



April 5, 2019

Gina Mahony, Board Chair  
Paul Public Charter School – International High School  
5800 8<sup>th</sup> Street NW  
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Ms. Mahony,

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 20-year Charter Review during 2019-20 school year

**Qualitative Site Review Report**

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Paul Public Charter – International High School between February 4, 2019 – February 14, 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 Paul Public Charter School - International High School.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux  
Deputy Director

Enclosures

cc: Tracy Wright, Executive Director and Erin Fisher, Principal

## Qualitative Site Review Report

**Date:** April 5, 2019

### **Campus Information**

**Campus Name:** Paul Public Charter School – International High School (Paul PCS – International HS)

**Ward:** 4

**Grade levels:** Nine through twelve

### **Qualitative Site Review (QSR) Information**

**Reason for Visit:** School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2019-20 school year

**Two-week Window:** February 4, 2019 – February 15, 2019

**QSR Team Members:** Four DC PCSB staff members including one special education (SPED) specialist and English Learner (EL) specialist

**Number of Observations:** 22 observations

**Total Enrollment:** 480

**Students with Disabilities Enrollment:** 94

**English Language Learners Enrollment:** 95

**In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:**

**Visit 1:** February 6, 2019 – 91.1%

**Visit 2:** February 12, 2019 – 90.1%

**Visit 3:** February 13, 2019 – 93.0%

**Visit 4:** February 14, 2019 – 94.2%

### **Summary**

The mission of Paul PCS – International HS is to “offer all students a quality academic education which will enable them to become responsible and productive individuals, critical and independent thinkers, cooperative team players, and outstanding community leaders.” The QSR team observed evidence that Paul PCS – International HS’s classroom environment and instructional delivery support its mission. Students generally showed respect for their teachers, peers, and school community. Many students acted responsibly and played an active role in regulating their own behavior. Teachers showed genuine interest and care for students and often praised them with phrases like, “Thank you, sir” and “You are an expert.” Teachers attempted to engage students in conversations that required critical thinking but with uneven success. Some tasks required only rote responses and passive engagement from students. Teachers dominated the conversation during many classroom discussions limiting students’ ability to think independently.

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). The QSR team scored 82% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain, roughly the same as the school’s last QSR in 2014<sup>1</sup> when 81% of observations were rated as proficient or distinguished

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul PCS Qualitative Site Review Report, March 5, 2014, <https://bit.ly/2EFuLWx>.

in this component. The highest rated component was *Managing Student Behavior*, with 91% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished. The lowest rated component was *Establishing a Culture for Learning*, with 68% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished. Notably, no observation was rated unsatisfactory in this component.

The QSR team scored 58% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. This is a decrease from the school's last QSR in 2014<sup>1</sup> where 75% of observations were rated as proficient or distinguished in this component. One component, *Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques* scored basic in 52% of observations. This means over half of the observations in this component fell into the basic range. The Danielson Group broadly defines "basic" as "uneven." New teachers often score within this range. The highest rated component was *Engaging Students in Learning* with 72% of observations rated as proficient or distinguished. Notably, no observation was rated unsatisfactory in this component.

### Governance

Gina Mahony chairs the Paul PCS – International HS board of trustees. The school's bylaws requires the board to meet eight times per year, which the school has been compliant with for the past five years. The school has also been compliant with the School Reform Act<sup>2</sup> for the past five years, which requires the board to include two parent representatives and have a majority of DC residents.

### Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

94% of special education observations scored proficient or distinguished in Domain 2 of the Danielson rubric, while 60% of special education observations scored proficient or distinguished in Domain 3. Prior to the two-week window, Paul PCS – International HS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). The school reported that its special education model is rooted in a "customized schedule for students with Individual Education Plans (IEPs)." During the observation window, DC PCSB looked for co-teaching, small group instruction, and modified classwork. DC PCSB conducted four special education observations: two sheltered self-contained classrooms and two co-taught inclusion classrooms. Overall, the school implemented its stated program with fidelity as evidenced by engaging students in learning in three of the four observations described below.

