



February 8, 2017

Donald Hense, Board Chair  
Friendship Public Charter School – Technology Preparatory Middle School  
2705 Martin Luther King Avenue, SE  
Washington, DC 20032

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 Public Charter School Technology Preparatory Middle School (Friendship PCS - Tech Prep Middle) between November 28, 2016 - December 9, 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 – Tech Prep Middle.

Sincerely,



Naomi DeVeaux  
Deputy Director

Enclosures  
cc: Patricia Brantley, CEO

## Qualitative Site Review Report

**Date:** February 8, 2017

### **Campus Information**

**Campus Name:** Friendship PCS – Tech Prep Middle

**Ward:** 8

**Grade levels:** 6-8

### **Qualitative Site Review Information**

**Reason for visit:** School eligible to petition for 20-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year

**Two-week window:** November 28, 2016 - December 9, 2016

**QSR team members:** 1 DC PCSB staff, 1 special education (SPED) consultant, 1 consultant

**Number of observations:** 15

**Total enrollment:** 257

**Students with Disabilities enrollment:** 53

**English Language Learners enrollment:** 0

### **In-seat attendance<sup>1</sup> on the days the QSR team conducted observations:**

Visit 1: November 29, 2016 – 96.0%

Visit 2: December 7, 2016 – 96.8%

Visit 3: December 8, 2016 – 92.9%

### **Summary**

The mission of Friendship PCS 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.

Friendship PCS – Tech Prep Middle is a college preparatory middle school serving students in 6th - 8th grade. The school is a safe and orderly place. Security guards greet students by name and distribute breakfast in the morning. Adults consistently monitor the hallways to ensure students transition between classes in a safe and timely manner. The physical space supports the school's mission to motivate students to achieve high academic standards. Historically black colleges and prominent black scholars and civil rights leaders are featured throughout the building. Advertisements for enrichment activities, such as the Saturday math club called "Tech Prep Titans," are posted on the halls.

Observers noted strong contrasts in instructional quality and classroom management from classroom to classroom. In some observations student behavior significantly interfered with the school's mission. In these observations teachers referenced standards of conduct,

---

<sup>1</sup> This data has not been validated by the school. DC PCSB pulled the data in December 2016.

but students did not comply. Significant learning time was lost as teachers attempted to correct student behavior. In other classes student behavior was generally appropriate, teachers effectively communicated the lesson objectives and procedures, and students demonstrated their enjoyment for learning.

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 52% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in the Classroom Environment domain. (By comparison, in the SY2012-13<sup>2</sup> QSR, 59% of observations were proficient or distinguished in this domain.) While 57% of observations in the *Managing Classroom Procedures* component were proficient or distinguished, only 42% of observations in the *Managing Student Behavior* component were proficient or distinguished. This suggests that a majority of teachers prepared materials and activities, but that most did not or were not able to effectively monitor and respond to student misbehavior.

The QSR team scored 45% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. (By comparison, in the SY2012-13 QSR, 58% of the observation in this were scored as distinguished or proficient.) While 57% of observations in the *Communicating with Students* component were proficient or distinguished, only 29% of observations in the *Using Assessment in Instruction* component were proficient or distinguished. Teachers in most observations communicated expectations for learning and directions for activities, but there was minimal monitoring of learning. In some observations there were no opportunities for discussion.

### Governance

DC PCSB reviewed Friendship PCS' October 2016 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 – Tech Prep Middle provided answers to questions posed by DC PCSB regarding the provision of instruction to students with disabilities in the Special Education Questionnaire. Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program in their observations. The SPED specialist on the QSR team documented that teachers provided effective accommodations in the resource classes, but there was minimal evidence of differentiation in the inclusion classrooms.

- The school stated that leveled classroom libraries, virtual access to an online library, and blended learning platforms are used to differentiate instruction and support reading intervention and acceleration. The observer saw evidence of a blended learning platform (Read 180) in one out of three inclusion classrooms. The observers also noted leveled reading in the resource classroom, but did not observe leveled classroom libraries or virtual learning libraries in the inclusion classrooms.

---

<sup>2</sup> The SY2012-13 QSR for Friendship PCS – Tech Prep included observations of grades 6 – 12.

