



March 5, 2014

James Kemp, Board Chair  
Hope Community PCS – Lamond  
6200 Kansas Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Kemp:

The Public Charter School Board (“PCSB”) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews (“QSR”) to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, 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 QSR during the 2013-14 school year for the following reason(s):

- School eligible for 10-year Charter Review during the 2014-15 school year
- School had a Tier 3 rank on the Performance Management Framework during the 2012-13

### **Qualitative Site Review Report**

A QSR team conducted on-site review visits of Hope Community Public Charter School – Lamond (“Hope Community PCS – Lamond”) between January 13 and January 24, 2014. The purpose of the site review is for PCSB to gauge the extent to which the school’s goals and student academic achievement expectations were evident in the everyday operations of the public charter school. To ascertain this, PCSB staff and consultants evaluated your classroom teaching by using an abridged version of the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* observation rubric. We also reviewed board meeting minutes in order to observe the school’s governance as it relates to fulfilling its mission, and charter goals. PCSB was unable to attend a board meeting due to inclement weather.

Enclosed is the team’s report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report is focused primarily on the following areas: charter mission and goals, classroom environments, and instructional delivery.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at Hope Community PCS – Lamond. Thank you for your continued cooperation as PCSB makes every effort to ensure that Hope Community is in compliance with its charter.

Sincerely,

  
Naomi DeVeaux  
Deputy Director

Enclosures  
cc: School Leader

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Hope Community Public Charter School – Lamond (“Hope Community PCS - Lamond”) is one of two Hope Community PCS campuses operated by Imagine Schools. The Lamond campus serves approximately 370 pre-kindergarten through sixth grade students in ward 4. The DC Public Charter School Board (“PCSB”) conducted a Qualitative Site Review (“QSR”) at the Lamond campus in January 2014 because Hope Community PCS is eligible for 10-year Charter Review during the 2014-15 school year. Additionally, Hope Community PCS – Lamond earned a tier 3 score on PCSB’s Performance Management Framework for the 2012-13 school year. The second Hope Community campus, Tolson, will be visited in fall 2014 for its 10-year Charter Review QSR.

PCSB conducted observations over the course of a two-week window, from January 13 through January 24, 2014. A team of three PCSB staff members and two consultants (including a special education consultant) conducted observations of 24 classrooms, including classrooms where more than one teacher was present. The spirit of the QSR process is to identify the educational experience for all students, including students with disabilities. The results of this QSR reflect what the QSR team observed in all learning environments within your school, including the two special education teachers observed in the inclusion and pull-out settings. In some instances, the review team may have observed a teacher twice. The QSR team used Charlotte Danielson’s *Framework for Teaching* Rubric throughout the observations and observed classrooms in mornings and afternoons. In addition to this two-week window, PCSB also reviewed minutes from a Board of Trustees meeting to observe the school’s governance as it relates to fulfilling its mission and charter goals.

On average, just under two-thirds of the observations received a rating of proficient or exemplary in the Classroom Environments domain. Establishing a Culture for Learning was the highest rated domain, with 71% of teachers rated as proficient or above. Teachers consistently encouraged students to try their best and with hard work, they could succeed. Managing Classroom Procedures received the lowest rating in this domain with 50% of observations rated below proficient. Instructional time was lost in half of the classrooms due to only partially effective routines and procedures.

On average, just over half of the observations received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Instructional Delivery domain, which is low for a school in its ninth year of operation. Communicating with Students was the highest rated element within this domain, with 70% of the teachers rated as proficient or above. For the majority of classrooms, teachers consistently updated the whiteboards to reflect the Common Core State Standards, objectives and Students Will Be Able To “SWBAT” for the lesson. Most teachers clearly communicated the purpose of the lesson and made no content errors, two critical areas in student learning. Engaging Students in Learning and Using Assessment in Instruction were the two lowest rated elements, with only 46% and 42% of observations rated proficient and above, respectively. Students who were not working directly

with the teacher were often off-task and students who finished tasks early did not have something else to work on. Additionally, teachers did not give specific feedback to improve student performance nor did they elicit evidence of individual student understanding during the lessons. A select group of six teachers, concentrated in specific grade levels, consistently scored below proficiency in at least six out of the eight elements of the rubric.

**CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS, AND BOARD GOVERNANCE**

This table summarizes Hope Community PCS’s goals and academic achievement expectations as detailed in its charter and subsequent Accountability Plans, and the evidence that the Qualitative Site Review (“QSR”) team observed of the school meeting those goals during the Qualitative Site Visit.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>Mission: The mission of Hope Community is to positively shape the hearts and minds of our students by providing them with an academically rigorous, content rich curriculum, an environment in which character is modeled and promoted, and a community in which to build trusting relationships with others.</p>	<p>The QSR team observed that Hope Community PCS - Lamond campus is inconsistently meeting its mission. The school uses the Core Knowledge curriculum and the teachers have access to its content-rich materials. Students used “Common Core” workbooks for math warm-ups and a booklet called <i>Main Idea and Details</i> during ELA intervention hour. However, not all of the teachers observed asked rigorous, challenging questions to maintain an academically rigorous environment. The questions were mainly yes/no questions or following a single path of inquiry. Only half of the teachers asked open-ended questions inviting students to think or offer multiple possible answers.</p> <p>The school has a character education program. The January character trait was “courage.” Many classrooms had the word posted on the whiteboard and, in some rooms, student-written definitions were posted it on the walls. The QSR team observed whole-class discussions of the character trait and posted projects in the rooms and in the hallways emphasized the core virtues (courage, integrity, and gratitude).</p> <p>Approximately two-thirds of the teachers were proficient or exemplary in the <i>Framework for Teaching</i> rubric element “Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport” which is related to building</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>trusting relationships. In the remaining classrooms teachers struggled to maintain a respectful environment for the students. The QSR team observed some teachers speaking harshly to students after which some students put their head down or ignored the teacher for the rest of the lesson.</p>
<p>1. HCCS students will be strong readers.</p>	<p>Teachers worked on strategies to help students learn to read in the lower grades (PK through 2<sup>nd</sup>). Kindergarten students read words aloud by segmenting the sounds. One kindergarten classroom worked on sight words while waiting for parents to pick up their students. Students in 2<sup>nd</sup> grade read aloud to their peers from both fiction and non-fiction texts. Teachers corrected students if they misread or mispronounced a word. Posted on the walls of many classrooms were posters that encouraged reading or gave strategies to be a successful reader. Some classrooms had a 100 Books campaign; most students had read between 25 to 35 books by mid-January.</p> <p>The school leader explained that, on Jan. 13, 2014, they implemented a new schedule for grades 3-6. Every afternoon the students are divided into small groups depending on reading and math levels for intensive classes. The ELA-intensive classes work on main idea and supporting details. This class started late for many groups because not all students had their books and two teachers went from class to class looking for extra books. The same book, <i>Main Idea and Details</i>, appeared to be used across all grade levels. One teacher was teaching third grade students that the answer to the passage questions is always in passage. She taught the students strategies to help them read, such as finger on</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>every word to help track reading and to look for key words such as “and.” Students worked on answering questions by eliminating the “crazy” and “close” options to find the correct one.</p>
<p>2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Hope Community students will master key concepts related to mathematics, science, and technology and apply them effectively in observing, analyzing, problem solving, and synthesizing data.</li> <li>b. Hope Community students will be critical thinkers and numeric problem solvers and will demonstrate the ability to integrate concepts and make connections related to the core disciplines.</li> </ul>	<p>The QSR team observed inconsistent evidence that the school is meeting this goal.</p> <p>Students in math classes worked on observing, analyzing, problem solving, and synthesizing data in some classes but not in all. Different math teachers displayed markedly different levels of proficiency on the elements of the rubric. In some classes the teachers asked open-ended, probing questions to challenge the students. One math teacher explored integers with her small class. First the group wrote on sticky notes what they already knew about integers, then they discussed many places where integers can be observed. In a 4<sup>th</sup> grade math class, the teacher had a student walk through and correct a long division problem in which the teacher had purposefully made mistakes and the class used mathematical terms to explain to the teacher how to master the problem. Other math teachers focused on yes/no questions and questions based on recall. In one grade math class, the students worked on comparing fractions. The students had great difficulties with their simple multiplication and division tables, and the teacher struggled to help them. The teacher asked many yes/no questions to guide the students through the exercise. The students continued to have difficulty demonstrating the knowledge on their own. In another math lesson, the teacher answered all of the problems before giving the students a chance to respond.