December 8, 2016

Dr. Julie Johnson, Board Chair
Maya Angelou Public Charter High School
5600 E. Capitol St, NE
Washington, DC 20019

Dear Dr. Johnson:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. Per 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:

- o School designated Priority by Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE)

Qualitative Site Review Report

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Maya Angelou Public Charter High School between October 17 and October 28, 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, in addition to the school's strategies in its Priority improvement plan.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at Maya Angelou Public Charter School – High School.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Dr. Heather Wathington, Chief Executive Officer
Ms. Clarissa Mendoza, Chief of Schools
Ms. Tomeika Ashford Freeman, Principal

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: December 8, 2016

Campus Information
Campus Name: Maya Angelou Public Charter School - High School
Ward: 7
Grade levels: 9-12

Qualitative Site Review Information
Reason for visit: School designated Priority by Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE)
Two-week window: October 17 and October 28, 2016
QSR team members: Three DC Public Charter School Board staff members (including one special education specialist) and one consultant
Number of observations: 21
Total enrollment: 209
Students with Disabilities enrollment: 78
English Language Learners enrollment: 0

Summary
Maya Angelou Public Charter School's mission is "to create learning communities in lower income urban areas where all students can grow academically and socially. At Maya Angelou, our students develop the academic, social, and employment skills they need to build rewarding lives and promote positive change." The QSR team observed limited evidence of the school meeting its mission. This QSR is the last QSR prior to the school undergoing its 20-year review. Since the school was identified by the Office of the State Superintendent of Education as in need of a School Improvement Grant (SIG) and later a Priority school, and was renewed by DC PCSB based on implementing a commitment to implement a robust turn-around plan, the school was allocated $1,213,966.42 in federal aid as well as support. As shown in the table below, QSRs over this entire time have shown some improvement, but the percentage of classrooms rated distinguished or proficient remains low.

Date	% Proficient/Distinguished in Classroom Environment	% Proficient/ Distinguished in Instruction
Fall 2013	45%	17%
Spring 2014	36%	21%
Fall 2014	50%	32%
Fall 2016	51%	33%

During this review, the QSR team observed limited evidence of the school's academic development of students, with 33% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished in the Instructional Delivery domain. While teachers demonstrated warmth and caring for students, some students disrespected their peers and teachers.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environments and instructional delivery (see Appendix I). The QSR team scored 51% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest rated component in the <u>Classroom Environment</u> domain was *Establishing an Environment of Respect and Rapport*, with 58% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished. In these classrooms teachers showed warmth and care for students and helped diffuse conflicts among students. The lowest rated component in the Classroom Environment domain was *Establishing a Culture for Learning*, with 19% of observations rated as unsatisfactory and 38% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished.

The QSR team scored 33% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the <u>Instruction</u> domain. The highest rated component in the Instructional domain was *Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques*, with 43% of observations rated as proficient, although this was also the component that had the highest rate of observations scored as unsatisfactory at 24%. In both components of *Engaging Students in Learning* and *Using Assessment in Instruction*, the QSR team rated 19% of observations as unsatisfactory.

A DC PCSB staff member attended the Maya Angelou PCS Board Meeting on October 13, 2016. Eight board members were present and one member participated via video conferencing. The meeting was led by Dr. Julie Johnson, the school's newly appointed Board Chair. Dr. Johnson noted that Jane Dimyan-Ehrenfeld recently stepped down as chair, and Dr. Johnson and Michael Vu will now serve as Board Chair and Vice Chairman, respectively. Dr. Heather Wathington gave a CEO Report that included details about the school's current enrollment and the outcome of the Office of the State Superintendent of Education's (OSSE) count day for the high school for SY 2017-2018. Dr. Wathington reported that Evans High School is currently under-enrolled by approximately 213 students, with a preliminary enrolment count of 209 students[1]. The board asked several questions regarding student recruitment and retention efforts, to which Dr. Wathington provided details of the school's efforts to date. Other topics discussed during the meeting included improving teacher benefits, a newly implemented teacher evaluation system, revisions to the staff handbook and plans to sublet part of its vacant space at the high school facility. No actions or votes were taken.

