DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

April 5, 2019

Chris Zimmerman, Board Chair
The Children's Guild DC Public Charter School
2146 24th Pl NE
Washington, DC 20018

Dear Mr. Zimmerman,

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 2018-19 school year for the following reason(s):

- School eligible for 5-year Charter Review during 2019-20 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report
A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of The Children's Guild DC Public Charter School between February 4, 2019 – February 15, 2019. 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 The Children's Guild DC Public Charter School.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
Duane Arbogast, Chief Innovation Officer
Nakia Nicholson, Executive Director

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: April 5, 2019

Campus Information
Campus Name: The Children's Guild DC Public Charter School (Children's Guild PCS)
Ward: 5
Grade levels: Kindergarten through eighth

Qualitative Site Review Information
Reason for Visit: School eligible for 5-year Charter Review during 2019-20 school year
Two-week Window: February 4, 2019 – February 15, 2019
QSR Team Members: Three DC PCSB staff including two special education (SPED) specialists and two consultants including an additional SPED specialist
Number of Observations: 26 (including two SPED pull-outs not included in scoring)
Total Enrollment: 363
Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 178
English Language Learners Enrollment: n<10
In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:
Visit 1: February 7, 2019 – 91.8%
Visit 2: February 8, 2019 – 88.2%
Visit 3: February 13, 2019 – 81.4%
Visit 4: February 14, 2019 – 85.4%

Summary
The Children's Guild PCS's mission is

> "to use the philosophy of Transformative Education to prepare special needs and general education students for college, career readiness, and citizenship in their community by developing in them critical thinking and creative problem solving skills, self-discipline, and a commitment to serve a cause larger than themselves."

Per the school's charter application, Transformation Education[1] is rooted in the "belief that culture is the most powerful teaching tool known to human beings." As a result, The Children's Guild builds schools "by first creating a culture that will communicate…the values of caring, contribution, and commitment." DC PCSB saw evidence of the Transformation Education philosophy at The Children's Guild PCS.

[1] https://www.tranzed.org/about-us/transformation-education/

The school design supported the individual needs of all students by allowing for inclusion, self-contained, and pull-out settings. The QSR team observed multiple teachers in every room, and the relationships between students and teachers and among students was warm and caring. Classrooms were calm and orderly; there were very few instances of misbehavior, indicating self-discipline, another piece of the school's mission. Compared with the school's first years this transformation is truly remarkable.

However, the instructional rigor was mixed. In some observations instruction was rote and required little to no critical thinking or creativity. In other observations there were learning opportunities for students to think critically and explore multiple strategies; in several observations students were explicitly asked to explain their thinking.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teachin*g to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendix I and II). The QSR team scored 78% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. The vast majority of observations fell into the "proficient" range, the second highest of the rubric, in all components of this domain.

The QSR team scored just over one-third (38%) of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The majority of observations fell into the "basic" range in this domain, and in some components, fewer than half of observations were proficient. This indicates that teachers at the Children's Guild PCS are performing in the middle range of the rubric in Instruction, and it is important to note that the Danielson Group broadly defines "basic" as "uneven." This level is where you would expect a new teacher to perform. By comparison, the typical elementary school we evaluate shows about 70% observations as proficient or distinguished in the Instruction domain. On a more positive note, only one observation was rated as "unsatisfactory" in one component of this domain.

Governance

Chris Zimmerman chairs the Children's Guild PCS board of trustees. Per its bylaws, the school's board is required to "meet quarterly," which the school has been compliant with since its opening in SY 2015-16. The school has also been compliant with the School Reform Act[2] since that time, which requires the board to include two parent representatives and a majority of DC residents.

[2] https://www.dcpcsb.org/policy/school-reform-act

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Children's Guild PCS consists of 49.0% students with disabilities (SWD). Prior to the two-week window, the school completed a questionnaire about how it serves its SWD. Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Overall, the school implemented its stated program with fidelity as evidenced by the observations described below where students were engaged in learning.