- The school noted that the inclusion model at Friendship PCS – Tech Prep Middle takes the form of co-teaching or whole class inclusion. The QSR team only saw whole-class instruction and no co-teaching. In inclusion observations students' disruptive behavior significantly interrupted instruction.
- The school described the following observable differentiation techniques in the inclusion classroom: preferential seating, supplemental lighting, background music, highlighted materials, blended learning software, choice of oral or written assessments, and self-evaluation rubrics. The QSR team observed classical background music in two observations and Read 180 in one observation, but did not observe any of the other methods of differentiation.
- The SPED Specialist observed two resource classes and a self-contained special education math class. These class sizes were smaller and behavior was appropriate. The special educator supported the students through oral and written instructions, repetition of directions and information, and scaffolding.

**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.

<b>Mission and Goals</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
<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 noted mixed evidence that Friendship – Tech Prep Middle is meeting its mission. While there were exceptional observations in which virtually all students demonstrated enjoyment for learning, in most classroom observations student engagement was low. Students often spoke to their teachers and peers disrespectfully and in some cases, refused to engage with the lesson. In multiple observations student behavior resulted in a significant loss of instructional time. There was little evidence that most students could self-sufficiently manage their time and interactions.</p> <p>Overall teachers held high academic expectations for some, but not all students. In nine out of 15 observations, some students chose not to participate in class without teacher redirection; students were allowed to put their heads down, talk to their classmates, or turn their backs to the lesson.</p>
<p>Goals:</p>	
<p>PMF Indicator #1: Student Progress – Academic improvement over time <i>Effective instruction supporting student academic progress in reading.</i></p>	<p>The QSR noted evidence of small group instruction and differentiation in some English Language Arts (ELA) observations. In one ELA observation</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>PMF Indicator #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards <i>Moving students to proficient and advanced levels in reading.</i></p>	<p>students practiced leading a Socratic seminar. The teacher provided opportunities for differentiation by allowing students to self-select designated roles in the discussion. In another observation the teacher successfully engaged all students in a close reading and annotation lesson, asking high-level questions such as, “What is the plot twist here in the story?” and “What is the mood of the main character?” In another observation students wrote responses to a non-fiction article of their choice.</p> <p>In reading intervention programs there was explicit instruction of reading strategies in small groups. The special education teacher focused on sound blends, phonetic awareness, reading comprehension, and fluency.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator #1: Student Progress – Academic improvement over time <i>Effective instruction supporting student academic progress in math.</i></p> <p>PMF Indicator #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards <i>Moving students to proficient and advanced levels in math.</i></p>	<p>The QSR team saw some effective math instruction. In most of the observations teachers did not challenge students through questioning or check for individual understanding. Most students copied teacher work directly from the board without having to engage with the problems on their own.</p> <p>Teachers used whole group instruction in math and there was no evidence of differentiation. Some classes engaged in “Mad Minute” math drills where students completed as many multiplication problems as possible in a condensed time frame. A few math teachers passed out end-of-lesson exit tickets but there was no evidence of re-teaching in math observations.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator # 3: Gateway – <i>Promotion of math proficiency by eighth grade.</i></p>	<p>The QSR team saw limited evidence of the school preparing all students to be at grade level by 8<sup>th</sup> grade in math. Overall</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>teachers in math classes did not insist on full class participation. In two observations only a few students participated by raising their hands. In one math class the teacher did example problems in the board without involving students in questioning. Several students had their backs turned to the teacher in the back of the room. In another observation students answered a series of questions and then the teacher had one student come up to the board to write the answer. The teacher did not provide individual feedback or teach the content.</p> <p>In one observation students were mostly engaged and completed the math work. When a student came up to the board, the teacher insisted that other students pay attention and then gave opportunities for students to discuss their answers.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator # 4: School Environment – <i>Predictors of future student progress and achievement</i></p>	<p>DC PCSB uses attendance, among other indicators, to evaluate the climate of a school. DC PCSB believes that if students are not in school, they lose opportunities for learning. On the days the QSR team visited, the school had attendance rates well above 85%, the threshold that DC PCSB encourages schools to meet or exceed.</p> <p><b>In-seat attendance on the days the QSR team conducted observations:</b>  Visit 1: November 29, 2016 – 96.0%  Visit 2: December 7, 2016 – 96.8%  Visit 3: December 8, 2016 – 92.9%</p>

### THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT<sup>3</sup>

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 52% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 57% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations students were respectful to the teacher and one another. In some observations teachers referred to the students as “scholars” and “friends.” Teachers displayed Student of the Month posters in a few classrooms. Students offered one another pencils and helped each other by clarifying assignment expectations. In one distinguished observation a student asked his teacher if he could take the lead by greeting each of his classmates as they entered the classroom.</p>	Distinguished	21%
		Proficient	36%
	<p>The QSR team scored 36% of the observations as basic in this component. These observations were marked with occasional disrespect or insensitivity. In one observation students repeatedly told each other to “shut up” often yelling it across the room. The teacher’s response of, “Thank you but we don’t say shut up,” did not stop the outbursts. In another observation two students laughed as they sang a mocking song about another student’s weight, which went on for ten minutes before the teacher intervened. In a few observations students yelled obscenities and mocked their teachers.</p>	Basic	36%

<sup>3</sup> Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	7%
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	The QSR team scored 50% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations teachers encouraged academic discussion and praised student effort. In one distinguished observation the teacher ensured every student participated in the discussion. The teacher gave reluctant students advanced notice that they would be called on, which appeared to put students at ease and ensure whole-class participation. A few teachers held individual "data conferences" with students. The teachers discussed each student's current performance and invited them to set aspirational goals for the next assessment.	Distinguished	14%
		Proficient	36%
	The QSR team scored 50% of the observations as basic in this component. In most observations some students participated throughout the lesson, but teachers permitted the rest to sit passively. In one observation a student sat for forty minutes without engaging in the learning task and without teacher redirection. In a math observation students solved problems on whiteboards at their desk while at least four students did not complete any math problems. The teacher said, "Are you in this group? You better get to work." The students did not change their behavior and continued to sit throughout the remainder of the lesson.	Basic	50%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

<b>The Classroom Environment</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>School Wide Rating</b>	
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 57% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers in these observations used timers and attention getting signals. In one observation the teacher had students repeat lining up at the door twice to ensure all students understood the procedure. Teachers in these observations had systems and routines in place that ensured most students knew what to do and had all necessary materials. In one observation the teacher disseminated highlighters as students completed a warm-up and collected them while students completed an exit ticket without losing instructional time.</p>	Distinguished	7%
		Proficient	50%
	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as basic in this component. These observations lacked established procedures and routines. Instructional time was lost while teachers and students looked for materials. Students often interrupted the lesson when they needed to use the restroom or get water. Classroom transitions were announced over the loudspeaker, and at times classes were not prepared to transition. Some teachers did not have an opportunity to collect exit tickets before students transitioned to their next class.</p>	Basic	29%
<p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations teachers' classroom management strategies were ineffective. In one observation the teacher attempted to explain the rules and procedures of a review game for over thirty minutes. At one point students got into an argument about team captains for fifteen minutes.</p>	Unsatisfactory	14%	

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 42% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations there was virtually no student misbehavior. When teachers occasionally had to redirect students for quietly chatting during work time, students corrected their behavior immediately. In one observation the teacher never stopped circulating the room. When one student needed to be redirected, the teacher said, "You will spend your free time with me if you don't get to work." The student immediately got back on task. In another observation a teacher simply looked at two students who were talking and said, "Fix it." The students stopped talking and got back to work.</p>	Distinguished	21%
		Proficient	21%
	<p>The QSR team scored 43% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations students lost a significant amount of learning time due to off-task behaviors. Teachers attempted to redirect behavior with uneven results. In one observation a teacher used proximity by walking to the back of the classroom where students were talking. When the teacher went back to the board, the students continued to talk.</p> <p>In another observation the teacher wrote the names of the students who were misbehaving on the board. Each time the student did not alter his or her behavior the teacher placed a check by the student's name, however students did not alter their behavior. In a few observations the teacher said, "I'm waiting" while students were talking. Some students altered their behavior momentarily but continued off-task behavior minutes later.</p>	Basic	43%

<b>The Classroom Environment</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>School Wide Rating</b>	
	<p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations students refused to work, used profanity, and laughed at the teacher. In one observation students took pictures on their phones while the teacher attempted to conduct a test review. Forty minutes passed without instruction.</p>	Unsatisfactory	14%