<u>Special Education</u>

Prior to the two-week window, Maya Angelou PCS – High School provided answers to specific questions posed by DC PCSB regarding the provision of instruction to students with disabilities.

- The school stated that teachers use co-planning and co-teaching to support students with disabilities. In one co-taught class, both the inclusion teacher and the general education teacher were actively involved in facilitating an activity about the skeletal system in which students built their own mini-model while answering questions from a pamphlet. Teachers demonstrated evidence of collaborative

---

[1] Maya Angelou PCS – Young Adult Learning Center's audited enrollment is 128 students, bringing the LEA total enrollment to 337, which is 213 below the enrollment cap of 550 students.

planning, as both teachers played an active role in instruction and the observer was unable to distinguish between the lead and supporting teacher. The QSR team did not observe co-planning.

- The school noted that they use differentiation, small group instruction, and targeted skill practice on laptops to provide individualized instruction to students with disabilities. The special education observer saw evidence of differentiation and small groups in each observation. Although students did not appear to have much choice in learning activities or how to complete assignments, students generally appeared engaged and comfortable in their learning environment.

- In the inclusion and self-contained classes, teachers had a particularly strong rapport with their students and students demonstrated a high level of respect for their teachers. Overall, the level of academic rigor in the lessons varied from teacher to teacher. Some teachers executed well-planned, engaging lessons and encouraged high participation, while others appeared to be going through the motions by simply teaching and having students practice basic skills.

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
Mission: Maya Angelou Public Charter School's mission "to create learning communities in lower income urban areas where all students can grow academically and socially. At Maya Angelou, our students develop the academic, social, and employment skills they need to build rewarding lives and promote positive change."	The QSR team observed limited evidence of the school meeting its mission. The QSR team observed limited evidence of the school supporting academic growth, with only 33% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished in the Instruction domain. As described further in Communicating with Students, component 3a, the QSR team observed minor content errors, and instruction was not consistently clear. In Engaging Students in Learning, component 3c, student engagement was inconsistent across classrooms. Students lost significant instructional time to transitions, socializing, and cell phone use. While teachers generally demonstrated warmth for students, students' respect for teachers varied, with some students following directions promptly when asked, and others ignoring directions and continuing off-task behavior. Some students demonstrated respect for each other, helping each other with academic tasks, while others cursed and insulted each other. In building employment skills, the QSR team saw teachers attempt to help students write resumes, complete job applications, and look through job advertisements in newspapers. Student engagement in these classes was weak with limited teacher intervention.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
Goals:	
Student Progress: 50% of students in grades 9-10 will meet their assigned growth reading targets in school years 1-5, 60% in school years 6-10, 70% in school years 11-15 as measured by the Global Scholar Performance Series spring assessment.	The QSR team saw mixed evidence of the school's support for students in meeting reading growth targets. The QSR team observed a small Read 180 reading intervention class (3 students) that allowed the teacher to provide individual support to each student. Teachers across classrooms worked with students on vocabulary development, though the QSR team observed minor content errors in a few classes. Students worked on reading skills by listening to text and following along in a textbook or on the Edgenuity program. Teachers checked in on individual student progress and asked comprehension questions to monitor understanding.
Student Progress: 50% of students in grades 9-10 will meet their assigned growth targets in math in school years 1-5, 60% in school years 6-10, and 70% in school years 11-15.	The QSR team observed mixed evidence of the school supporting students in meeting their growth targets in math. In a strong math observation with two students, both worked on the same math concept in different ways, with one working one-on-one with the teacher to solve algebraic equations and the other working on the Edgenuity program as the teacher periodically checked on the student's progress. The teacher consistently asked students to justify their responses. In another observation students struggled with the order of operations, all students worked on the same worksheet in the same way, and student engagement was low.
Student Progress: 40% of students in grades 9-10 will meet their assigned growth targets in writing in school years 2-5, 60% in school years 6-10, 70% in school years 11-15.	The QSR team saw limited evidence of the school supporting students in meeting assigned growth targets in writing. During the two-week window, the team did not observe any writing instruction in any class. Teachers worked with students on vocabulary development though observers