In general education inclusion classrooms, the school said that it uses the One Teach, One Assist and the Station Model co-teaching models, which is consistent with DC PCSB's observations. In these observations, DC PCSB observed a lead teacher and a second (and sometimes third) teacher assisting by leading small groups and circulating the classroom to ensure students were on-task during whole-group instruction.

DC PCSB observed twelve self-contained classrooms. In most observations there was ample evidence of flexible scheduling, chunking of instructional materials, structured breaks, preferential seating, small grouping, and repeated directions. Teachers implemented regularly scheduled "brain breaks" after 20-30 minute instructional blocks. During the breaks, students were permitted to go to the restroom, play a computer game using one of the desktops and headphones in the classroom, or play a board game with a peer. Breaks lasted between five and ten minutes, and in each observation, teachers were able to successfully transition students back to regular instruction without a significant loss of time.

In one observation the teachers made sure that students could see the board from their seats and offered students preferential seating closer to the board if they appeared to be straining their eyes. Classroom instruction blocks were structured but flexible. For example, teachers allowed students additional time or adjusted the lesson if they noticed that students need more time to go over key content. In a few observations, worksheets and leveled reading material was broken into small paragraphs so students read brief paragraphs and discussed reading comprehension questions with the teacher in small groups. Students frequently used the online tool iReady to practice mainly math skills in the form of educational games. Teachers and aides reinforced lessons, directions, and expectations multiple times in written and oral formats.

In another self-contained observation, however, four students worked on learning programs online while the lead teacher worked independently with one student. The other aides in the classroom did not monitor the students working on computers, who became easily distracted by one another. The lead teacher taught a quick whole-class lesson but did not adjust the lesson to address the students' confusion.

DC PCSB also observed two pull-out sessions: students were fully engaged in one session and minimally engaged in the other. In one observation an assistant teacher pulled a small group of students out of the main classroom. The students took turns testing letter recognition and sounds with the teacher while the group was supposed to be coloring. The teacher repeatedly asked students to remain quiet so s/he could conduct testing but did not successfully manage behavior to maximize learning time. In another pull-out, two students worked on strategies for solving word problems. The teacher had the students sort clue words such as “more, less, shorter, altogether, less than” into categories for addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. As students solved problems, they chose to use either counters or a calculator. Both students used whiteboards to set up their problems for immediate teacher feedback.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[3]

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Classroom Environment 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 78% 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	School Wide Rating	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	The QSR team scored 91% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component, with over a quarter of observations scored as Distinguished. In distinguished observations the classroom interactions between students and teachers were highly respectful and reflected genuine warmth and care. Teachers listened attentively, responded with excitement, and encouraged students to take academic risks. Even when an answer was incorrect students and teachers would note, "It's ok, you're still cool." When one student became upset, a teacher asked another adult in the room to take him for a short walk to get water and discuss the importance of trying and learning from mistakes. Interactions in virtually every observation were friendly and conveyed respect among students and teachers. Several teachers reminded students that all opinions are valued and that mistakes are okay. In several observations teachers made connections to students either by joking with them, connecting to their lives outside of school, or encouraging students to be themselves and stand up for their own opinions. One teacher said, "Now is a good time for me to share my appreciation for how hard you are working in class. Make sure you put your name on that so when I put it up on the board, you'll be able to see your name in lights!" When an argument broke out in one classroom, an aide intervened and took	Distinguished	26%

