



December 22, 2016

Donald Hense, Board Chair
Friendship PCS- Woodridge Elementary
2959 Carlton Ave. NE
Washington, DC 20018

Dear Mr. Hense:

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

- School eligible to petition for 20-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Friendship PCS-Woodridge Elementary between November 7, 2016 through December 2, 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 Friendship PCS-Woodridge Elementary.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Patricia Brantley, CEO

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: December 22, 2016

Campus Information

Campus Name: Friendship PCS - Woodridge Elementary School

Ward: 5

Grade levels: PK3 - 3

Qualitative Site Review Information

Reason for visit: School eligible to petition for 20-year review during 2017-18 school year

Two-week window: November 7, 2016- December 2, 2016

QSR team members: 1 DC PSCB staff, 3 consultants including 1 English Language Learner (ELL) specialist and 1 special education specialist

Number of observations: 22

Total enrollment: 305

Students with Disabilities enrollment: 20

English Language Learners enrollment: 10

Summary

Friendship Public Charter School's mission is to provide a world-class education that motivates students to achieve high academic standards, enjoy learning, and develop as ethical, literate, well-rounded, and self-sufficient citizens who contribute actively to their communities.

The QSR team found that Friendship PCS - Woodridge Elementary provides a strong academic program in a warm, nurturing, and clean facility. The QSR team commented on the kind behavior of the students and the family-friendly environment. School staff greeted students and parents by name at drop off and hallways were generally safe and orderly. The QSR team did not rate any observations at Woodridge Elementary as unsatisfactory according to the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching. It should also be noted that over the past five years, the school has continued its strong academic climate.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching to examine classroom environments and instruction (see Appendix I). The QSR team scored 90% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. In the components of *Creating and Environment of Respect and Rapport* and *Managing Classroom Procedures*, the QSR team scored 95% of observations as distinguished or proficient. In these observations teachers and students demonstrated genuine warmth toward each other and teachers maximized instructional time with effective transitions and procedures. The lowest rated component in this domain was *Managing Student Behavior* with 23% of observations scored as basic. While in most observations behavior was appropriate and teachers addressed misbehavior effectively, in some observations teachers acknowledged and made attempts to redirect off task student behavior with limited success leading to lost instructional time.

The QSR team scored an impressive 89% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The highest rated component in this domain was *Engaging*

Students in Learning with 95% distinguished or proficient. Teachers in these observations used a variety of instructional strategies (small groups, learning centers and whole group learning). The QSR team observed students eagerly participate in learning tasks. The lowest rated component in this domain was *Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques* with 18% of observations rated as basic. Teachers in these observations asked questions with only a single correct answer resulting in little opportunity for student discussion.

DC PCSB had to overcome many logistical obstacles to conduct the reviews. DC PCSB meets with each school prior to the QSR to explain the QSR process. During this time Friendship PCS asked DC PCSB to change many of the observation windows. DC PCSB changed the dates and Friendship PCS agreed to the dates of the new observation windows.

Friendship PCS was late in getting the requested documents to DC PCSB including: schedules, room numbers, goals charts, board meeting minutes etc. In many cases the schedules were incorrect and had to be resubmitted to DC PCSB. Friendship PCS scheduled testing during every QSR window. One school also scheduled professional development during the window without telling DC PCSB. This resulted in many observers not being able to conduct their observations. DC PCSB had to extend the review windows for multiple schools in order to collect data.

Governance

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

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, Friendship PCS- Woodridge ES provided answers to specific questions posed by DC PCSB regarding the provision of instruction to students with disabilities. The reviewer who conducted special education-specific observations noted the following evidence to support that the school is implementing some, but not all, of its articulated special education program:

- The school wrote that general and special educators assess student progress through weekly or biweekly assessments and they differentiate those assessments in accordance with a student's IEP. The school also stated that they used verbal checks and exit tickets. The specialist observed verbal checks for understanding via whole group and individualized questions of varying levels posed to students. However the use of daily exit tickets was not observed in these observations.
- The school stated that general education teachers have resources in their classrooms to support the learning of students with disabilities. The specialist observed leveled libraries in the inclusion classes. Students used the libraries in some of the centers with independence. The specialist did not observe the use of calculators in any of the classrooms.

