



December 22, 2016

Donald Hense, Board Chair
Friendship PCS– Blow Pierce Elementary
120 W Street NE, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Mr. Hense:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews (QSRs) 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 QSR during the 2016-17 school year for the following reasons:


- School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year
- School designated Focus or Priority by Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE)

Qualitative Site Review Report

A QSR team conducted on-site reviews of Friendship PCS– Blow Pierce Elementary between November 7, 2016 through November 18, 2016. Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the QSR report focuses primarily on the following areas: charter mission and goals, implementation of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) strategies, classroom environments, and instruction.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the QSR at Friendship PCS – Blow Pierce 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 – Blow Pierce Elementary

Ward: 7

Grade levels: PK3- 3

Qualitative Site Review Information

Reasons for visit:

- School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year
- School designated Priority by Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE)

Two-week window: November 7, 2016- November 18, 2016

QSR team members: 3 DC PCSB staff members including a special education specialist and an English Language Learner (ELL) specialist, and 1 consultant

Number of observations: 18

Total enrollment: 410

Students with Disabilities enrollment: 19

English Language Learners enrollment: 9

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.

At Friendship PCS- Blow Pierce Elementary, students receive high quality education, as described further in the Instruction section of this report. In some observations teachers helped students talk to each other respectfully. In hallways however observers noticed concerning trends, such as teachers speaking disrespectfully to students.

During the Qualitative Site Review (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 76% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. This is slightly higher than the percent of observations rated proficient or distinguished in SY 2015-16 QSR, at 72%.¹ Teachers and students demonstrated mutual respect. Some teachers displayed genuine caring and warmth for students as they asked about their lives outside of school. Classroom routines functioned smoothly in most classrooms, and observers saw limited instances of misbehavior throughout classrooms.

The QSR team scored 71% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain, which is a significant increase from 57%, the percentage of observations rated

¹ Friendship PCS – Blow Pierce Elementary received a full QSR last year because of its identification as a Priority school.

proficient or distinguished in this domain last year. Teachers delivered error-free content and modeled the learning process when appropriate. The QSR team rated 17% of observations as unsatisfactory in *Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques*. In a few classrooms there was no discussion at all or teachers asked students questions that required only recall without any deeper thinking.

While the QSR team rated over 70% of classroom observations as distinguished or proficient in both the Classroom Environment and Instruction domains, observers noticed concerning school climate trends throughout hallways. The QSR team noted numerous instances of adults firmly (and sometimes forcefully) escorting students out of classrooms, and speaking with students disrespectfully. The QSR team also observed a chaotic fire drill. As students came back into the building, they kicked and punched each other with ineffective intervention from adults.

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.

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). Friendship PCS – Blow Pierce Elementary was identified as a Priority school during school year 2014-15 based on weak DC CAS performance on both the English Language Arts (ELA) and math sections of the assessment during the 2013-14 school year. As part of this designation, Friendship PCS – Blow Pierce Elementary developed intervention strategies to address overall underperformance.

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.

ESEA Waiver Priority School Intervention and Support Plan

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. Priority schools are required to implement their Priority improvement strategies for at least three years, thus Friendship PCS– Blow Pierce Elementary was not eligible for the flexibilities that OSSE granted to Focus and Priority Schools that met specific performance thresholds based on 2016 PARCC results. 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. The school explained that DC PCSB observers should see: (1) re-teaching based on benchmark analysis (2) thematic approach to ELA and math instruction, incorporating science and social studies in ELA and math lessons (2) checks for understanding; (3) Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS); and (4) intervention block using Compass Learning and Lexia online learning systems. Please click [here](#) for a link to last year’s report. Note that the only strategy the school did not revise for SY 2016-17 was the Intervention Block.

Re-teaching Based on Benchmark Analysis

The QSR team observed the English Language Learner (ELL) teacher re-teaching standards from the general education setting to an ELL in one classroom, but observed no other evidence of re-teaching standards.

Thematic Approach

DC PCSB observed weak implementation of a thematic approach to ELA and math lessons. One observer saw the teaching of science concepts in an ELA class as the class read a text about a pet fish, discussed how to care for one, and discussed the appearance of a lion-fish. The QSR team observed no other references to science or social studies concepts in ELA or math classes.

Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS)

The QSR team observed mixed implementation of PBIS. Teachers encouraged positive behavior by prompting students to speak to each other respectfully, and narrated positive on-task behavior during lessons. Teachers used behavior charts and behavior expectations were posted throughout classrooms. In some classrooms, teachers awarded students with positive behavior points using a tracking system on their cell phones. Students referred to “Fun Fridays”, which seemed to be a reward for positive behavior during the week. Teachers did not refer to any behavior tracking or incentive systems in a few observations.

Checks for Understanding

The QSR team observed strong evidence of checks for understanding, rating 73% of observations as proficient or distinguished in *Using Assessment in Instruction*. Individual student data related to progress on benchmarks was posted in hallways and in classrooms. Teachers gauged understanding through a mix of higher order questioning and questioning requiring recall of facts or procedures, examining individual student work, and watching students perform tasks at centers.

Intervention Block

Similar to last year, the QSR team saw mixed implementation of the use of Lexia and Compass intervention programs overall, though observers noted limited use of the programs during the actual intervention block. Students used the programs during pullout sessions and during their math block as one of their math stations. Students used the computer programs in two of five classrooms observed during the intervention block.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, Friendship PCS – Blow Pierce Elementary provided answers to questions posed by DC PCSB regarding the provision of instruction to students with disabilities in the Special Education Questionnaire. The reviewer looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. While the reviewer saw strong evidence of the school's use of a variety of resources for special education students, the reviewer saw limited evidence of the school's use of informal assessments and was unable to witness co-teaching because of scheduling conflicts.

- The school indicated that teachers have access to a variety of resources for students with disabilities including online interventions, manipulatives, visual aids, graphic organizers, and leveled libraries, which was confirmed during the site review. In all special education settings, the QSR team observed the use of a variety of resources to differentiate learning including computer-based interventions (Lexia and Compass), leveled books, word/sound sorting activities, phonics flashcards, spelling activities on pocket charts, and whiteboards.
- The school described teachers using a variety of informal assessments including exit tickets to check for understanding throughout lessons, which was partially observed during the site visits. The QSR team did not observe exit tickets, although teachers collected classwork at the end of lessons. In a pullout setting the teacher provided quick and specific feedback to students and encouraged students to incorporate feedback into their work.
- The school stated that the QSR team should see evidence of teacher collaboration through co-teaching but the QSR team was unable to witness co-teaching due to multiple scheduling conflicts with the school.

Instruction for English Language Learners

Prior to the two-week window, Friendship PCS - Blow Pierce Elementary submitted responses to a questionnaire related to the school's provision of services for the school's

English Language Learner (ELL) population. The ELL specialist looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Observations confirmed that the school is faithfully implementing its articulated ELL program.

- The school explained that students receive pull-out services based on their individual proficiency levels and needs. The ELL Coordinator conducted pull-outs at each grade level. Each session had a clearly defined learning objective aligned to the learning goals of the general education classroom.

The school also explained that the ELL coordinator frequently checks for student understanding. The ELL Coordinator checked 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. In one session the students made a letter blends flip chart to guide their practice. The ELL Coordinator provided clear directions and modeled each step before asking students to complete tasks independently. She closely monitored their work products and provided additional guidance for correcting incomplete sentences, anticipating letter sounds, and capitalizing proper nouns.

- The school explained that the ELL coordinator supports modifications from the general education lessons. In one session, the ELL Coordinator reviewed the assignment the student completed independently in the general educator classroom and taught specific grammar skills applicable to improving the student's work for accuracy. In other sessions the ELL Coordinator provided a graphic organizer to help students organize their writing.

