



May 25, 2017

Thomas O'Hara, Board Chair
Center City Public Charter School – Congress Heights
220 Highview Place, SE
Washington, DC 20032

Dear Mr. O'Hara:

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 10-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Center City PCS – Congress Heights between March 6, 2017 and March 17, 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 Center City PCS – Congress Heights.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Russ Williams, Executive Director

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: May 25, 2017

Campus Information

Campus Name: Center City PCS – Congress Heights

Ward: 8

Grade levels: PK3 – 8th grade

Qualitative Site Review Information

Reason for visit: School eligible for 10-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year

Two-week window: March 6, 2017 – March 17, 2017

QSR team members: 1 DC PCSB staff, 3 consultants including 1 special education specialist

Number of observations: 17

Total enrollment: 251

Students with Disabilities enrollment: 23

English Language Learners enrollment: <10

In-seat attendance on the days the QSR team conducted observations:

Visit 1: March 7, 2017- 92.1%

Visit 2: March 9, 2017- 97.5%

Visit 3: March 16, 2017- 94.6%

Summary

Center City Public Charter School's mission is to empower their students for lifelong success by building strong character, promoting academic excellence and generating public service throughout Washington, DC.

The QSR team saw evidence that Center City – Congress Heights is working to meet its mission. Students worked diligently in various settings. Teachers used whole group, small group, and one-on-one instruction to deliver content. Students participated in discussions and problem solving. The majority of classrooms had a designated greeter to shake hands with visitors and explain what the students were doing and the topic they were exploring.

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). None of the observations received an unsatisfactory score in either domain. The QSR team scored 85% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain as compared with 75% for this domain in April 2013 report. The highest scoring component in this domain was *Establishing a Culture for Learning*. The QSR team rated 94% of the observations as proficient or distinguished. Teachers demonstrated high expectations for student learning and hard work, and students clearly understood their role as learners. In these observations there was a strong sense of conviction that everyone can and would learn.

The QSR team scored 66% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain as compared with 67% for this domain in the April 2013 report. The highest

scoring component in this domain was *Using Assessment in Instruction*. Teachers assessed prior knowledge by asking open-ended questions and then providing time for students to work both independently and with partners on learning tasks. Small group instruction and individual conferencing dominated instructional practices, indicating teachers knew and utilized information about student understanding to further learning. *Communicating with Students* and *Engaging Students in Learning* were the lowest scoring domains, each receiving 57% of the observations rated as proficient or distinguished. The QSR team noted that there were missed opportunities for instruction in several observations. The majority of class time in some observations was spent on reinforcing procedures or behavior redirection. In other observations student misconceptions and misunderstandings were left unaddressed by the teacher.

Governance

DC PCSB reviewed the meeting minutes from Center City PCS' Board of Directors meeting on March 15, 2017. A quorum was present. The board discussed the recent science fair among all six Center City PCS campuses. The CEO shared that he is working to improve employee retention and academic achievement. The Finance and Academic Committees discussed a joint meeting to finalize the current and three-year budgets of each campus. The Academic Committee reviewed midyear NWEA-MAP results and explained that principals and assistant principals are coaching teachers in preparation for the PARCC test. The CEO informed the Board that Center City PCS received official notification of their accreditation.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, Center City PCS – Congress Heights provided answers to specific questions regarding the provision of instruction for students with disabilities. A special education specialist observed evidence of the school's articulated program and determined that Center City PCS – Congress Heights is implementing its stated program with fidelity. Student-teacher rapport was strong and collaborative teaching teams worked well together. Below are key examples of what the Special Education specialist observed in comparison to the school's stated program.