In one co-taught inclusion classroom, the special educator used the One Teach, One Assist co-teaching model. While the lead teacher taught a whole-group lesson, the special educator worked with one table of students who were situated in pre-determined groups. The special educator assisted each student in his/her group with graphing calculators and provided feedback, ensuring all students followed along with the lesson. In another co-taught classroom, the lead and special educator used the Alternative Teaching model. While the whole class wrote essays uninterrupted for thirty minutes, the special educator worked exclusively with two

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.dcpccb.org/policy/school-reform-act>

students on a graphic organizer to prepare the students to write their own essays with scaffolded support.

In one sheltered classroom, the two special educators in the room used the Parallel Teaching method. Both teachers taught the same lesson to small groups at opposite ends of the classroom. In this observation pacing was a challenge. One teacher set a timer for three minutes for students to answer one multiple-choice question. Students then went on a gallery walk to view a series of images and predict how they related to the reading. Students were unable to make the historical connection despite the teacher's probing questions. Eventually, students got frustrated and refused to engage in questioning. The teacher then read aloud from a long text as students sat idly. In another sheltered classroom, students worked in small groups to make posters demonstrating the steps of a complex math problem. The teacher provided color-coded notecards explaining the steps that students modified by putting the steps into their own words to demonstrate understanding.

### Specialized Instruction for English Learners

Paul PCS – International HS's EL instructional model combines "Sheltered Content Instruction, Inclusion, and English Language Development classes." The EL specialist observed one Sheltered Content class, two inclusion classes, and one English Language Development (ELD) class. The EL classes provided a "safe and positive environment" for students while supporting the development of their English language skills and grade-appropriate content.

As described in the EL questionnaire, the one sheltered class "ensured comprehension" through "scaffolded language," giving students opportunities "to respond to material being studied." A projector displayed questions on the whiteboard and students used individual tablets to choose the correct answer. The quiz program tabulated and displayed their answers on the board so the teacher could see the number of students that chose each answer while allowing students to remain anonymous so no one felt self-conscious about choosing incorrectly. The teacher assessed student learning after each question, reviewing each answer choice and asking for student volunteers to describe their rationale to the class. The teacher adjusted instruction and clarified misconceptions that may have led to errors. S/he used hand motions and number lines to designate greater and less than, decreasing the language load to allow comprehension of rounding and place value concepts. Students also used graphic organizers (place value charts) as they answered questions about expanded forms of numbers. Students felt comfortable explaining their rationale to the rest of the class, volunteering their answers even when incorrect. By the end of the lesson the quiz displayed 100% correct answers, indicating that students understood the content.

Teachers presented grade-level content in the inclusion/collaborative teaching classes using strategies to make content accessible to ELs. During the first inclusion observation, the EL teacher used primary sources to help students understand a historical event. (Note that this class was supposed to be co-taught, but the co-teacher was absent.) S/he described some concepts in the students' home language and repeated explanations in English. Materials included explanations of relevant vocabulary. The teacher made the lesson highly engaging, and students made

comparisons between Nazi Germany's tactics and those of dictatorships around the world. The EL teacher repeated questions and wrote them on the board to support student understanding. Students practiced both reading and writing skills as they read primary sources and responded to an essay question.

Students in the second inclusion class (taught by a lead teacher with EL teacher support) learned about feudalism through texts, visual aids, and primary source materials. The lead teacher gave students background knowledge through a whole-class discussion before asking them to create their own feudal contract. She called on most students, paraphrasing and building on their answers. She required students to use historically accurate vocabulary, displayed on a color-coded word wall. (Words related to the same unit had the same color.) When students began their independent work, both the EL teacher and the lead teacher continuously circulated throughout the classroom, reading student essays and providing feedback (like where to find information among their materials, clarifying the learning task, and talking through the students' essays before they began to write). The lead teacher created a positive environment for students, praising specific academic habits like looking through study guides to find information.

The ELD class gave students opportunities to improve their speaking, reading and writing skills. Students' Do Now activity asked them to create and describe their own ritual. The teacher walked around the classroom reading student responses, providing immediate feedback and asking students to write more detail. Students practiced speaking by describing their rituals to the entire group. Later students worked with partners on vocabulary related to a short story, *The Lottery*. Work packets asked them to look up definitions of words from the story, provided examples of the words from the text, and asked students to write their own examples. The teacher gave each table a tablet and encouraged them to look at Learner's Dictionary, an online resource for those learning English, as they wrote their definitions of words. The teacher gave students a short mini lesson on the word *hush*, describing and providing examples of the word as a verb or noun, using the students themselves in her examples. Students worked productively throughout the lesson.