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>The QSR team observed evidence that the school is meeting its mission. The QSR team rated 71% of observations as proficient or distinguished in the <u>Instruction</u> domain. In most classrooms students demonstrated their enjoyment of learning through engagement, with 61% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished in <i>Engaging Students in Learning</i>.</p> <p>Teachers fostered the development of students as ethical citizens who contribute to their communities by creating positive classroom environments, with over 70% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished in <i>Establishing an Environment of Respect and Rapport</i>. Students contributed to their community by caring for the classroom pet in one observation. Some teachers coached students by giving them specific ways to speak with each other respectfully to resolve conflicts and by asking students to reflect on negative actions by drawing.</p> <p>While classrooms interactions were generally respectful, observers noticed concerning trends in hallways as teachers used disrespectful language towards students and students fought with each other on their way back from a fire drill.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<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 observed mixed evidence of effective instruction in reading. In strong observations students practiced letter sounds, demonstrated their learning by choosing a word that started with a letter and shared examples of compound words. Teachers used grade-appropriate texts to model reading strategies like how to identify the moral of the story and how to discuss main characters. Teachers in some classrooms used turn and talks to engage students and to assess learning by listening to students talk with each other.</p> <p>Students did not consistently receive feedback tailored toward future improvement. In a whole-group lesson students practiced fluency by reading a text aloud. The only feedback the teacher shared with students was to slow down.</p>
<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>The QSR team observed mixed evidence of effective math instruction. Teachers differentiated instruction through math centers/stations. In one observation the teacher gave a student at a center manipulatives to help him answer questions about a number line. Centers also gave students multiple ways to reinforce their learning, as in an observation where students had the opportunity to form shapes with clay and draw shapes. Teachers facilitated small group work and provided tailored support to some students while other students worked at computers on their level through the COMPASS math intervention program. Teachers gave students feedback on their work, helping them find where they may have made a mistake in their calculations.</p> <p>In a few observations questioning led students down a single path of inquiry with one word correct answers, with limited opportunities to justify their responses.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>Student engagement in some math classes was weak, and classroom management challenges prevented the effective delivery of instruction.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator # 3: Gateway – Outcomes in key subjects that predict future educational success</p>	<p>The QSR team observed mixed evidence of effective instruction in third grade reading. Teachers in a science class and in an ELL session reinforced reading skills by asking students to cite specific evidence from a text to justify their answers. Teachers gave students specific feedback to improve their work, encouraging them to go back through their writing to make complete sentences. Students used the Lexia reading intervention program at their own individual levels to improve their literacy skills.</p> <p>In some ELA instruction, questioning led students down a single path of inquiry with one-word correct answers and student engagement was weak as demonstrated by off-task behavior and a constant need for the teacher to redirect students.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator #4: School Environment – Predictors of future student progress and achievement</p>	<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 observations:² Visit 1: November 4, 2016 – 90.9% Visit 2: November 8, 2016 – 94.6% Visit 3: November 9, 2016 – 90.9% Visit 4: November 10, 2016 – 81.9% Visit 5: November 14, 2016 – 93%</p>

² This data has not been validated.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT³

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 76% 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 72% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers demonstrated genuine caring and warmth for students, making sure students had eaten their breakfast, and asking about their Halloween costumes. Teachers helped students work out disagreements in respectful ways by giving them examples of language and encouraging students to apologize when they had offended each other, and students complied. Students also encouraged each other to respect teachers.	Distinguished	11%
		Proficient	61%
	The QSR team scored 22% of the observations as basic in this component. Students disrespected teachers by ignoring directions, walking in and out of the classroom without permission, and fighting with each other despite the teacher’s attempts to redirect. Some teachers disrespected students by interrupting them.	Basic	22%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	6%

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	<p>The QSR team scored 78% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers recognized the efforts of students. In these observations teachers praised student responses, recalled specific points about a topic that students discussed the previous day, and recognized hard work with comments like, "Wow, you guys are working so hard and remember so much!" Students participated in classroom discussions enthusiastically and commended each other by clapping after responses. In one observation the teacher expected effort from all students by saying, "We are working on literacy and you can all do it."</p>	Distinguished	6%
	<p>The QSR team scored 17% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations students demonstrated limited commitment to learning as they continued to talk over the teacher's directions or socialized instead of completing the learning task. In one observation students did not complete any work, and the teacher's intervention was unsuccessful.</p>	Basic	17%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	6%
Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>The QSR team scored 82% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Students were productively engaged during small groups, even when not working directly with the teacher. Teachers used timers, chimes, and countdowns resulting in smooth transitions between activities. Students helped teachers collect and distribute</p>	Distinguished	6%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	materials. Classroom materials were available and ready for students, and students knew how to get them without wasting instructional time.	Proficient	76%
	The QSR team scored 12% of the observations as basic in this component. Students did not consistently follow routines, with teachers reminding students several times what they were supposed to be doing. In one observation the teacher attempted to use countdowns and timers but few students complied with the directions. Students had to practice their transition to centers multiple times in one observation.	Basic	12%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	6%
Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 72% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Student behavior was appropriate in most classrooms, and students quickly corrected minor instances of misbehavior with light teacher intervention, like reminders about how to read quietly and a review of expectations for carpet time. In a couple of observations, students helped each other get back on track by collecting materials and reminding each other that the teacher was talking. Teachers narrated positive behaviors and used proximity to prevent negative behavior.	Distinguished	22%
		Proficient	50%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 22% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers' expectations for behavior were inconsistent. In one observation the teacher reprimanded a student who talked without raising his hand and allowed another student to do so later in the lesson, prompting the student to keep talking through questioning. In another observation the teacher attempted to correct student behavior but students continued to ignore directions, stayed off-task, and walked in and out of the classroom.</p>	Basic	22%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	6%

