



June 8, 2018

Susan Rosenbaum, Board Chair
DC Bilingual Public Charter School
33 Riggs Road NE
Washington, DC 200011

Dear Ms. Rosenbaum,

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 2017-18 school year for the following reason(s):

- School eligible for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2018-19 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of DC Bilingual Public Charter School (DC Bilingual PCS) between April 23, 2018 – May 4, 2018. Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report focuses primarily on the following areas: classroom environment and instruction.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at DC Bilingual PCS.

Sincerely,



Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Daniela Anello, Head of School

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: June 8, 2018

Campus Information

Campus Name: DC Bilingual Public Charter School (DC Bilingual PCS)

Ward: 5

Grade levels: Prekindergarten-3 (PK3) – 5

Qualitative Site Review Information

Reason for visit: School eligible for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2018-19 school year

Two-week window: April 23, 2018 – May 4, 2018

QSR team members: One DC PCSB staff member and five consultants including one special education (SPED) specialist, one English Learner (EL) specialist, and one Spanish language specialist

Number of observations: 21

Total enrollment: 420

Students with Disabilities enrollment: 71

English Language Learners enrollment: 220

In-seat attendance on observation days:¹

Visit 1: April 25, 2018 – 96.7%

Visit 2: April 26, 2018 – 95.8%

Visit 3: April 27, 2018 – 90.5%

Visit 4: April 30, 2018 – 96.3%

Visit 5: May 1, 2018 – 97.4%

Visit 6: May 2, 2018 – 97.0%

Visit 7: May 3, 2018 – 96.5%

Summary

DC Bilingual PCS' mission is:

To be a learning community that ensures high academic achievement for all students in both Spanish and English, develops leadership, and values all cultures.

The QSR team observed evidence that DC Bilingual PCS's classroom environment and instructional delivery supports its mission. The school's bilingual model was pervasive across grade levels and throughout the school. Staff greeted the QSR team and other visitors in both languages, signs and student work on all walls of

¹ The Performance Management Framework (PMF) floor for the attendance measure is 85% and the target is 95%.

the building were written in both languages, and many teachers seamlessly incorporated both languages in instruction. In one classroom where students participated in small group instruction in one of the two languages, both teachers had similar pedagogical and instructional approaches and all students were highly engaged. This consistency of practice across the school was evident, and DC PCSB observers noted that approximately ten teachers gathered during their common planning period to discuss ways to improve their professional growth. Teachers used common language throughout the building, including use of the term "leaders" when referring to students. Teachers also explicitly taught students what "good readers" or "good scientists" do and a significant percentage of observations involved student-led inquiry.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendix I and II). In virtually all components of the Danielson rubric, several observations were rated as distinguished indicating the initiative students took in their own learning. No observations rated as unsatisfactory in either domain.

The QSR team scored 92% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. This was slightly lower than the school's average of 97% in this domain in 2013. The domain average was above proficient at 3.17, meaning the average observation was scored as proficient, the second highest rating on the rubric. The highest scoring component for the school was *Establishing a Culture for Learning* with 90% of observations rated as distinguished or proficient and an impressive 33% of observations rated as distinguished. Students and teachers in these classrooms demonstrated a passion for learning. Students in several observations stated that they wanted more time to do their work. One student commented, "I wish that we could have two periods of science!" Teachers also demonstrated high expectations for all students in these observations.

The QSR team scored 83% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. Again, this is slightly lower than the score of 87% in 2013. The domain average was just below proficient at 2.90. One of the highest scoring components in this domain was *Engaging Students in Learning* with 85% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished and 13% of observations rated as distinguished, the highest for this domain. Open-ended tasks and assignments were the norm and students were invited to think critically, explain their thinking, and use a variety of strategies for problem-solving. *Using Assessment in Instruction* was also a highly rated component with 89% of observations scored as proficient. Most teachers monitored student understanding through a variety of strategies including verbal questioning, written responses, and exit tickets. Teachers offered specific feedback such as, "On words that we have a blend like this, like "cl," then we really

need to tap it out. Once you did that, you knew how to spell it right away!” The lowest scoring component in either domain was *Communicating with Students* with 76% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished. While many teachers clearly communicated directions and the instructional purpose with students, this was less consistent school-wide. Several teachers had to clarify directions and some teachers had minor content errors.