The EL specialist rated all components of Domain 2 as proficient or above in all EL observations, demonstrating that these classes provided a safe and positive environment for ELs. Students, including newcomers, volunteered to answer frequently, showing their trust in classmates and teachers. There was little to no off-task behavior and students responded to teachers' gentle redirection. Students remained focused on completing the learning task in all EL observations.

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

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 82% 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 |     |
|--|---|--------------------|-----|
| <p><b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b></p> | <p>The QSR team scored 91% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations talk between teachers and students was uniformly respectful. In one observation the teacher greeted each student at the door and asked how they felt. One student responded that he was “just ok.” The teacher walked over to the student and asked, “Is there something we need to talk about?” In another observation the teacher selected one student to be the “Cool Physicist of the Day” based on how he worked hard and supported his peers.</p> | Distinguished      | 5%  |
|  | <p>In the distinguished observation students dressed in all black to celebrate Black History Month. The teacher praised students by saying, “You all look so great. I’m so happy you all participated. We need to take a picture.” The teacher later conferenced with individual students and gave frequent compliments and words of encouragement on their work. Students in this class also peer-reviewed the work of their classmates and gave kind compliments like, “You did a really good job. I saw a spelling mistake but I fixed it because I’m your friend.”</p>              | Proficient         | 86% |
|  | <p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component.</p>  | Basic              | 9%  |
|  | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>  | Unsatisfactory     | 0%  |

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

| The Classroom Environment                  | Evidence   | School Wide Rating |     |
|--|--|--------------------|-----|
| <b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b> | <p>The QSR team scored 68% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations teachers communicated the importance of learning. In one observation the teacher mentioned one student's desire to become an engineer saying, "I know that you want to be a Mechanical Engineer. Here is why this is going to help you." In another observation the teacher insisted that all students participate. When one student struggled, a group of peers worked together to support him. The teacher encouraged the student by saying, "We're not moving on without you." The student persisted and was able to complete the activity. Students in these observations intellectually engaged with the lesson. In one observation students watched intently as the teacher modeled expectations for conducting a science experiment. Later, students carefully and diligently used the lab equipment to complete the assigned tasks.</p> | Distinguished      | 0%  |
|  | <p>The QSR team scored 32% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations the teacher conveyed high expectations for only some students. In one observation the teacher struggled to offer students the opportunity to participate. The teacher often responded to their own questions when attempts to engage students failed. For example, the teacher stated, "I want to hear from someone on this side of the room," but quickly moved on when students did not respond. In another observation the teacher attempted to engage a student with their head on the desk. The student responded, "Oh my God. I don't know." The teacher did not persist any further.</p>   | Basic              | 32% |
|  | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>   | Unsatisfactory     | 0%  |
|  | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>   | Unsatisfactory     | 0%  |

| The Classroom Environment            | Evidence  | School Wide Rating |     |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| <b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b> | <p>The QSR team scored 78% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations classroom routines functioned smoothly. During one small group discussion the teacher passed out colored pieces of paper to help students indicate their point of view without interrupting the discussion. In another observation students quickly accessed their designated binders and warm-up packets upon entering the room. In another observation the teacher projected a timer on to the board and frequently checked on student progress based on the time remaining.</p>  | Distinguished      | 5%  |
|                                      | <p>In the distinguished observation students themselves ensured that transitions and other routines were accomplished smoothly. Students took the initiative and distributed goggles and other materials at the beginning of the lab.</p>   | Proficient         | 73% |
|                                      | <p>The QSR team scored 23% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations classroom routines functioned unevenly. In one observation there was no clear system for how materials were distributed and collected. In one observation students appeared unclear on what to do with their notebooks once they finished taking notes. Instead, students began to talk amongst themselves before the teacher intervened and selected one student to collect all of the materials. In another observation the teacher instructed students to begin working on an activity but had not distributed the materials. This caused a brief delay in the start of the activity and a loss of instructional time as students sat idly by while the teacher passed out materials.</p> | Basic              | 23% |
|                                      | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>  | Unsatisfactory     | 0%  |