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 71% 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 83% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers’ directions were clear and when appropriate, provided short vocabulary lessons that allowed students to apply new words immediately to their learning. In one observation the teacher pre-taught the words “tremble”, “giddy”, and “resourceful”. Students also categorized synonyms. The instructional purpose of most lessons was clear, with teachers telling students how the lesson fit into the broader learning purpose. One teacher explained that students were learning about characters “to help them become better writers.”</p>	Distinguished	11%
		Proficient	72%
	<p>The QSR team scored 11% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations the instructional purpose of the lesson was unclear. The teacher referred in passing to what students should learn in one observation but took students off topic for the remainder of the class period. In another observation the teacher told students they needed to learn words to do well on a spelling test without any reference to why this was important.</p>	Basic	11%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as basic in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	6%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques	The QSR team scored 67% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers asked age-appropriate, open-ended questions. In a prekindergarten class the teacher asked students to name a compound word and in a kindergarten class students had to think of words beginning with their letter of the week. Teachers asked students to explain their thinking with questions like, "How did you know?" Teachers also asked students to make predictions about what stories would be about based on pictures.	Distinguished	6%
		Proficient	61%
	The QSR team scored 17% of the observations as basic in this component. Questioning was largely recall in these observations, leading students down a single path of inquiry with one-word correct answers and no opportunities for students to explain their thinking.	Basic	17%
	The QSR team scored 17% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In two of these observations, the teacher did not ask any questions or attempt to engage students in discussion. In another all questions required one-word answers.	Unsatisfactory	17%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Engaging Students in Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 61% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Students had choice in how they completed learning tasks. In one observation students filled in number lines at a station and one of the students used manipulatives for support. Learning tasks were engaging and had multiple correct answers. One teacher asked students to draw and write about a character from their story. Teachers used a range of instructional strategies to engage students. In one observation the teacher used motions, pictures, and verbal cues to help students remember the meaning of compound words. Teachers engaged all students through turn and talks and by encouraging students to ask each other for help if they did not know an answer.</p>	Distinguished	11%
		Proficient	50%
	<p>The QSR team scored 33% of the observations as basic in this component. In some observations students had no choice in how they completed their learning tasks. In these observations every student worked on the same handout requiring pre-determined, one word answers for the entire class, resulting in inconsistent student engagement.</p> <p>In other observations students were unable to engage in the learning task. Students in one class waited during the entire observation for the teacher to help them or when students could not log in to computers. Only some tasks demanded student thinking, with some requiring only recall of facts.</p>	Basic	33%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as basic in this component.	Unsatisfactory	6%
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team scored 73% of the observations as proficient in this component. Teachers assessed student understanding in multiple ways: asking each individual student to name a compound word or a word that started with a letter, looking at student work and helping students locate their mistakes, asking students to put their answers on the board, and listening to turn and talks. Teachers adjusted their lessons after realizing students did not fully understand a concept, and gave students specific feedback to use immediately to improve their writing.	Distinguished	6%
		Proficient	67%
	The QSR team scored 22% of the observations as basic in this component. In some observations feedback was ineffective in helping students improve work. In one observation the teacher gave only global feedback. In another observation the teacher told students how to correct their responses without telling the students why their responses were incorrect.	Basic	22%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as basic in this component.	Unsatisfactory	6%

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 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.
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.