[3] Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	the more agitated student out into the hallway to cool down in a way that respected the student's dignity.	Proficient	65%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as basic in this component.	Basic	4%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as basic in this component.	Unsatisfactory	4%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team scored 61% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In this distinguished observation students and teachers challenged each other to explain their thinking during a four-corners activity. One student took the initiative to adjust the structure of the lesson to express his opinion accurately. In all proficient observations, almost all students demonstrated understanding of their role as learners and expended effort to demonstrate their understanding. Teachers consistently checked-in with individual and small groups of students and used language that conveyed high expectations for all. One teacher asked, "What does your invincible grit mean?" and the student replied, "It means I don't quit!" Another student took the initiative to consult a resource on the wall to help her figure out the answer. Teachers expected effort from everyone and intentionally called on various students during group discussion, regardless of whether students volunteered to participate. In most classrooms there were both primary teachers and classroom assistants whom together held high expectations while providing accommodations and individualized support to keep students motivated.	Distinguished	4%
		Proficient	65%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 30% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations the teacher's primary concern appeared to be task completion rather than holding high expectations for all students. A few teachers went step-by-step through the teacher instruction manual in a rote manner. One teacher had students identify key details to support the main idea but did not intervene or clarify the task when students simply copied random sentences from their textbook. In several classrooms students working on computer programs (iReady, Zearn, etc.) showed signs of boredom/disengagement – slumped in their seats or with their heads down. In one self-contained observation the classroom aides watched students work on computer programs but did not intervene or offer support/questioning when students chose incorrect answers at a pace that suggested they were merely guessing.	Basic	30%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team scored 70% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations there was little loss of instructional time due to effective classroom routines and procedures. In some classrooms students had assigned roles to pass out supplies or collect papers, which helped reinforce smooth transitions between activities. In each of these observations teachers used timers and provided frequent time checks. Supplies were often readily available. Primary classrooms had seat bags, and in upper grades, materials were available in group baskets. Aides and paraprofessionals operated small groups in Station Teaching fluidly.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	70%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 22% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations some instructional time was lost due to partially effective classroom procedures. In one observation it took over 30 minutes for instruction to begin. In another observation there was a lack of co-planning: an aide asked the teacher, “What do you want him to be working on?” In some observations procedures were inconsistently implemented. For example, the teacher asked all students to raise their hands before speaking but did not reprimand some students who called out. In one classroom students did not know their computer logins and had to leave class to ask another adult for support, reducing learning time in the classroom.	Basic	22%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	9%
Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 83% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations behavior was entirely appropriate, and teachers/assistants silently monitored students' behavior. In some proficient observations teachers and assistants quickly addressed minimal student misbehavior. In other proficient observations there were many behavior challenges. Nevertheless, teacher actions were kind, swift, and effective. Students had opportunities to “cool down” by taking walks and speaking one-on-one with classroom aides.	Distinguished	9%
		Proficient	74%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 13% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations standards of conduct were clear but inconsistently applied. For example, one teacher said, "We're not going to be unkind. Say you're sorry. Say it." The student refused, and the teacher moved on without addressing the hurt student. Another teacher said, "Didn't I just tell you to come back from that door?" The student didn't come back, and the teacher did not facilitate a plan for the student to re-join the lesson.	Basic	13%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	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 38% 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	
Communicating with Students	The QSR team scored 41% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations the teacher clearly stated what students would be learning and how it connected with their previous lessons or assignments. In one observation the teacher explained that students needed to complete their exit ticket according to the differentiated group they were assigned. The teacher then asked a few probing questions to ensure students knew how to complete the steps. In another observation the teacher explained the instructions for students' assigned task and reminded them of the resources/notes available in their notebooks. In response, students indicated they understood the teacher's instructions by reviewing their notes to complete the task. One teacher explained, modeled, and scaffolded the lesson directions by working with students on an example problem and clearly explaining how it pertained to the concept of an unknown variable. The teacher focused on strategies students could use when working independently and invited student engagement. The teacher watched students in each small group that met with her and had them present their work. The teacher's use of academic vocabulary was precise and served to extend student understanding. The teacher used and clearly defined words such as *decompose:* "I'm going to decompose, or break apart, the number."	