In-School Suspension

The school staff informed the QSR team that there is not a room at DC Bilingual PCS for In-School Suspension. Rather, students whose behavior merits a break spend time in another classroom with a work packet and often participate in that class' specials, lunch, and recess.

Governance

The DC Bilingual PCS Board of Trustees met four times in the third quarter of the 2017-18 school year. DC PCSB reviewed the school's approved board meeting minutes and found a quorum was present at each meeting. DC Bilingual PCS is undergoing renovations that will be completed in August 2018. The school is also in the process of pursuing accreditation and developing a strategic plan with Bellwether Education Partners.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, DC Bilingual PCS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. The QSR team noted genuine rapport between students and teachers that reflected warmth and care. Overall, the school implemented accommodations with fidelity and evenly applied strategies for differentiation and checks for student understanding including turn and talks, exit tickets, and opportunities for students to receive individual feedback from teachers.

- To demonstrate that co-planning has occurred with special education teachers, the school explained that SWD work on the same content as their general education peers, but with modifications to their materials. DC PCSB staff observed students working in stations or small groups to access the same content in different ways or on their current instructional levels. In kindergarten, the special educator pulled three students to a different part of the classroom and used cubes, drawings, and numbers to explore number stories, while the general educator taught a similar lesson to the remainder of the class at a more rapid pace with the same manipulatives.
- To support the learning of SWD, the school reported that they implement various models of co-teaching. The QSR team observed both Parallel Teaching and Station Teaching. Both models were effective as students were on-task and teachers were

able to support individual students and small groups. For example, in one observation, the special educator pulled a small group of students to teach the same concept that the rest of the class was learning at a modified pace and used visuals and manipulatives to break down the problems. In an ELA lesson, teachers used station teaching to work with students during guided reading and each group had a book specific to their reading levels.

- To provide accommodations according to the Individualized Education Programs (IEP) of SWD, the school stated that observers would see frequent breaks, specialized equipment or furniture, preferential seating and clarification/repetition of instructions. Students were provided seating options such as bouncy balls, wobble stools, floor mats, and scoop rockers. One student in a pull-out session chose to stand. The teacher nodded and told the student s/he had 5 seconds. The student did a handstand, counted down from 5, and then got back on his feet and sat down to rejoin the group.
- To provide modifications according to the IEP of SWD, the school wrote that students work on material on their individual instructional levels. In one observation teachers were working in stations during literacy and students were working on reading and comprehension using different texts. The special educator had more visual supports during the lesson, such as a small anchor chart with strategies that good readers use and a white board on the table to use when instructing on the /ir/ /ur/ /ire/ sounds.

Specialized Instruction for English Learners (ELs)

DC Bilingual PCS serves 220 EL students. Prior to the two-week window, the school completed a questionnaire about how it serves EL students. The school described its two-way immersion model of bilingual learning in which native English and Spanish speakers come together for literacy and academic content in the two languages. Reviewers looked for evidence of implementation of this model. Overall, the school's EL program excelled at providing students with language acquisition support inside and outside of the general education setting.

- To meet the needs of ELs inside the general education setting, the school wrote that teachers use instructional strategies that target language acquisition in both English and Spanish. Across observations, the activities and materials aligned with acquisition goals across the four language domains: reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Students were highly motivated to work on a variety of language domain-focused tasks, including writing an original fairy tale revision, engaging in a discussion about the sun, and matching and using homophones in sentences.

Teachers consistently monitored student learning and offered targeted feedback accordingly.

