



March 21, 2017

Sulee Clay and Rick Torres, Board Chairs  
Cesar Chavez Public Charter School for Public Policy – Parkside High School  
3701 Hayes Street NE  
Washington, DC 20019

Dear Ms. Clay and Mr. Torres,

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

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

**Qualitative Site Review Report**

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Cesar Chavez PCS for Public Policy – Parkside High School between January 23 and February 3, 2017. 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 Cesar Chávez PCS for Public Policy – Parkside High School.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux  
Deputy Director

Enclosures  
cc: Katie Herman, Executive Director

## Qualitative Site Review Report

**Date:** March 21, 2017

### **Campus Information**

**Campus Name:** Cesar Chavez PCS for Public Policy – Parkside High School

**Ward:** 7

**Grade levels:** 9-12

### **Qualitative Site Review Information**

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

**Two-week window:** January 23, 2017 - February 3, 2017

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

**Number of observations:** 22

**Total enrollment:** 360

**Students with Disabilities enrollment:** 49

**English Language Learners enrollment:** 8

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

**Visit 1:** 1/24/2017: 91.3%

**Visit 2:** 1/25/2017: 90.8%

**Visit 3:** 2/1/2017: 91.0%

**Visit 4:** 2/2/2017: 91.9%

### **Summary**

Cesar Chavez PCS for Public Policy’s mission is to prepare students to succeed in competitive colleges and to empower them to use public policy to create a more just, free, and equal world. Cesar Chavez Public Charter School for Public Policy – Parkside High School (Cesar Chavez PCS – Parkside High) academic program includes classes such as thesis, journalism, and public speaking, which align to the mission. Students in the Thesis class learn how to evaluate and write thesis statements related to social justice and public policy solutions to social challenges like police brutality. Throughout the school building, observers saw an emphasis on college attendance and empowering students, with posters for different colleges, announcements related to scholarship opportunities, and signs with inspirational quotes in classrooms and hallways.

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 59% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain, down from 83% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this domain during the school’s last QSR in October of 2012. The QSR team rated 64% of observations as proficient or distinguished in both *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport*, and *Establishing a Culture for Learning*. In most observations students and teachers demonstrated mutual respect, and put forth good effort to complete high quality work.

---

<sup>1</sup> This data has not been validated by the school. DC PCSB pulled the data in February 2017.

The QSR team scored fewer than half (48%) of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain, down from 75% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this domain during the school's last QSR (see link above). However, it is also important to note that very few observations received unsatisfactory scores. Most teachers clearly presented content, and students demonstrated their learning through vocabulary-rich responses during discussion and by explaining their answers to the rest of the class.

DC PCSB attempted to visit the school's in-school suspension room, but a school official told the observer that there were no students in in-school suspension on the observation day.

A DC PCSB staff member observed the Cesar Chavez PCS for Public Policy Board of Trustees meeting on February 8, 2017. A quorum was present. During the meeting the Board discussed the upcoming 20-year charter review and the expected revisions to the Performance Management Framework (PMF) as Goals Policy. The Head of School announced that Scott Pearson had a positive visit to Cesar Chavez PCS – Chavez Prep. The Board discussed enrollment trends and projections for the 2017 – 18 school year.

### **Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities**

Prior to the two-week window, Cesar Chavez PCS 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 observation. The reviewers saw some evidence of the described methods of supporting students with disabilities within, and outside of the general education environment. Overall, however, the school program did not effectively implement all components of lesson differentiation, online supports, and gauging of student understanding as described.

- In the Special Education Questionnaire, the school stated that general education and special education teachers collaborate for two to four hours a week to help modify lessons, and discuss accommodations and daily student outcomes. In two of the three push-in classroom observations, the special education teacher co-taught with the general educator (one teach-one assist and parallel teaching), demonstrating that teachers had planned lessons together.
- The school noted that lesson differentiation could look like visual supports and graphic organizers, word banks, alternate work products or answers, as well as adjustable performance tasks. Observers saw teachers use visual supports and word banks, and alternate work products/answers using manipulatives (colored flash cards when assigning words into "positive" and "negative" connotation columns and puzzle pieces of the quadratic formula which students put together in groups) to support students with disabilities. Observers saw performance tasks tailored to student levels in a math class where students completed personalized quizzes based on different skill levels on radicals and exponents. Observers did not see teachers use graphic organizers or multiple pathways for reading passages.
- The school described the following online resources to support students with disabilities in the classroom: IXL, Google Read and Write, online dictionaries, No Red Ink. In three out of four observations, teachers used online resources but not

those listed on the Special Education Questionnaire. In one classroom the teacher used Quizzizz.com to test students' understanding of square roots.