- Per the questionnaire all teachers are trained on accommodations and modifications and receive consultative support from the SPED teacher or coordinator. The observer saw evidence of these trainings in many classrooms. The specialist observed students receiving individualized instruction, repetition of directions and paraphrasing. Many classes used centers supporting differentiation and choice. Teachers often maintained proximity to support students who were both able and unable to advocate for themselves. Clarification of task and praise language was used to support student progress through tasks.
- The school explained that differentiating a lesson looks like: varying levels of rigor and amounts of work, scaffolding questions, small group instruction, centers, computer-based learning and individualized instruction based on student assessment results and leveled readers. The specialist observed the implementation of these components in the inclusive classrooms she visited.
- The school claimed to use inclusionary supports such as a co-teaching model and pull out for direct instruction. The specialist observed the use of these methods in all the inclusive classrooms observed. Special education teachers also pulled students into a smaller group within the larger classroom setting to provide additional instruction.

Instruction for English Language Learners

Prior to the two-week window, Friendship PCS – Woodridge Elementary provided answers to specific questions posed by DC PCSB regarding the provision of instruction to English Language Learners. The reviewer who conducted ELL-specific observations noted the following evidence to support that the school is implementing a portion of its articulated ELL program. The reviewer saw clear evidence that the school is implementing its program as outlined in the ELL questionnaire:

- The school stated that ELL students receive both pull-out and push-in services based on their individual proficiency levels and needs. The ELL specialist observed ELL services using both pull-out and push-in models. The teacher used modeling, appropriate wait time and strategic questioning to scaffold student learning in all the sessions. One concern is the limited schedule for ELL services. Most students receive only one session of ELL services per week for approximately 40 minutes.
- The school stated that the ELL teacher checks for understanding both informally and formally during pull-out sessions by communicating with each student, asking strategic questions, and monitoring their work during the lesson. Their methods range from brief one-on-one conversations, to more formal exit slips. During the observation the ELL observer did see many examples of informal assessments and checks. The proximity of the students in all the sessions and the substantial one-on-one contact indicates the use of close monitoring of student understanding. Overall the assessments were primarily informal questions with more formal assessment observed in two sessions as written responses to prompts.
- The school claimed that differentiation in an inclusive classroom would mean that

the ELL students are participating in the lesson just as much as their classmates. In the observed push-in lesson, the ELL student worked one-on-one with the ELL teacher, away from the rest of the students.

CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

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

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>Mission:</p> <p>The mission of Friendship Public Charter School is to provide a world-class education that motivates students to achieve high academic standards, enjoy learning, and develop as ethical, literate, well-rounded, and self-sufficient citizens who contribute actively to their communities.</p>	<p>There was evidence that Friendship - Woodridge Elementary is meeting its mission.</p> <p>The school has a warm and caring environment with 10 tenants of the school for scholars posted throughout the school: principled, communicator, risk-taker, caring, thinker, open-minded, inquirer, reflective, balanced, knowledgeable. World map murals and information about world cultures hang throughout the building. The EYO International Bachelorette (IB) program is highlighted on bulletin boards in classrooms and hallways but the QSR team did not see evidence of it being referenced in lesson delivery. Students showed respect to teachers and to each other while demonstrating ownership of their learning. The team observed self-sufficient student behavior through the effective execution procedures and routines. Students generally appeared to enjoy learning tasks often completing academic work with minimal teacher intervention, actively participating in class discussions, and working collaboratively in small groups.</p> <p>In some observations the QSR team saw limited evidence of students contributing to classroom community. Off task student behavior such as getting into small disagreements that required teacher intervention or failing to contribute to group work, disrupted the learning process.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>Teachers in these observations attempted to engage and redirect students however students disregarded the expected norms of conduct and participation.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator #1: Student Progress – Academic Improvement over time in English Language Arts (ELA)</p> <p>PMF Indicator #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards in ELA</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 89% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. Observers saw high-quality instruction and collected evidence that the school is close to meeting this goal. Students in most classrooms demonstrated knowledge of their reading levels as they quickly joined reading groups or easily picked books from leveled reading libraries. Classrooms contained bulletin boards with current reading data and organized leveled reading libraries.</p> <p>The QSR team observed evidence of both whole group and small group instruction in most ELA classrooms. In one Pre-Kindergarten class, the teacher led an interactive read aloud that asked students to talk about the role of the author and illustrator, identify the title, choral read, and act out parts of the story. Students then worked in writing centers directly with the teachers. Teachers wrote as students dictated what they wanted to say on the paper. In Kindergarten through third-grade ELA classrooms, students worked on a variety of learning tasks in literacy centers: guided reading, practicing election speeches, tech (reading books and completing activities on Compass learning), word work on wipe away boards, and independent reading.</p> <p>According to the goals evidence chart provided by the school, there is a balance of teacher directed and student initiated questioning. However, the QSR team saw little evidence of student initiated questioning during reading activities and in a few observations teachers did not ask any open-ended questions to facilitate academic</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>PMF Indicator #1: Student Progress – Academic Improvement over time in math</p> <p>PMF Indicator #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards in math</p>	<p>discussion.</p> <p>The QSR team observed high-quality math instruction and collected evidence that the school is working to meet this goal.</p> <p>Teachers engaged students in math using a variety of instructional strategies and groupings. In one observation students worked in math centers, participated in a whole group counting games, and completed independent work. In another observation the teacher moved students through three math activities. By the end of this observation, students completed a story problem independently with each student finding the right answer in their own way. To conclude the lesson the teacher called on three students to explain how they solved the problem to the class.</p> <p>The QSR team observed the use of Compass Learning, small group work, and manipulatives in math lessons. Teachers rotated during independent math time giving specific feedback and correcting misconceptions on the spot as detailed further in the <i>Using Assessment in Instruction</i> component of the Danielson rubric.</p> <p>In two math observations students completed a series of problems on a handout and shared each answer aloud. In one of these observations there was no opportunity for students to initiate questions about the work and teachers did not provide feedback.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator # 3: Gateway – Outcomes in key subjects that predict future educational success</p>	<p>The QSR team for Friendship - Woodridge Elementary limited observations to reading instruction for the purposes of this goal. The QSR team observed high-quality reading instruction and high student engagement in ELA classes.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
PMF Goal #4: School Environment	<p>DC PCSB measures attendance to evaluate the climate of a school. DC PCSB believes that if students are not in school, they lose opportunities for learning.</p> <p>In-seat attendance on the days the QSR team conducted observations¹:</p> <p>Visit 1: November 8, 2016 – 94.4% Visit 2: November 10, 2016 – 87.1% Visit 3: November 15, 2016 – 93.8% Visit 4: November 22, 2016 – 93.1%</p>

