehavior in ways that are appropriate and respectful of the students.	Student behavior is entirely appropriate, with evidence of student participation in setting expectations and monitoring behavior. Teacher's monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive, and teachers' response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs.

APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Communicating with Students	Teacher’s oral and written communication contains errors or is unclear or inappropriate to students. Teacher’s purpose in a lesson or unit is unclear to students. Teacher’s explanation of the content is unclear or confusing or uses inappropriate language.	Teacher’s oral and written communication contains no errors, but may not be completely appropriate or may require further explanations to avoid confusion. Teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose, with limited success. Teacher’s explanation of the content is uneven; some is done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow.	Teacher communicates clearly and accurately to students both orally and in writing. Teacher’s purpose for the lesson or unit is clear, including where it is situated within broader learning. Teacher’s explanation of content is appropriate and connects with students’ knowledge and experience.	Teacher’s oral and written communication is clear and expressive, anticipating possible student misconceptions. Makes the purpose of the lesson or unit clear, including where it is situated within broader learning, linking purpose to student interests. Explanation of content is imaginative, and connects with students’ knowledge and experience. Students contribute to explaining concepts to their peers.
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	Teacher makes poor use of questioning and discussion techniques, with low-level questions, limited student participation, and little true discussion.	Teacher’s use of questioning and discussion techniques is uneven with some high-level question; attempts at true discussion; moderate student participation.	Teacher’s use of questioning and discussion techniques reflects high-level questions, true discussion, and full participation by all students.	Students formulate many of the high-level questions and assume responsibility for the participation of all students in the discussion.

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Engaging Students in Learning	Students are not at all intellectually engaged in significant learning, as a result of inappropriate activities or materials, poor representations of content, or lack of lesson structure.	Students are intellectually engaged only partially, resulting from activities or materials or uneven quality, inconsistent representation of content or uneven structure of pacing.	Students are intellectually engaged throughout the lesson, with appropriate activities and materials, instructive representations of content, and suitable structure and pacing of the lesson.	Students are highly engaged throughout the lesson and make material contribution to the representation of content, the activities, and the materials. The structure and pacing of the lesson allow for student reflection and closure.
Using Assessment in Instruction	Students are unaware of criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and do not engage in self-assessment or monitoring. Teacher does not monitor student learning in the curriculum, and feedback to students is of poor quality and in an untimely manner.	Students know some of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and occasionally assess the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards. Teacher monitors the progress of the class as a whole but elicits no diagnostic information; feedback to students is uneven and inconsistent in its timeliness.	Students are fully aware of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards. Teacher monitors the progress of groups of students in the curriculum, making limited use of diagnostic prompts to elicit information; feedback is timely, consistent, and of high quality.	Students are fully aware of the criteria and standards by which their work will be evaluated, have contributed to the development of the criteria, frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards, and make active use of that information in their learning. Teacher actively and systematically elicits diagnostic information from individual students regarding understanding and monitors progress of individual students; feedback is timely, high quality, and students use feedback in their learning.