- Overall, Center City – Congress Heights promotes an inclusion model where most classrooms have two teachers working collaboratively to facilitate instruction. It was not evident which students had IEPs in the classroom, because students participated in whole-group and small-group instruction in the general education setting, where the collaborative teachers offered support to all students, as needed, throughout their lessons. In general, teachers had a strong rapport with students and lessons were well-planned and easily facilitated. In each classroom environment, both teachers took ownership in the lessons and had a significant role in the class.
- Per the school's Special Education Questionnaire, "General and special educators co-plan for lessons during their scheduled collaborative planning times daily." Evidence of effective co-planning between general educators and special educators was quite strong in most of the special education observations. In each class, teachers worked together to deliver content to students in selective groups that were determined by students' ability levels. Both teachers facilitated the daily

lesson, and students had an equal level of respect for both teachers in the classroom. The teachers divided the class according to which students might require additional support from the special educator or those who may need to work at a slower pace. Overall, the teachers had strong rapport with each other, which was conveyed in how they shared the classroom space and materials to carry out their planned lesson.

- The school's questionnaire also emphasized its use of differentiated instruction, small groups and "standard deep dives," to support its students. Differentiation was evident in every observation, because students were provided ample choice in how they completed certain tasks throughout the lesson. In one observation, students worked on a self-paced reading and writing assignment that required them to read the text, answer questions on a guided worksheet, and then write a short essay about a component of the story they were reading. Students had freedom to spread out around the classroom and take their time to complete the assignment in a manner they felt most comfortable. While some students chose to go back and re-read certain parts of the text, others typed their final drafts on a laptop. Meanwhile, teachers periodically gave one-on-one support to some students. Similarly, in another observation students had opportunities for independent writing time, as well as time to share with a neighboring peer. Thus, differentiated instruction was strong element of this school's instructional method.

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 charter review or 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 Center City Public Charter School is to empower our children for success through a rigorous academic program and strong character education while challenging students to pursue personal excellence in character, conduct, and scholarship in order to develop the skills necessary to both serve and lead others in the 21st century.</p>	<p>The QSR team saw evidence that Center City PCS – Congress Heights is meeting its mission. Classrooms were clean and well organized. The hallways were orderly between transitions. Student work and college flags displayed throughout the halls promoted an atmosphere of scholarship.</p> <p>Several classrooms used a greeter who welcomed the QSR team members and framed the visit. Students demonstrated excellence in character by being respectful to each other and to adults throughout the building. Consistent behavior management strategies were present in many classrooms, encouraging students to demonstrate high levels of conduct. In several classrooms, the attention to conduct overshadowed the focus on academics and character-building.</p> <p>Students worked diligently in many settings. Students actively participated in discussions and problem solving in many observations. Overall there was a rigorous program in place but this was implemented inconsistently among classrooms. In one observation students indicated with a thumbs down that they did not understand an explanation but the teacher moved on anyway. In other observations students took ownership of their own learning and worked at their own pace.</p>