¹ This data has not been validated.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT²

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 82% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	<p>The QSR team scored 95% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations teachers modeled respectful behavior and taught students how to be respectful to each other. In one observation a student reported to the teacher that another student hit him. The teacher immediately talked to the student about the situation. The student apologized, and both moved on with their work in the center.</p>	Distinguished	5%
	<p>In another observation two students had a disagreement. The teacher coached the students through a conversation in which they shared feelings and apologized to each other. Teachers called students by name, leaned down to meet students on their eye level when talking to them, and encouraged students. In one distinguished observation the teacher listened intently as a student explained something that happened to them. The teacher smiled and said, “I didn’t know that that happened. I’m so glad that you’re okay!”</p>	Proficient	90%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component.</p>	Basic	5%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

² 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	<p>The QSR team scored 91% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers maintained high expectations for students and students persisted when answering hard questions and participating in class activities. Teachers called on all students to participate in lessons and recognized student effort with high fives, cheers, and praise. Students were happy and inquisitive.</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>In one observation students eagerly asked, "what's that?" and "what are we doing today?" Teachers demonstrated confidence in students' abilities. In one observation a student said, "I saw that, I don't want to. I saw what we were going to do and I don't want to write." The teacher quickly responded, "writing is very important and you're so good at it." In another observation the teacher said, "oh yeah? That's a good one. Let's write it down" after a student reluctantly shared an idea with the class.</p>	Proficient	91%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component.</p>	Basic	9%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>The QSR team scored 95% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers maximized instructional time using timers, countdowns, and claps to signal transitions and manage lesson pacing. In many observations students moved quickly and efficiently from large group lessons to small group work. In one observation students moved between learning centers easily. Students posted</p>	Distinguished	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>stars with their names to identify where they were working. In another observation teachers called students one at a time to go to centers. Students placed a name card on the board indicating which center they wanted as the teacher called their name. For the duration of the observation students worked diligently in centers without teacher direction. Teachers signaled clean-up time and students worked together to put away materials. No students left to use the restroom or asked to leave the class in any of the observations.</p> <p>In pull-out sessions for ELLs and students with disabilities, students left classrooms and returned, escorted by SPED teachers, with no disruption to the other students.</p>	Proficient	95%
	The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component.	Basic	5%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 77% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations student behavior was almost entirely appropriate. Students worked together, talked in a friendly manner, and shared ideas. Teachers reminded students of behavior expectations and referenced classroom rules when needed. The QSR team observed behavior charts in most classrooms and teachers used the charts in a consistent and fair manner. Students in many observations moved name clips up on behavior charts for demonstrating appropriate behaviors such as helping others, using inside voices, and managing their bodies on the carpet.	Distinguished	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>In one observation the teacher gave class points. The teacher said, "make sure you are sitting on your star with your hands up. Everybody is tracking Student X." When the entire class immediately followed directions, the teacher said, "Class point! Way to go guys!"</p>	Proficient	77%
	<p>The QSR team scored 23% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations student misbehavior interfered with learning. Students needed frequent reminders to raise their hands, stay in their seats, and keep their hands to themselves. Teachers attempted to redirect off task behavior with limited success.</p> <p>In one observation the teacher assigned points for good group behavior but students returned to the off task behavior immediately after getting the points. In another observation students hit each other as they worked in centers, wrote on each other's materials, and walked around the room instead of completing the expected learning task. During the observation the teacher called one student to her desk, but he ignored request. The teacher moved his name down on the behavior chart however the misbehavior continued.</p>	Basic	23%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