- The school explained that teachers use a variety of informal assessments that often happen more frequently than assessment in the general education setting and are sometimes modified for the student's need, such as checks for understanding, exit tickets, Google Classroom feedback, and Kahoot (an online program). The observer did not see the use of Google Classroom feedback or Kahoot, but saw examples of checks for understanding and exit tickets.
  - The observer saw one out of four teachers pass out an exit ticket, but the execution was weak and most students wrote nothing due to limited time to respond to a question.
  - In one classroom where two teachers parallel taught the lesson, the teachers worked with a small group throughout the observation and provided frequent and timely feedback. The teacher in another observation checked for understanding using online quizzes via Quizzizz.com. The teacher then identified which problems students missed and reviewed the correct answers.

### **Instruction for English Language Learners**

Cesar Chavez PCS – Parkside High submitted responses to a questionnaire related to the school's provision of services for the school's English Language Learner (ELL) population. Overall the QSR team observed moderate evidence of the school's implementation of its ELL program. The ELL observer noted the following during the two ELL classroom observations:

- According to the questionnaire, the school uses an inclusive model for students identified as ELL. In one observation the classroom appeared to have a mix of both ELLs and general education students.
- The school explained that teachers primarily use Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) informed resources and leverage technical interventions (Duo Lingo, Google Read and Write, online dictionaries, No Red Ink) to support language acquisition. DC PCSB observed the following SIOP strategies: graphic organizers, clear content objectives written on the board, modeling the learning task, and frequent repetition of vocabulary. DC PCSB did not observe any of the technical interventions mentioned above.
- The school noted that general education and teachers of language learners use the following informal assessments to gauge student understanding: checks for understanding, exit tickets, Google Classroom feedback, and Kahoot. Teachers used exit tickets or a closeout (written on the board or referenced by teachers during class time), and walked around the room to check student work. DC PCSB did not see Google Classroom feedback or Kahoot in either of the ELL classrooms observed.
- The school stated differentiating a lesson in an inclusive classroom varies by subject and teacher, but may include visual supports and graphic organizers, word banks, alternate work products, and performance tasks adjusted based on student need.

Teachers explained how to use a graphic organizer with the assignment, had word walls, and gave students additional time outside of class to complete assignments.

### **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: to prepare students to succeed in competitive colleges and to empower them to use public policy to create a more just, free, and equal world.</p>	<p>The QSR team observed mixed evidence that Cesar Chavez PCS – Parkside High is meeting its mission.</p> <p>The QSR team observed mixed evidence of the school preparing students to succeed in competitive colleges with only 48% of observations scored as proficient or distinguished on the Charlotte Danielson <i>Framework for Teaching Instruction</i> Domain. The QSR team rated 59% of the observations in the Questioning and Discussion and Student Engagement components as basic. Teachers in these observations did not engage all students in deep discussion, and student engagement in many observations was weak.</p> <p>The QSR team observed some evidence of the school empowering students to use public policy to create a more just, free, and equal world. Students in a Thesis class developed thesis statements asking for public policy solutions to a social justice issue. Observers saw banners around the school related to social justice issues like police brutality. The teacher embedded public policy themes in a Government class. In a Public Policy class, students worked on their resumes in preparation for internships (though it was not clear for what types of internships students were applying).</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>PMF Indicator #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards <i>Moving students to proficient and advanced levels in reading</i></p>	<p>The QSR team observed various ways that teachers supported student progress and achievement in reading. A poster in the hallway advertised an “English II Tutoring Day.” In proficient and distinguished observations students wrote and shared high quality responses using rich vocabulary related to visual advertisement, learned how to write thesis statements,</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>and used word walls to reinforce vocabulary. Teachers used rich vocabulary appropriate for the grade and content area in many classrooms.</p> <p>In a few English classes, student engagement was low and student behavior interfered with instruction. It was unclear how students would be evaluated in an English class where they wrote and acted out scripts. In another observation the learning task was unclear and students remained confused for much of the class without engaging in academic work.</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>In strong observations where student engagement was high and teachers assessed student learning. Teachers asked students to write out the quadratic formula by memory for the “Do Now,” students answered math problems on the board and explained them to the class, and students put together the quadratic formula with puzzle pieces to solidify their learning. Teachers gauged student understanding using an online quiz program, and adjusted their instruction based on the questions that students answered incorrectly, reviewing the problems and explaining the correct answers.</p> <p>In the weak observations, classroom management challenges prevented the effective delivery of instruction. Students walked in and out of the classroom without permission, ignored the teacher’s directions to not eat in the classroom, and the teacher reminded students throughout the class to pay attention with limited success.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator # 3: Gateway – Outcomes aligned to college and career Readiness</p>	<p>The QSR team observed several ways that the school promoted a college-going culture. Banners in classrooms and hallways represented different colleges and teachers wore college t-shirts. School-wide</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>announcements offered opportunities for scholarships and reminded students about SAT and ACT testing dates, and college application and financial aid deadlines. A sign in the hallway praised "2016-17 SAT MVPs," and another sign listed college acceptances for students in the class of 2014, 2015 and 2016.</p>
<p>PMF Indicator #4: School Environment – Predictors of future student progress and achievement</p>	<p>DC PCSB measures attendance<sup>2</sup> to evaluate the climate of a school. DC PCSB believes that if students are not in school, they lose opportunities for learning. The school's attendance rates on the days we visited was above 82%, which is the floor of the Performance Management Framework.</p> <p><b>Visit 1:</b> 1/24/2017- 91.3%  <b>Visit 2:</b> 1/25/2017- 90.8%  <b>Visit 3:</b> 2/1/2017- 91.0%  <b>Visit 4:</b> 2/2/2017- 91.9%</p>
<p>Mission-Specific Goal #1</p> <p>90% of juniors on track to graduate the next year complete a fellowship (internship) with a government agency, nonprofit or other organization aligned to the goal of offering students an opportunity to apply their academic skills and civic knowledge to address a policy issue or community concern.</p>	<p>DC PCSB will review quantitative evidence related to this goal for the school's upcoming review.</p>
<p>Mission-Specific Goal #2</p> <p>95% of seniors receive a passing grade on their culminating thesis paper by August 1st of their senior year.</p>	<p>The QSR team observed strong instruction in the school's thesis class. The teacher modeled how to evaluate the strength of various thesis statements proposing public policy solutions to social justice challenges. Students were actively engaged as they worked in small groups to evaluate thesis statements without the assistance of the</p>