<p>Goals:</p>	<p>The QSR team noted that Center City PCS – Congress Heights has a very focused environment. In many math and ELA</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>Center City PCS proposes that at least 70% of all students in grades K-8 will achieve at or above the 40th percentile or meet/exceed their spring growth target in math and reading based on NWEA MAP national norms by June of each year.</p>	<p>classrooms, dialogue about learning and problem solving dominated instruction and students expended effort to work accurately. There were two teachers in most classrooms who addressed students' questions promptly and provided additional support when needed.</p> <p>In several math observations teachers worked on problems with students by asking questions, polling others for agreement, then probing further. Teachers insisted on correct math terminology and clear explanations of concepts from students.</p> <p>The QSR team observed several primary classrooms during reading instruction. Students worked on specific skills for spelling and word work. Additionally the team observed small group and independent reading in several classrooms. Reading level data was displayed in one observed classroom.</p>
<p>Students will read and comprehend grade level appropriate text in the core content areas.</p>	<p>Center City PCS indicated in their pre-visit questionnaire a focus on complex texts and the use of read alouds, close reads, and text sets aligned with the curricular topics and the QSR team observed evidence of these instructional practices. Students engaged with on and above-grade level texts. Eighth graders read <i>Animal Farm</i> and discussed instances of propaganda in the text.</p> <p>There was also explicit vocabulary instruction in many classrooms. Some classrooms displayed content-related vocabulary on the walls. In one early childhood classroom, there was a focus on "compromise." The teacher defined the word, the class read a story together, and then students drew about a time they had to compromise.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>Students will master and apply grade-level appropriate computation skills and concepts; they will use mathematical reasoning to solve problems.</p>	<p>Center City PCS indicated a focus on conceptual development, mathematical reasoning, and focused fluency practice. The QSR team saw examples of these practices in many classrooms. Math facts filled the hallways and student math performance data was displayed.</p> <p>Several math teachers used group discussions during class, but the levels of student engagement were mixed. In one observation the teacher asked high level questions but did not address the students' confusion. In another observation students demonstrated their work on the board. The teacher stopped one student to indicate an incorrect approach but then simply moved on, leaving the misconception unresolved. The QSR team also observed students working independently during the math period.</p> <p>To gain a deeper understanding of mathematical concepts, students used worksheets, calculators and other manipulatives to solve problems.</p>
<p>All Center City PCS campuses will achieve an average of at least 90% attendance each year.</p>	<p>On each day of observations, the school had attendance rates above 90%.</p> <p>In-seat attendance on the days the QSR team conducted observations: Visit 1: March 7, 2017- 92.1% Visit 2: March 9, 2017- 97.5% Visit 3: March 16, 2017- 94.6%</p>
<p>All Center City PCS campuses should achieve an average of at least 75% re-enrollment each year.</p>	<p>DC PCSB will review quantitative data reported in the Performance Management Framework to assess this goal for the review.</p>
<p>Center City PCS students will build character by performing community</p>	<p>Several bulletin boards highlighted student participation in community service</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>service. Our goal is for at least 75% of students in grades 4-8 to participate in a minimum of two community service activities annually as measured by student exit tickets and tracked through PowerSchool.</p>	<p>activities and volunteering. Students wrote about their experiences volunteering with NBC's Food 4 Families and the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society. Teachers also displayed core value posters in classrooms and included "Character, Excellence, Service."</p>