| The Classroom Environment        | Evidence  | School Wide Rating |     |
|----------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| <b>Managing Student Behavior</b> | <p>The QSR team scored 91% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations teachers response to student behavior was effective. In one observation the teacher simply walked over to a group of students engaged in an off-topic conversation and made direct eye contact with them. The students quickly ended the conversation. In another observation a student left the classroom and was later involved in a fight. The teacher ensured that all students remained in the classroom and stayed on task and did not allow the incident to disrupt instruction.</p> | Distinguished      | 23% |
|                                  | <p>In the distinguished observations teachers used proximity to subtly monitor student behavior. In one observation the teacher circulated the room as students completed an experiment and queried students on the expectations for working in the lab. Multiple students articulated the process.</p>   | Proficient         | 68% |
|                                  | <p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component.</p>  | Basic              | 9%  |
|                                  | <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 58% 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 |     |
|------------------------------------|--|--------------------|-----|
| <b>Communicating with Students</b> | <p>The QSR team scored 53% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations the teacher explained content clearly, using metaphors and analogies to bring content to life. In one observation the teacher discussed the lesson objective through the lens of a guiding scientific question. The teacher prompted students to connect scientific concepts to real-life situations. In another observation the teacher explained the learning objective and then asked students to break down the expectations in their own words. The teacher asked, "What is the topic?" and "What is the action?" and "What is the proof?"</p> | Distinguished      | 10% |
|                                    | <p>In the proficient observations vocabulary usage was correct and appropriately suited for the lesson. In one observation students used specific vocabulary during a discussion about World War II: propaganda, totalitarian ruler, anti-Semitic, and Fuhrer. In another observation the teacher described the process they would use when editing student essays. The teacher said, "When you come back to me, I'm going to give you a compliment, a suggestion, and a correction." As students conferenced with the teacher individually, the teacher asked them to explain the editing process at the start of each conference.</p>  | Proficient         | 43% |

| Instruction  | Evidence   | School Wide Rating |     |
|--|--|--------------------|-----|
|  | <p>The QSR team rated 48% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers had to clarify the learning target. In one observation the teacher projected an image of candy onto the board and attempted to make a connection to the reading about the slave trade. Many students either did not answer or gave a response that indicated they did not understand the content.</p> <p>In another observation the teacher occasionally offered analogies for math procedures, but often used imprecise vocabulary with minor calculation mistakes.</p>  | Basic              | 48% |
|  | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>   | Unsatisfactory     | 0%  |
| <p><b>Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques</b></p> | <p>The QSR team scored 48% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations the teacher used open-ended questions, inviting students to think and offer multiple possible answers. In one observation the teacher facilitated a conversation about why students' responses were or were not correct. The teacher used equity sticks to ensure that all students participated in the discussion. The teacher asked questions like, "How do you know?" and "Why is this an expression?" and "If I give you a domain, what would you do?" In another observation the teacher separated the students into three groups. Two groups shared competing observations of lab data, while the third group hypothesized why the findings were different among groups.</p> | Distinguished      | 5%  |
|  |  | Proficient         | 43% |

| Instruction                          | Evidence  | School Wide Rating |     |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
|                                      | <p>The QSR team scored 52% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations the teacher framed some questions designed to promote student thinking, but only a few students were involved. In one observation the teacher asked “Ok, who wants to share their answer?” and “Does anyone agree or disagree?” When students did not respond the teacher answered his/her own question and moved on. Teachers’ attempts to encourage student persistence often fell flat. One teacher attempted to probe saying, “I’m going to push you a bit. What do you think the slaves were harvesting?” Students did not respond and the teacher simply gave students the answer.</p>   | Basic              | 52% |
|                                      | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>  | Unsatisfactory     | 0%  |
| <b>Engaging Students in Learning</b> | <p>The QSR team scored 72% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations there was a mix of different types of groupings, suitable to the lesson objectives. In one observation students worked well in groups and alternated between independent work and discussion as they provided feedback to their peers. In another observation the teacher broke students into small groups and provided them a printout to help them solve the problem. The teacher later asked students to break the steps down in their own words and provide a rationale for their answers.</p> <p>In the distinguished observation the teacher engaged students through individual conferences to support making edits to their essays. Later, students exchanged feedback with their peers. All students actively engaged in the activity and provided quality and thoughtful feedback to their classmates. At the end of the game students transitioned quickly back to their tables and ended the class period independently editing their work.</p> | Distinguished      | 5%  |
|                                      |   | Proficient         | 67% |