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 89% 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 86% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers clearly explained learning tasks, directions and objectives. Teachers had lesson objectives posted in the classrooms and referenced them during the observations. At the beginning of one class the teacher stated, “Today we are going to write four things we would do if we were president. Then we are going to make them into paragraphs in our journals.” Students in these observations followed directions and completed learning tasks without any clarification needed from the teacher. Lesson delivery was free of content errors.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	86%
	<p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers repeated directions multiple times and students still had trouble starting on new assignments. In a few observations students asked questions that demonstrated confusion. In one observation a student did not start any work after the teacher repeated directions three times. He then started to cry and was only able to start the assignment when another adult entered the room to work with him.</p>	Basic	14%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques	<p>The QSR team scored 82% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers asked questions to extend student thinking and facilitate discussion. In one observation a teacher asked students, "What can you infer?" Followed up with additional questions: "Why do you think he was trying to figure out what was said? What clues gave you the idea that they were going to try and trick him?" Next the teacher facilitated a discussion that allowed students to agree and disagree by using hand signals. Students who disagreed were given a chance to express their different opinions.</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>In other observations teachers asked, "Who wants to build on that answer?" or "Can anyone add something new to what your classmates have said?" to increase participation. Teachers in these observations asked students to justify and explain their thinking. In one observation the teacher asked, "Why do you think the boy is smiling at the end?" A student volunteered, "He is smiling because the dog is lying on him and licking him." The teacher pushed, "How do you know that makes him smile?"</p>	Proficient	82%
	<p>The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers primarily asked questions that had one single correct answer and did not facilitate student discussion. In one observation the teacher prompted students to hold up agree or disagree symbols but did not give opportunities to share their reasoning or thinking.</p>	Basic	18%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Engaging Students in Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 95% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Materials supported the learning goals and were age-appropriate. In one observation teachers used picture strips to activate student language. In another observation students made question cubes to use in small groups after they read the story "The Tortoise and the Hare." The question cubes provided students with appropriate ways to discuss the story and ensured that all students could participate.</p>	Distinguished	5%
	<p>Teachers gave students choices when selecting centers and encouraged students to find their own ways to solve problems. The pacing of the lessons provided students the time to respond and engage with content. Teachers in these observations did not rush students and gave more time to complete tasks when students needed it. In one observation the teacher used a scene from a popular cartoon to have the students start a discussion about the meaning of certain words based on context clues from the scene.</p>	Proficient	90%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component.</p>	Basic	5%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Using Assessment in Instruction	<p>The QSR team scored 91% of the observations as proficient in this component. In these observations teachers posed specific questions to gauge student understanding. In a few observations teachers asked students questions as they worked in centers. In one observation the teacher asked students follow-up questions when needed such as, "Kind of—why do you say kind of? Explain." In another observation the teacher gave feedback to a student in a literacy center, "This does not tell me that you know the purpose of this book - I know that you know how to find the authors purpose."</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>Teachers monitored student understanding during work time. In one observation a student did not identify the correct operation to solve a math problem. The teacher gave the student seven pencils to use as manipulatives. After the student worked with the pencils the teacher said, "So should this be addition or subtraction? Do you now see why we use addition?" In two math observations students played number games while the teacher monitored correcting students as needed and addressing whole class misconceptions on the spot.</p>	Proficient	91%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component.</p>	Basic	9%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

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

APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC

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