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	saw minor content errors. The QSR team saw few opportunities for students to practice writing, but saw students in one English class use story elements to write a movie or play and students in a Life Skills class wrote about quotes.
Student Achievement: 70% of students will graduate high school in six years.	DC PCSB staff will use quantitative data to assess whether the school met this goal during its 10-year review.
Student Engagement: 85% in-seat attendance rate	Most classrooms had under ten students and students consistently came late to classes.
20% of truant students and/or students with a history of truancy will be re-engaged to attend MAPCHS or the Maya Adult Charter School.	**In-seat attendance on the days the QSR team conducted observations:** **Visit 1:** October 18, 2015 – 78.6% **Visit 2**: October 20, 2015 – 69.5% **Visit 3:** October 21, 2016 – 68.1% **Visit 4**: October 25, 2016 – 76.2% **Visit 5:** October 27, 2016 – 71.6%
Postsecondary and Career Readiness – Socio-emotional Learning: At least 60% of students will score in the average range or better on at least two of three posttest measures on the RSCA in years 1-5; 65% of students will score in the average range or better on at least two of three post-test measures on the RSCA in years 6-15.	The QSR team saw mixed evidence of teachers supporting students' social-emotional learning. Observers scored half of the observations as proficient or distinguished in Classroom Environment. Some teachers effectively helped de-escalate volatile students, enabling them to focus on academic instruction. A teacher facilitated a discussion about self-awareness and self-wellness, resiliency, and reacting to change, though some students were engaged in this class and others were not. In another observation the teacher led a discussion about positive habits for the future and asked students to develop future goals, though the class was teacher-centered. In some observations students disrespected teachers and peers with limited or no teacher intervention.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
Postsecondary and Career Readiness-Employment and Enrollment: 75% of exiting graduates will enter the workforce or enter into post-secondary education one year after high school graduation.	The QSR team saw limited evidence that the school prepares students to enter the workforce or enter post-secondary education. While teachers attempted to work with students to build resumes, fill out job applications, and look at job advertisements, student engagement in these classes was weak and students spent most of their class time socializing. Academic development was similarly weak, as described in the Instruction section of this report, with only 33% of observations scored as proficient.

ESEA STRATEGIES

The 2014 Memorandum of Understanding that DC PCSB has with the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) around implementation of the 2012 Waiver to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA Waiver) states that DC PCSB must "Ensure that public charter schools identified as Focus or Priority are providing interventions and supports to students and their teachers consistent with that school's Intervention and Support Plan" (p.5). Maya Angelou PCS – High School was identified as a Priority school for overall low academic performance in English language arts and math during school year 2012-13 based on its DC CAS performance during the 2011-12 school year. As part of this designation, Maya Angelou PCS – High School developed intervention strategies to address overall weak academic performance.

While the ESEA Waiver expired on August 1, 2016, Focus and Priority schools are still required to implement Intervention and Support Plans as the state transitions to The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) during school year 2016-17. OSSE granted certain flexibilities, including flexibility from intervention and support plan monitoring, to Focus and Priority Schools that met specific performance thresholds[2] based on past and present PARCC results. Maya Angelou PCS – High School was not eligible for these flexibilities because of its weak academic performance, thus DC PCSB is required to continue monitoring the school's implementation of its intervention and support plan during school year 2016-17.

Prior to the two-week window the school submitted responses to an ESEA Questionnaire focusing on instructional improvement strategies that observers could see in classrooms. These included:

- Edgenuity combined with face-to-face instruction
- differentiation
- co-teaching and teacher collaboration
- effective use of time through the After-School program, and
- frequent checks for student understanding

Overall the QSR team saw mixed implementation of the school's Priority plan. The QSR team saw strong implementation of *after-school programming and Edgenuity combined with face-to-face instruction.* Teachers checked in with students as they worked at their own pace on computers.