<sup>2</sup> This data has not been validated by the school. DC PCSB pulled the data in February 2017.



<b>Mission and Goals</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
	<p>teacher. The teacher provided adequate wait time as he posed questions to students, and all students remained on task for the entire class period. Students wrote their own thesis statements in preparation for their culminating thesis papers.</p> <p>DC PCSB will review quantitative evidence related to this goal for the school's upcoming review.</p>
<p>Mission-Specific Goal #3</p> <p>A minimum of 90% of seniors with an IEP will be accepted to at least one college.</p>	<p>DC PCSB will review quantitative evidence related to this goal for the school's upcoming review.</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 59% 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>	The QSR team scored 64% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers and students demonstrated mutual respect, with students following directions the first time and responding to gentle reminders to listen attentively to classmates. Teachers showed positive relationships with students, joking around with them while staying focused on academic work. Students clapped for each other without prompting from the teacher after performances of student-written scripts, and teachers commended students for high-quality work or good effort.	Distinguished	9%
		Proficient	55%
	The QSR team rated 32% of the observations as basic in this component. Student interactions with each other and with the teachers were negative at times. In these observations students occasionally cursed and threatened each other without a response from the teacher. Students in a few observations demonstrated disrespect for teachers as they kept their heads down on their desks, socialized, or walked around the classroom despite the teacher’s attempts to refocus them.	Basic	32%
	The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	4%

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

<b>The Classroom Environment</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>School Wide Rating</b>	
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	The QSR team scored 64% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers demonstrated high regard for student learning. Teachers praised student work and said specific things they liked about their responses.	Distinguished	9%
	Teachers expected excellent work from students, pushing them to think more deeply about their learning tasks, saying "You're almost perfect!" or "Explain more!" Students helped each other with academic work and supported each other during hard tasks.	Proficient	55%
	The QSR team rated 36% of the observations as basic in this component. Students in these observations demonstrated little commitment to learning. Students cursed and in one observation questioned where an assignment was coming from. Students did not engage with learning tasks during independent work time often putting their heads on their desks or socializing.	Basic	36%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	The QSR team scored 55% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In most observations classroom routines functioned smoothly with no loss of instructional time. Teachers had materials like graphic organizers, PowerPoint presentations, and video clips ready, and frequently reminded	Distinguished	5%