**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 45% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Instruction domain.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<p><b>Communicating with Students</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored 57% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In one distinguished observation students learned how to lead a Socratic seminar. The teacher modeled best practices and showed exemplar videos. The teacher invited students to draw their own conclusions from the examples to explain the content to their classmates. In another observation the teacher used many examples to help students understand the scientific concept of natural selection and evolution.</p>	Distinguished	14%
		Proficient	43%
	<p>The QSR team scored 36% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations the lesson directions were unclear. Some students attempted to clarify the lesson purpose while others sat idly or talked to their peers. In some observations the teachers said, “Someone tell me what you’re supposed to be doing right now.” A student usually answered but not everyone would follow directions.</p>	Basic	36%
<p><b>Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	7%
	<p>The QSR team scored 43% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations teachers provided students the opportunity to help each other when answering questions. Teachers asked</p>	Distinguished	7%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>some complex questions requiring students to give more than one word answers. For example, "Why did the character act in that way?" and "What happens in natural selection to the animal with weaker traits?" Students in these observations responded to each other's thoughts respectfully.</p>	Proficient	36%
	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations all questioning led students through single path of inquiry. In one observation the teacher did example problems on the board with minimal participation from the class. The teacher worked through the complexity of factoring each problem but only asked simple questions of the class such as "What is 1 X 3?" and "What is 4 + 7?"</p> <p>In another observation the teacher asked questions only to a student standing next to the board. There was not any opportunity for other students to respond to the teacher or each other about any academic content.</p>	Basic	29%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations there was no questioning or discussion. In one class students worked on an essay for the entire class period. Students asked questions about directions for the assignment, such as "What am I supposed to write?" and the teacher responded, "I've already given you directions for this assignment."</p> <p>In another observation questions were rapid-fire with a single correct answer. The teacher said, "Which amendment ensures you can say whatever you want?" One student called out, "First!" and the teacher moved to the next question without inviting student thinking. Only a few students responded to the questions. Student behavior prevented the teacher from asking more than five questions in thirty minutes.</p>	Unsatisfactory	29%
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 43% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations students demonstrated enthusiasm for the content by participating and teachers ensured all students were engaged in the learning task. In an ELA observation the teacher said, "This is an open discussion. You don't need to raise your hand." Each student had a designated job: statement evaluator, transition tracker, white board recorder, and quote tracer. In another class students were eager to solve math problems and cheered when the teacher said, "Problem time!" When students completed problems, they would announce it proudly. Students worked collaborative and high-fived when their answers were correct. In one class a student was called "professor," and he walked around the room helping his peers.</p>	Distinguished	14%
		Proficient	29%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 50% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations some students were not engaged in the learning task. In one observation the teacher showed a video. He stated, "We are going to watch this two more times. If you have your work done you can just sit and if not, this is your chance." When the video played a few students answered their questions but most just watched. The teacher then gave the students all of the answers without asking for student voice or participation. In these observations there was no variety or choice in how students demonstrated learning.</p>	Basic	50%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	7%
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 36% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations students received targeted feedback. One teacher narrated specific praise globally to encourage improvements, such as "Student X went through and summarized the text for himself!" and "I like that Student X went back to check his responses. He is looking at capitalization and punctuation." The same teacher checked in with an individual student and provided pointers for annotation. Some teachers gave end-of-class exit tickets and it appeared that students were aware of the assessment criteria. In one observation students revised their writing based on individual edits the teacher made on each student's paper.</p>	Distinguished	7%
		Proficient	29%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 43% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations feedback to students was general, and few students assessed their own work. In one observation the teacher circulated the classroom and reminded students to use the distributive property. In another the teacher did global checks by asking students to vote on correct unit prices with thumbs up or down.</p>	Basic	43%
	<p>The QSR team scored 21% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In one observation students answered questions on a handout related to a video. The teacher paused the video after each answer and told the students what to write. There were no questions intended to gauge what students knew and the teacher did not give any feedback. In another observation the teacher distributed a rubric that was unrelated to the learning task. One class attempted to complete an exit ticket but the teacher dismissed the students nine minutes early, which prevented some students from thoroughly responding to the prompt.</p>	Unsatisfactory	21%

## APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

The Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>	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.
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	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.
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	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.
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	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
<b>Communicating with Students</b>	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.
<b>Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</b>	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.
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	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.
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	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.