- To provide Tier 2 and 3 interventions outside of the Tier 1 core curriculum for ELs with reading deficiencies, the EL specialist pushes into classrooms and pulls out students for small group and individual work. During two pull-out observations, the EL specialist effectively supported academic language acquisition through explicit instruction and multiple opportunities for practice. When a student struggled to say a blended sound during a lesson from Wilson Reading, a research-based intervention, the specialist modeled the process, offering specific strategies to use; then, the student correctly applied this new knowledge. In both observations, the specialist defined, used, and had students practice content-specific vocabulary during a variety of reading, writing, speaking, and listening activities.
- As a bilingual immersion school, teachers provide core instruction to classes comprised of first and second language learners in Spanish and English. In K-5 classrooms, students spend 50% learning and interacting in Spanish and 50% in English; science is taught every day in Spanish. In K-5 observations, teachers maintained the target language throughout instruction, and many students showed enthusiasm and interest in the lesson activities. In two science observations, students worked on rigorous projects, such as preparing for the science fair and testing the greenhouses they made. Students discussed their work in Spanish, the target language, asking each other thoughtful questions and actively participating according to their assigned roles.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT²

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Classroom Environments domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of “distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” and “unsatisfactory” are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 92% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
<p>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</p>	<p>The QSR team scored an impressive 95% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the vast majority of observations, interactions between students and teachers and among students were warm, friendly and respectful. Most teachers crouched to talk to students as needed to ensure respectful and clear rapport. Many teachers had encouraging personalized phrases they frequently used such as, "Awesome possum!" or "You're on a roll!" Teachers praised students frequently and recognized effort and accomplishments. One teacher noted, "I am so impressed by the yellow table. They have shown excellent persistence staying on task and working hard."</p>	Distinguished	24%
	<p>In several of the distinguished observations, all interactions were highly respectful and students supported each other. In one observation, students demonstrated active listening, clapped with enthusiasm and selected which celebration cheer to offer after each student’s presentation at a writing station. In another observation when a student lost a game of vocabulary Bingo, he congratulated the winner without prompting. Several teachers made individual connections to students by asking questions about the child in relation to the content such as “Do you want to be a scientist when you grow up?” and by encouraging their efforts, “I never thought about it that way before!”</p>	Proficient	71%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component.</p>	Basic	5%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

² Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Establishing a Culture for Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 90% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Students were cognitively busy and engaged in these observations. In several early childhood observations, students engaged in self-selected centers and remained busy for extended periods of time. Teachers interacted with students in a variety of ways, at times guiding a task or working with individual students on the task of their choosing. Teachers reinforced vocabulary in Spanish and English and modeled the target language in all interactions. In another observation a student was visibly excited about his fairy tale revision. The teacher valued his hard work by saying, "Great, your action connects to the dialogue. Those are the kinds of details that bring your story to life!"</p>	Distinguished	33%
	<p>33% of observations were scored as distinguished, the highest distinguished rating for the school. In these observations both teachers and students demonstrated the belief in the importance of learning and hard work. In a few observations students directed their own work and learning. In one early childhood classroom, a small group of students initiated a task to create puppets together using art materials. In other observations, students assisted one another in understanding the content. In a science lesson, work groups researched their topic and discussed content as well as design. Students in the groups questioned each other, "Why do you want to include that? What does it do? (pointing to a picture of an ancient aqueduct)."</p>	Proficient	57%
	<p>The QSR team rated 10% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations, the teachers' energy for the work was neutral, and the teachers and students seemed mainly concerned with task completion. There was little if any explicit reference to learning standards or other reasons for completing a task.</p>	Basic	10%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>The QSR team scored 90% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Transitions and classroom procedures functioned smoothly in almost all observations. Students followed routines and, in several classrooms, students led transitions such as calling on students or ringing the bell for clean-up with the teacher's help. Classroom routines for individual and small group work were clearly established, and students carried them out with minimal guidance from the teacher. Most students not working with a teacher were on task. Several teachers used a variety of effective chants such as "Hands on top- that means stop," and signals to cue students for certain behaviors or transitions. In one observation the teacher referred students to the daily schedule for an interactive check-in on what they had done and what was coming up.</p>	Distinguished	14%
	<p>In the distinguished observations, students were in charge of material distribution and were able to get ready for different activities without any help from the teacher. In one observation students helped each other determine whether space was available in a center by referring to the sign-up charts. In another whole group literacy lesson, individual students seamlessly took on multiple roles such as reading a line or posting a picture on the white board as the teacher kept the lesson moving.</p>	Proficient	76%
	<p>The QSR team rated 10% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations, some instructional time was lost between the transition from the whole-group and small-group activities. There appeared to be established routines on how to put away and take out materials; however, the teacher had to provide regular guidance for students to carry them out. In another observation students working in small groups were only partially engaged when not working directly with the teacher. Some students occasionally wandered slowly around the room while others engaged in off-task conversations.</p>	Basic	10%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Managing Student Behavior	<p>The QSR team scored 90% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Student behavior was generally appropriate and teachers monitored student behavior and responded to misbehavior in ways that were consistent and respectful of students, including eye contact, discreet verbal reminders, and positioning themselves near specific students. When groups of students did not meet a class expectation, teachers had them practice demonstrating the expectation correctly. Teachers often got down to individual student's eye-level to remind them of the rules and offer consequences if the misbehaviors continued. Several teachers also offered positive narration, noting students who were following the rules or meeting expectations. In one observation a student had a personalized token board to track behavior, and an aide updated it during the observation. Another teacher reminded students of the expectations of turn-taking before they began an activity.</p> <p>30% of observations were distinguished. In these observations student behavior was entirely appropriate and there was no misbehavior.</p>	Distinguished	30%
		Proficient	60%
	<p>The QSR team rated 10% of the observations as basic in this component. Although student behavior was generally appropriate, a few teachers' responses to student misbehavior were inconsistent. Sometimes they used a harsh tone or redirected a student publicly. In one observation a single student who was off-task at the beginning of independent work was directed to work at the reflection desk, but other students who became off-task were not assigned a consequence.</p>	Basic	10%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of “distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” and “unsatisfactory” are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 83% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Instruction domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<p>Communicating with Students</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 76% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In many observations teachers clearly explained content and concepts and focused on strategies students could use resulting in students engaging with the tasks. In many early childhood centers, the tasks were open-ended and students engaged in extended play. When teachers worked with students in these observations either in free choice centers, directed tasks, or individual assessments, their directions were clear and scaffolded. In several observations teachers clearly stated what the students would be learning during each activity. One teacher modeled the process and described specific strategies to use. Another teacher anticipated possible challenges students might face during the task and noted, “There are a few ways that you might do this so make sure that when you are discussing in your group that you are open to other perspectives.”</p>	Distinguished	5%