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT¹

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 85% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	<p>The QSR team scored 76% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this domain. In many classrooms, teachers and students demonstrated care and respect for each other. In one distinguished observation students helped each other sharpen pencils. In other classroom celebrations, students would cheer for each other. Teachers greeted and called students by their first names or by the term "friends" in all classrooms. Several classrooms had an assigned greeter who interacted with people entering the room.</p>	Distinguished	6%
	<p>Many teachers worked side-by-side with individual students, encouraging effort and praising success. In one observation the teacher discreetly walked over to idle students during independent reading time and whispered to redirect. Students exhibited comfortable attitudes with each other and the adults. Overall most environments and interactions were respectful and polite.</p>	Proficient	70%

¹ Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team rating 24% of the observations as basic in this component. In several classrooms interactions between teacher and students lacked warmth and respect. Teachers sometimes acted in visibly frustrated or sarcastic manner. In one observation, the teacher asked a student to come to the board to demonstrate a problem. The teacher stopped the student in the middle of working and said his approach was wrong. The teacher did not say what was wrong with the student's work and then moved on. In another observation the teacher responded to a student question with, "Didn't I just say that? Are you serious?"</p> <p>In several observations students did not interact with each other respectfully and the teachers did not respond. Students told each other to "shut up" and teachers did not address the situations. In other observations engaging in off-task behaviors even when the teacher was nearby.</p>	Basic	24%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 94% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this domain. The majority of teachers demonstrated high expectations for student learning and the majority of students expended good effort to complete work of high quality. Several teachers ensured equal participation by calling on all students, not just those who raised their hand. Teachers congratulated students on their effort and often noted when individual students worked hard on a task. In one observation the teacher encouraged students to persist even when it was challenging by saying, "Struggle, it is the only way you are going to improve."</p>	Distinguished	6%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>Many teachers also demonstrated passion for their content. One teacher enthusiastically asked questions and responded to students with clear follow up and additional information from a conference they had attended.</p> <p>In many observations teachers waited for visible signs from all students that they were ready for instruction. In a few classrooms teachers indicated that students should be in "SLANT position". In other observations teachers asked students to track during reading and occasionally interjected opportunities for all students to respond and engage with the text.</p> <p>Students in the majority of classrooms worked diligently and without disruption. In several classrooms tasks were self-paced. In one observation students organized their folders and easily moved from one assignment to the next without any support from the teacher. Students often helped or shared their work with each other.</p>	Proficient	88%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as basic in this component.</p>	Basic	6%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>The QSR team rated 82% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers used a variety of attention-getting methods, including clapping and chanting and the majority of students responded immediately and effectively. Teachers also utilized strategies for transitions, including dismissing students by rows, counting backwards, and ringing a chime.</p>	Distinguished	6%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>Teachers had established clear procedures in these classrooms. In one middle school transition, the incoming class waited silently while others exited. In another observation as students completed their writing assignment, the teacher instructed them to get a laptop and engage with Lexia. Many classrooms had a class job chart. In a distinguished observation there was a greeter who welcomed visitors and explained what the class was doing.</p>	Proficient	76%
	<p>The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as basic in this component. Several observations involved large amounts of instructional time used for restroom or water breaks and/or whole class pencil sharpening time.</p> <p>In other observations teachers inconsistently managed transitions and allowed students to disrupt learning. In one observation some students began working right away while others engaged in off-task conversation. In another observation even though the teacher instructed students to work with a partner, most students did not comply. This resulted in loss of instructional time as the teacher had to continually address routines.</p>	Basic	18%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<p>Managing Student Behavior</p>	<p>The QSR team scored a very high 88% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In several classrooms student behavior was entirely appropriate. Teachers monitored and responded to misbehaviors effectively. Students returned to work quickly after teacher redirection. At times students needed an additional support, such as a countdown, to help them return to expectation.</p>	Distinguished	6%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>During learning times students worked quietly. Some teachers provided movement breaks in between academic tasks.</p> <p>Many teachers set expectations for behavior anticipating transitions and reminded students of expectations. Some teachers used positive reinforcement for good behavior. In one observation a teacher said, "So much focus from the students here on the carpet!"</p>	Proficient	82%
	<p>The QSR team scored 12% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers were often inconsistent in either monitoring or responding to misbehavior. In a few observations teachers did not react when students said "shut up" to each other.</p> <p>In other classrooms teachers inconsistently addressed off-task behaviors, redirecting some students but not all. In a few classrooms redirection was more harsh and unfair with some students. A teacher in one observation gave a student a countdown to start work with the consequence of seeing an administrator if there was noncompliance. The student started doing their work before the countdown ended, but the teacher sent him out anyway.</p>	Basic	12%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of “distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” and “unsatisfactory” are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 66% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Instruction domain.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<p>Communicating with Students</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 59% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Several teachers used clear language to articulate content and strategies students could use. In a distinguished observation, a teacher restated a student’s response, “What he is trying to say is he used repeated addition” and “Who has a more eloquent way to explain...What is the number that represents nothing?” Throughout many observations the emphasis on clear and precise vocabulary was important.</p> <p>Many teachers explained the objective or directions to students in different ways to ensure understanding. One teacher said, "We are going to learn how to approach a classmate to play with us" and then restated it as, "We are going to learn how to go to a classmate to share our toys". It was evident in many classrooms that students knew exactly what to do. Some students even offered an explanation during the QSR team's visit. In one-on-one instruction, some teachers ensured clarity of next steps before sending students back to their seats to continue working.</p>	Distinguished	6%