| Instruction                                   | Evidence   | School Wide Rating |     |
|---|--|--------------------|-----|
|   | <p>The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations the pacing of the lesson was uneven. In one observation students disengaged after the teacher read an entire article aloud before students moved into a close reading<sup>4</sup>. As the teacher read, students sat idle and did not engage with the lesson. In another observation the teacher assigned students a basic cut-and-paste activity. The teacher asked students to paste different terms with the definition on a cutout of a wheel. The teacher's engagement with the students was limited to procedural directions and general feedback. When a student asked why the definitions did not line up, the teacher said, "So re-glue it. Go ahead and do it over." The teacher did not engage in any additional intellectual conversation with the student.</p> | Basic              | 29% |
|   | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>   | Unsatisfactory     | 0%  |
| <p><b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b></p> | <p>The QSR team scored 62% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations feedback included specific and timely guidance on how students could improve their performance. In one observation the teachers conferenced individually with each student to provide feedback on their essays. During each conference the teacher offered students specific feedback on how they could improve their writing. One teacher said, "I want you to use your thesis to establish [the body of your] paragraph" and "You should go through your topics and break down each topic sentence."</p>   | Distinguished      | 5%  |

<sup>4</sup> Close reading is thoughtful, critical analysis of a text that focuses on significant details or patterns in order to develop a deep, precise understanding of the text's form, craft, meanings, etc. It is a key requirement of the Common Core State Standards and directs the reader's attention to the text itself.

| Instruction | Evidence  | School Wide Rating |     |
|-------------|---|--------------------|-----|
|             | <p>The teacher also provided the student with a list of sentence starters that they could use to enhance their essay. In another observation the teacher checked individual students' graphs for accuracy. When students found mistakes, the teacher walked them through their corrections.</p> <p>In the distinguished observation, students monitored their own understanding as a result of tasks set by the teacher. The teacher provided individual feedback to each student and then organized a game of musical chairs where students gave feedback to one another. At the end of the game, each student offered a compliment and asked a question or gave a suggestion to their classmates. For example, one student shared, "I liked when he mentioned that they gave the patients aspirin and minerals" and "That was good paraphrasing."</p> | Proficient         | 57% |
|             | <p>The QSR team rated 38% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations feedback to students was not specific. In one observation the only feedback the teacher gave was, "Fix it." The teacher later read the answers to the problems aloud but did not provide further explanation. In another observation the teacher requested only global indicators of student understanding. For example, the teacher focused the entire line of questioning on students providing definitions of mathematical terms. One student attempted to make a real-world connection with one of the words by sharing a personal experience, but the teacher insisted that the student only give the definition.</p>  | Basic              | 38% |
|             | <p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>  | Unsatisfactory     | 0%  |

## APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT RUBRIC

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

## APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION RUBRIC

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



**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                    | 9%          | 32%         | 23%         | 9%          | 48%         | 52%         | 29%         | 38%         |
| Proficient               | 86%         | 68%         | 73%         | 68%         | 43%         | 43%         | 67%         | 57%         |
| Distinguished            | 5%          | 0%          | 5%          | 23%         | 10%         | 5%          | 5%          | 5%          |
| <b>Subdomain Average</b> | <b>2.95</b> | <b>2.68</b> | <b>2.82</b> | <b>3.14</b> | <b>2.62</b> | <b>2.52</b> | <b>2.76</b> | <b>2.67</b> |

|                          | Domain 2    | Domain 3    |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| % of Proficient or above | 82%         | 58%         |
| <b>Domain Averages</b>   | <b>2.90</b> | <b>2.64</b> |