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	41%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 59% of the observations as basic in this component. The teachers' explanations did not invite students to engage intellectually or understand strategies they might use independently. In two classrooms the teacher followed a teacher's manual, reading the rote directions and not clarifying or expanding on the purpose of the lesson or the strategies students could learn. In one classroom students read from a history textbook and were supposed to summarize the text into bullet points, but they just copied sentences verbatim. In five classrooms teachers gave directions and had students repeat them back exactly, or repeat the directions verbatim to a friend, without any evidence that the students understood the directions or the larger purpose. The vocabulary was not always appropriate to the students' ages. In one observation the teacher continued to repeat "use evidence" but students indicated by their lack of response that they were unsure how to do this. On the other hand, in an upper-grade classroom, the teacher focused on the word "embarrassed," even though the level of the book the students were reading indicated that they were working on grade level. Teachers rarely took the opportunity to explain academic vocabulary. In one classroom the teacher handed out a warm-up that was about the term "organism," but s/he did not review the task, collect the work, or monitor whether students had even completed it. In another classroom a student incorrectly defined "sturdy," but the teacher did not take the opportunity to engage further than just quickly correcting him (even though the student explained why he thought it meant "smooth").	Basic	59%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques	The QSR team scored 35% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished. Teachers' questions were occasionally low-level, but many questions were designed to promote student thinking and understanding. Some teachers challenged students to elaborate on their answers and justify their reasoning. One teacher asked probing questions such as, "What's going on in this text? What's going on in this picture… what evidence could you get?" The teacher then built upon students' responses to further discussion. In a few observations teachers used small groups to ensure that all students had opportunities to participate and contribute solutions. By allowing students pre-work time, teachers ensured students were ready and comfortable to participate in class discussions.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	35%
	The QSR team scored 60% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers inconsistently asked students to explain their thinking. In one observation students had open-ended questions as part of the task, but the teacher guided students to the answer without allowing for discovery or conversation. In other classrooms the teacher attempted to engage all students in the discussion with uneven results. In one blended learning class, the questions either did not require thought or were rigorous and students guessed as a result. One question was, "Click on the correct definition of context clues." Another was, "Choose between an appositive clue or appositive clue." The student clicked on the clues before s/he had a chance to read the answers.	Basic	60%
	The QSR team scored 5% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	10%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team scored 38% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations the learning tasks and activities were designed to challenge students. As students cycled through centers, teachers prompted them to make their thinking visible. For example, one teacher working in a center worked closely with students to scaffold their emerging understanding of an unknown variable. In the other center, the aide worked with students on multiplication problems and the students actively engaged with the content and took the initiative to use resources in the classroom to help them with the work. Lessons had clearly defined structures and pacing was appropriate, providing most students time to complete their tasks but not become bored or disengaged.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	38%
	The QSR team scored 62% of the observations as basic in this component. Here, the learning tasks and activities required only minimal student thinking and little opportunities for students to explain their reasoning, allowing most students to be passive or merely compliant. For example, in one classroom students merely glued steps of a scientific system in the right order in a flip book. In another classroom the teacher followed a script which required students to repeat sentences the teacher read in the story. In an upper-grade classroom, students were required to find apostrophes in a reading passage, which appeared to be below grade level for most students in the room. In several classrooms, the blended learning platforms (iReady, Zearn, Ready Core) did not engage students in learning. Students put their heads down, slumped down in their seats, attempted to access non-academic websites, or engaged in off-topic discussions.	Basic	62%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team scored 38% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations teachers regularly used questions and assessments to diagnose evidence of learning. Aides also worked closely with small groups and asked probing questions such as, “Why do both of these ways of solving the problem work? How do you know?” Some students engaged in self-assessment by intentionally seeking out teachers for feedback on their work. When necessary, teachers made impromptu lesson adjustments. One teacher realized students were confused and stopped the class to say, “Ok, let’s all go over question three.”	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	38%
	The QSR team scored 62% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers monitored understanding globally and did not offer concrete feedback. Teachers said phrases such as, "Does anyone not understand what I just said? Ok, good" and "Check, check?" to which students simply replied, "Awesome, awesome." No teachers in these observations reviewed assessment criteria with students. Teachers’ adjustment of the lesson in response to student assessment was minimal or ineffective. In one observation students demonstrated that they were confused about the difference between prefixes and suffixes but the teacher did not address the misunderstanding.	Basic	62%
	The QSR team scored 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 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 may 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	4%	0%	9%	4%	0%	5%	0%	0%
Basic	4%	30%	22%	13%	59%	60%	62%	62%
Proficient	65%	65%	70%	74%	41%	35%	38%	38%
Distinguished	26%	4%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Subdomain Average	3.13	2.74	2.61	2.87	2.41	2.30	2.38	2.38

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	78%	38%
Domain Averages	2.84	2.37