		Proficient	53%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team rated 41% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations the purpose and process of the lesson were not written or stated clearly. Not sure of what to do, students asked many clarifying questions or engaged in off-task behavior. In another observation the teacher checked the work of some students, offering appropriate feedback but refused to look at the work of others who also requested feedback.</p> <p>In other observations attempts to explain content were inconsistently effective. In one observation a student shared how he determined the answer to one math problem. When the teacher asked the group if they agreed, most students stated that they either did not know how to do the problem or came up with a wrong answer. In a middle school observation the teacher struggled to adequately explain content when students were confused.</p>	Basic	41%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<p>Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 71% of the observations as proficient in this component. Genuine discussion was observed in many classrooms, in both whole group and small group settings. Many teachers called on all students and asked meaningful questions to push student thinking. Teachers encouraged students to build on their own, and each other's thinking.</p> <p>Many teachers asked open-ended questions and included tasks that could have multiple representations. Students were able to use</p>	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>wooden blocks to create a unique depiction of a human figure on the rug. As they created, students were asked to use mathematical vocabulary to name the shapes they used and created. In another observation the teacher's line of questioning could be answered in many ways and encouraged students to actively engage with the text with questions such as: "Thinking about what you've read in the text, why do you think she has that expression?" and, "How does this relate to what you read in the text?" and, "How does it relate to her responsibility in the text?"</p> <p>There was a high level of student participation across most classrooms. In one observation the class primarily worked on a self-paced learning activity but students proudly shared their writing with peers. In another observation students initiated discussion during their independent work time about the text they were reading and their related writing assignments.</p>	Proficient	71%
	<p>The QSR team rated 29% of the observations as basic in this component. A few teachers framed questions to promote student thinking, but the levels of student response and engagement were mixed. In other observations there was a single path of acceptable inquiry or predetermined answers. One teacher only responded to one student's representation of the concept even though other students had equally appropriate answers. In other observations students completed the same work packets or problems to solve.</p>	Basic	29%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Engaging Students in Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 59% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Many learning tasks challenged student thinking and teachers scaffolded content to ensure student understanding. In several classrooms tasks were self-paced, allowing students to engage in a variety of tasks without feeling rushed. In other classrooms students worked in a variety of instructional groupings including small groups, whole group discussion, and centers. Students in one observation moved into small groups for differentiated practice. The second teacher worked with one of the groups.</p>	Distinguished	6%
	<p>Teachers also used many techniques to engage students including projecting pictures of the story on the overhead. In this specific observation the teacher paused after reading parts of the story to engage students in a discussion. Students also used a strategy of moving their arms over their head every time they heard a vocabulary word.</p>	Proficient	53%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 41% of the observations as basic in this component. These observations included factual work with little opportunity for students to explain their thinking or engage intellectually. Several lessons consisted of student work packets where all students received the same tasks to complete independently. In another observation students completed math problems independently and then shared the answers, which the teacher wrote on the board. There was no exploration of strategy or thinking beyond getting the right answer.</p> <p>In other observations engagement was mixed with some students involved and others looking around or engaging in off-task behavior. In a middle school observation, students used Chromebooks and some followed along during the teacher's PowerPoint. However, the presentation was only loosely connected to the content and students spent a large part of class time looking around or talking.</p>	Basic	41%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<p>Using Assessment in Instruction</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 76% of the observations as proficient in this component. Most teachers incorporated questions throughout the lessons. They then used various strategies to gauge student response such as white boards, thumbs up/down, individual student response and monitored turn and talk.</p> <p>Several teachers also used more structured formative assessments at various points in the lesson. In one observation the teacher walked around to check every student's</p>	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>homework then incorporated challenging problems in the do now. In another observation the teacher used an exit ticket to assess student understanding at the end of the lesson.</p> <p>In many observations teachers circulated to ask specific questions and provide feedback to individual students and to the whole group. In one observation the teacher looked at student work then noted to the class, "Go back over your charts, I am seeing a lot of mistakes being made... If I don't see units, it is incorrect."</p>	Proficient	76%
	<p>The QSR team scored 24% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations there were some global checks for understanding with little to no individual feedback. In one observation the teacher asked, "Do we feel pretty good about the water cycle? Thumbs up if we do." There was little evidence in some observations that students fully understood when or how their work would be evaluated, as evidenced by student confusion during the discussion.</p> <p>In other observations feedback was given to individual students inconsistently. In one observation students asked the teacher to look at their work and the teacher responded, "I'm not looking at your work until you are finished" even though this was done for other students in the class. In another observation peer assessment was attempted but only some students participated and demonstrated understanding of the process and purpose.</p>	Basic	24%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

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

APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC

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