The QSR team saw mixed evidence of *differentiation.* In some observations teachers differentiated instruction by having students work on the same content in different ways, like individually at computers using Edgenuity or in small groups as the teacher walked

---

[2] *Flexibilities will be granted for eligible schools in which:*

- ✓ *At least 25 percent of students in the school performed at level 3 or above (for Focus schools this includes only students in the identified subgroup and subject area);*
- ✓ *At least 5 percent of students in the school performed at level 4 or above (for Focus schools this includes only students in the identified subgroup and subject area).*

around to ask comprehension questions about the subject matter. Differentiation was also evident in a math class in which two students were present and one student worked at a computer on algebraic expressions while a teacher worked one-on-one with another student, periodically checking on the student working independently. In other classrooms instruction was not differentiated. Students worked on the same worksheet in the same way for the duration of the class.

Observers saw weak evidence of *teacher checks for student understanding*, with only 33% of observations rated as proficient in the Using Assessment in Instruction component and 19% of observations scored as unsatisfactory. In the unsatisfactory observations, teachers did not attempt to gauge student understanding.

The QSR team observed limited evidence of implementation of teacher teams. In one special education observation, the QSR team saw strong evidence of te*acher collaboration*, as each of the two teachers in the room played an active role in leading instruction. Other members of the QSR team either saw no *co-teaching* or observed two teachers in the classroom but only one leading instruction.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[3]

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. Overall, 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 58% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers demonstrated care for individual students. In these observations teachers inquired about progress on college applications and supported students who appeared stressed by staying positive, joking around with them, giving them extra time to refocus on class, and putting forth extra effort to involve them in class activities. Talk between teachers and students was respectful. Teachers respected student dignity when they got incorrect answers, giving additional time or asking questions to help students arrive at the correct answers.	Distinguished	10%
		Proficient	48%
	The QSR team rated 38% of the observations as basic in this component. The quality of interactions demonstrated some disrespect, with students cursing at each other and calling each other names. While teachers attempted to intervene in most cases, students did not consistently correct their behavior. Students in some observations disrespected the teacher through continued off-task behavior despite the teachers trying to get students on track.	Basic	38%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	5%

---

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

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team scored 38% of the observations as proficient in this component. Teachers demonstrated high regard for student ability, consistently commending student work. Teachers expected all students to participate. Teachers also promoted further learning by talking about enrichment opportunities in the subject area.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	38%
	The QSR team scored 43% of the observations as basic in this component. Students demonstrated no observable commitment to learning as they continued socializing, using their cell phones, and kept their heads down on their desks. Teachers failed to intervene in students' off-task behavior and did not attempt to help students struggling with academic material.	Basic	43%
	The QSR team scored 19% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Teachers held high expectations for only a small number of students, allowing some students to sleep and use their phones without any attempt to refocus them on academic content. Students in one observation had a 20 minute "work break" where students did no academic work, despite the presence of two teachers. In another observation students took notes on a PowerPoint presentation. One student asked about the purpose of copying notes and the teacher glared at the student without responding.	Unsatisfactory	19%
Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team scored 57% of the observations as proficient in this component. Students were productively engaged and lost little to no instructional time. Students entered class, immediately got materials, started work, and knew what they were supposed to be doing for the entire class. Students helped with	Distinguished	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	classroom procedures, handing out textbooks, and taking attendance. Teachers gave students additional activities while waiting for other students to finish academic tasks before moving on to the next whole-group activity.	Proficient	57%
	The QSR team scored 33% of the observations as basic in this component. Classroom routines functioned unevenly. Teachers had to continually remind students to stop using their phones and stop talking during a silent quiz. Students sometimes raised their hands to speak and at other times did not (within the same classroom). Classes lost additional instructional time as teachers could not find extra work packets for students.	Basic	33%
	The QSR team scored 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component due to significant loss of instructional time. Teachers had to go to each individual student's station to log in to computers in one observation. Students did not engage in the learning task, staring at the computer screen and socializing. Students lost significant instructional time in another observation when, after a 20 minute "work break" (as discussed above in Establishing a Culture for Learning), 15 minutes passed before all students (less than seven) had signed into an online program on their phones.	Unsatisfactory	10%
Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 52% of the observations as proficient in this component. There were no instances of misbehavior in some observations. Standards of conduct were established. Students volunteered to give up their phones to focus on the assignment, and removed	Distinguished	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	personal headphones by the beginning of the lesson without the teacher's prompting. Students complied with teachers' requests to refocus. Teachers effectively pre-empted misbehavior by calling on students who seemed distracted.	Proficient	52%
	The QSR team scored 43% of the observations as basic in this component. Students misbehaved by socializing, using their cell phones, and walking in and out of class, and teachers attempted to address misbehavior with uneven results. Observers saw no evidence of behavior tracking systems. Teachers repeatedly asked students to refocus with inconsistent success.	Basic	43%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	5%