		Proficient	71%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team rated 24% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations, directions needed to be repeated several times. Although one teacher solicited some student input while modeling the process of using narration to “stitch together” two scenes, students struggled to start the task. The teacher had to repeat and clarify the directions for students to begin working. In another observation students looked confused about to how to complete the task, asked each other questions, and began the wrong activity. The teacher called all students back to the carpet, repeated the directions, and clarified using simpler Spanish vocabulary for some students.</p> <p>In other basic observations, there were minor content errors. In one example, the teacher made a minor yet significant vocabulary error by repeatedly using the term “inverse” to refer to multiplication problems in which the order of the factors is reversed—for instance, 2x5 as the “inverse” of 5x2. In another math observation the teacher's explanation of content was procedural and relied heavily on imprecise language such as “moving the decimal point to make the number bigger or smaller.”</p>	Basic	24%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques	<p>The QSR team scored 80% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Teachers engaged in significant discourse with students, in both English and Spanish, using questions to help students expand their ideas. In most early childhood centers, teachers stepped aside to allow students to interact with each other in open-ended tasks. In other observations teachers used open-ended questions, often building upon students’ responses with follow-up questions asking them to cite evidence. One teacher noted, “You're saying he was surprised.</p>	Distinguished	10%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>Can you find the line in the text where it shows he was surprised?" Many teachers used a variety of strategies to engage students in discussion such as turn-and-talk, think-pair-share, and checking each other's' work. Teachers also effectively used wait time. In one observation the teacher allowed a student to take his time formulating his response and stated, "Let's give him time to think. We are going to wait to hear what he says. I want to hear it."</p> <p>In the distinguished observations the teachers probed as needed to allow students to truly engage with each other in meaningful dialogue. In one early childhood observation, a student asked the teacher a question to which the teacher responded, "If you don't know, ask someone who has already used it to see what they did." In another distinguished observation the teacher facilitated an appropriately challenging discussion anchored in the class text. The teacher effectively prompted students to access their prior knowledge ("What do you know about the word <i>bloom</i>?") and cued students to use their vocabulary words in responses. All students eagerly participated in the discussion.</p>	Proficient	70%
	<p>The QSR team rated 20% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations all discussion was between the teacher and individual students. Students either did not have the opportunity to engage with each other or only a few students participated. In one observation the teacher's questions led students along a single path of inquiry, with only one correct answer to most questions.</p>	Basic	20%
	<p>The QSR team rated 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 85% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Tasks in many early childhood centers were open ended and engaged students for extended periods of time. During independent work time in one observation all students engaged in math discussions during group time. Learning tasks in independent assignments built successfully upon the whole group lesson. Several teachers encouraged students to use different mathematical strategies including manipulatives, drawing, and talking through number meaning with partners. In another observation students were tasked with writing a fairy tale revision. The task encouraged higher-order thinking, and most students worked productively and enthusiastically on it. The lesson itself had a defined structure and closed with an opportunity for reflection and goal setting. In many observations materials and resources supported the learning goals and required intellectual engagement. The lessons were engaging in and of themselves, and the students independently chose the materials that they needed for their work, collecting appropriate materials from around the room as needed.</p>	Distinguished	14%
	<p>In the distinguished observations the teachers scaffolded the tasks and challenged students to explain their thinking. Students in one observation adjusted their own assignment by writing in Spanish or by using words from the word bank to create original sentences. In other observations, the tasks were open ended and allowed all students to engage in a variety of ways. Students were challenged both academically and social-emotionally in many of the early childhood center times. In another distinguished observation, students eagerly shared and appreciated each other's writing.</p>	Proficient	71%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team rated 14% of the observations as basic in this component. In one observation the pacing did not provide enough time for students to complete their work. In other observations recall and passive engagement were the norm. One teacher attempted to encourage students to think about a mathematical concept but most of the lesson was geared towards learning facts and procedures. The focus problem for the whole-group activity was aligned, but only a few students engaged in the conversation, and the pacing was rushed.</p>	Basic	14%
	<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 89% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. Many teachers asked students to justify or explain their thinking as a way to monitor the depth of student understanding. In one observation the teacher posed specifically-designed questions to elicit evidence of understanding. After reading a story about life on a farm and playing Bingo with farm vocabulary, the teacher asked students to respond to the questions: "What lives on a farm? What grows on a farm? What do farm animals give us?" In another observation, when a student's response suggested confusion about a key element of the story, the teacher paused the lesson to review the relevant content and directed the student's attention to an anchor chart posted near the board.</p> <p>In several observations students were aware of the assessment criteria because the teachers frequently referenced expectations. In one observation students checked each other's math work as the teacher circulated to check answers and provide feedback to most students. In another observation students self-assessed their progress, then asked the teacher for feedback.</p>	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The teacher reviewed students' work and offered guidance verbally and on a sticky note that was placed inside of their notebooks. Students then returned to their desks to incorporate the feedback.	Proficient	89%
	The QSR team scored 11% of the observations as basic in this component. Feedback to students in these observations was often vague, such as "You need to work on building triangles." In another observation there was no time for reviewing or assessing student comprehension on a one-question quiz.	Basic	11%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT 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 RUBRIC

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

APPENDIX III: SCORE BREAKDOWN BY COMPONENT

Percent of:	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Basic	5%	10%	10%	10%	24%	20%	14%	11%
Proficient	71%	57%	76%	60%	71%	70%	71%	89%
Distinguished	24%	33%	14%	30%	5%	10%	14%	0%
Subdomain Average	3.19	3.24	3.05	3.20	2.81	2.90	3.00	2.89

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	92%	83%
Domain Averages	3.17	2.90