<b>The Classroom Environment</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>School Wide Rating</b>	
	<p>students how much time they had left to complete a task. Students transitioned from whole group to small group instruction without incident and small groups worked productively without ongoing monitoring from the teacher. Students collected materials and put them away at the end of lessons without directions from the teacher. There were established procedures when students wanted to use the restroom, and students got the pass and returned without incident.</p>	Proficient	50%
	<p>The QSR team rated 40% of the observations as basic in this component. Though teachers seem to have established routines for transitions and the distribution of materials, significant instructional time was lost in some classrooms due to classroom management challenges. In one observation students spent the beginning of class getting to their seats. Students ignored the teachers' directions for about 20 minutes in another.</p>	Basic	40%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	5%
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 55% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component, including 14% rated as distinguished. In many observations there were virtually no instances of misbehavior and students remained highly engaged throughout the entire lesson. Teachers effectively refocused students, saying things like "We need to stop playing around," or by whispering</p>	Distinguished	14%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>to individual students to stop talking or looking at their phones. In a distinguished observation, a student encouraged a fellow student to get back on task.</p> <p>In some observations the QSR team saw evidence of a behavior management system, Chávez Credits and Debits, and students' names under each column, and teachers referenced debits while correcting behavior.</p>	Proficient	41%
	<p>The QSR team rated 41% of the observations as basic in this component. Students in some observations repeatedly ignored the teachers' directions, and in one observation, a dean came in to refocus the students, but the students were off-track as soon as the dean left. Teachers had to remind students multiple times to stop socializing during independent work. In some observations students cursed and threatened each other with no intervention from the teacher, despite the Chávez consequence ladder on the wall.</p>	Basic	41%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	4%

**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 48% 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 55% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component, including 14% as distinguished. Teachers’ explanations of content were clear, vocabulary-rich and error free, and some teachers asked students to explain content to their peers. In a math class students explained their answers to one another. In a distinguished observation, the teacher explained content clearly and used real life examples to bring content to life, and anticipated student misunderstandings.</p>	Distinguished	14%
	<p>Teachers modeled how to complete learning tasks, showing graphic organizers on the board and modeling how to fill them out. Students demonstrated their understanding of lessons by sharing high-quality responses with rich vocabulary, evaluating thesis statements according to the criteria described by the teacher, and asking the teacher his opinion on a specific academic topic.</p>	Proficient	41%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 45% of the observations as basic in this component. In some observations the teacher did not clarify the instructional purpose, telling students they would need information they were copying down "for later" or "for the test." Students worked in small groups on scripts in one class, but there was no reference to evaluation criteria or the learning objective. The presentation of content in some observations consisted of a monologue with limited participation from students, and when they asked students questions they answered them before students had a chance to respond.</p>	Basic	45%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 41% of the observations as proficient in this component. Many students were actively engaged in discussions in various classrooms. Students offered rich analyses of visual advertisements, asked each other and the teacher their opinions on a DC law they were learning about, and explained to their class how they arrived at an answer in a math class. Teachers asked open-ended questions requiring critical thinking, prodding students to think more deeply about topics such as political philosophies of the Democratic and Republican parties and why Congress would want a particular tax.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	41%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 59% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers dominated the discussion in classrooms as they presented prepared content on PowerPoint slides, inviting no student participation for most of the class. In several classrooms only a few students were involved in the discussion as the others socialized or put their heads on their desks. In one observation the teacher attempted to have students explain their responses, but few students were paying attention. In some classrooms teachers led students along a single path of inquiry with only one correct answer and one approach.</p>	Basic	59%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 41% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Virtually all students were intellectually engaged in learning tasks. Students worked on math problems independently, responded to short writing prompts, and created charts comparing Congress's and DC's preferences for laws. In some observations students were offered choice in learning tasks, like choosing which book to write about, or which visual advertisement to analyze. Teachers maximized learning time by giving students additional learning tasks once they were finished.</p>	Distinguished	9%
		Proficient	32%



Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 59% of the observations as basic in this component. In many observations student engagement was passive, as students learned facts with minimal participation through PowerPoint presentations. Students in some observations were not engaged and kept their heads down or socialized throughout most of the lesson. In other observations students had no choice in how they completed learning tasks, answering the same math problems in the same way, labeling triangles, and defining vocabulary words.</p>	Basic	59%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 55% of the observations as proficient in this component. Students shared high quality written responses, explained math problems to their peers, and evaluated statements based on a rubric to demonstrate their learning. Teachers diagnosed evidence of student learning by looking at individual student work, asking students to explain responses, and reviewing exit tickets. In a few observations, teachers adjusted instruction after reviewing individual student work to talk about questions students got wrong.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	55%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 45% of the observations as basic in this component. There was very little assessment in some observations. Teachers asked questions to the whole group but only a few students responded. In a few observations as students completed independent or group work, there was no indication that students knew how their work would be evaluated. Often teachers' feedback seemed to be more about task completion rather than quality.</p>	Basic	45%
	<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
<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 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.
<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.