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" are those from the Danielson framework. Overall, the QSR team scored 33% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Instruction domain.

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Communicating with Students	The QSR team scored 38% of the observations as proficient in this component. Teachers used real-life examples and rich vocabulary to explain concepts. Teachers presented content clearly and made no content errors. Teachers modeled the process to solve equations and answered questions effectively. The instructional purpose was clear and students engaged productively in learning tasks.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	38%
	The QSR team scored 57% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers made minor content errors. The instructional purpose in some observations was unclear, as students had to ask the teachers multiple times what they should be working on. Explanations of content were not consistently clear, leading to student confusion as they continued to ask questions and did not engage in the learning task.	Basic	57%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	5%
Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques	The QSR team scored 43% of the observations as proficient in this component. Teachers used open-ended questions to promote student thinking. Teachers provided adequate time for students to respond to questions, and asked additional probing questions to help	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	students formulate their answers. In one observation, the teacher stepped out of the role of mediating discussions as students solved math problems at the board with the help of their peers.	Proficient	43%
	The QSR team scored 33% of the observations as basic in this component. Most discussion was between the teacher and students with few or no opportunities for students to discuss academic content with each other. The teacher's attempts to start a discussion in some observations were derailed by misbehavior. Questioning primarily required recall with few questions to promote deeper thinking about content.	Basic	33%
	The QSR team scored 24% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Teachers did not attempt to facilitate any discussions with the class. In one observation students spent the entire class copying notes or watching a movie with no connection made to academic content. Students remained disengaged from the material, spending class time looking at their phones or socializing.	Unsatisfactory	24%
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team scored 19% of the observations as proficient in this component. Teachers strategically arranged students to facilitate students helping each other with the learning task. Teachers used different groupings depending on student need, with some students working independently on	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	Edgenuity or a worksheet, and others discussing content in small groups as the teachers checked in with clusters of students. Students were intellectually engaged, asking questions, helping each other with academic tasks, and staying on task even when the teacher was not working directly with them.	Proficient	19%
	The QSR team scored 62% of the observations as basic in this component. Some students were intellectually engaged in the lesson while others were not, as they stared at a blank screen or socialized when they were supposed to be using their computers or an online program on their cell phones. In other observations students played on their cell phones with no apparent connection to academic content. Students had no choice in how they complete learning tasks; students filled out the same worksheets with one word, pre-determined answers or answered questions primarily about procedures or facts.	Basic	62%
	The QSR team scored 19% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Students were disengaged for most or all the class, socializing, sleeping, or looking at their phones with limited or no intervention from the teacher.	Unsatisfactory	19%
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team scored 33% of the observations as proficient in this component. Teachers continually circulated to independent students or small groups of students to check student work and ask questions to gauge	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	understanding. Teachers provided specific feedback or additional guiding questions to promote thinking. Teachers effectively adjusted their lessons after realizing students did not fully understand how to solve a problem, with students showing full understanding by the end of the lesson. Teachers also used exit tickets.	Proficient	33%
	The QSR team scored 48% of the observations as basic in this component. Assessment criteria was unclear in some observations. Teachers asked for global indications of student understanding and did not attempt to ensure every student understood the lessons.	Basic	48%
	The QSR team scored 19% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Teachers did not ask for feedback or give students an assessment of learning at any point during the lesson, and did not respond when students gave incorrect answers or when students stated that they did not understand the content.	Unsatisfactory	19%

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

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

APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC

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