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>The QSR team observed little science and technology instruction. The new, updated student schedule has double blocks of math and ELA for most grades and science and social studies have been minimized. The pre-kindergarten classrooms worked at science centers and discussed animal habitats and characteristics while reading <i>Are You My Mother?</i> and <i>Good Night Gorilla</i>.</p> <p>The QSR team observed only a few teachers helped students make connections related to the core disciplines or to become critical thinkers. During two ELA classes teachers covered social studies themes. In one classroom a group read a non-fiction text on George Washington Carver and discussed how he influenced history and write a Brief Constructed Response (BCR) . In another room, the group discussed Mahalia Jackson, an American gospel singer. The QSR team did not observe teachers integrating content or making connections relating to the core disciplines in many other classrooms. Few classes also allowed students to think critically. Only half of the teachers asked challenging, open-ended questions, as evidenced in Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques in the domain of Instructional Delivery.</p>
<p>3. HCCS will effectively manage negative student behavior.</p>	<p>Over half of the teachers effectively managed student behavior during classroom observations. These teachers had established standards of conduct and responded to misbehavior consistently, appropriately, and effectively. Many teachers used “Husky Bucks” to motivate good behavior, consistently awarding them throughout the lessons. In the</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>other classrooms, teachers used Husky Bucks as a punitive measure, taking Bucks away for misbehavior. At other times, teachers forgot to consistently reward students using Husky Bucks throughout the class, resulting in them hurrying to figure out which group or individuals should be rewarded at the end of the class period with no evidence. Behavior management strategies in some rooms were ineffective and instructional time was lost due to off-task behavior. In two pre-kindergarten classrooms, children were hitting other students or fighting over toys without any teacher intervention.</p> <p>Every classroom had consequences posted on the wall, stating that students would receive increasing consequences (warnings, call home, etc.) for their negative actions. The QSR team did not observe any references to these consequences.</p>
<p>4. Hope Community teachers will have continuing opportunities to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to present challenging subject matter and to foster student mastery of the required curriculum.</p>	<p>The QSR team neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to continuing opportunities for teachers.</p>
<p>5. Quality Assessment and Accountability Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Hope Community assessments will reflect the standards that are the most important for students to learn.</li> <li>b. Hope Community assessments will support good instructional practices and enhance every student's opportunity to learn.</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers focused on the Common Core State Standards to teach each class. Most classrooms had up-to-date standards posted on the board. In one classroom, the standard was not current and in another classroom, the board was blank where the standard was supposed to be posted.</p> <p>The school uses the Achievement Network (ANet) for benchmark</p>



Mission and Goals	Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Hope Community will be accountable for providing student and parent assessment results and feedback on each student's educational achievement.</li> <li>d. Hope Community teachers will implement data-driven decision-making and use assessment data to diagnose student progress and improve classroom practices.</li> <li>e. Hope Community students will master the District of Columbia Standards for Teaching and Learning.</li> </ul>	<p>testing. A few classes had either 1<sup>st</sup> quarter or 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter results posted with students' results. ANet testing is based on the Common Core State Standards. According to the data wall one class showed impressive math gains by the second test. The QSR team did not observe evidence that the school provides student and parent assessment results on each students' educational achievement.</p> <p>During the pre-visit meeting, school leadership stated the teachers' professional development has focused on small group instruction to implement data-driven decision-making. They stated that the QSR team should observe students rotating in small groups for both ELA and math. However, the only small groups observed were during the newly designed intervention blocks. One teacher described that the intervention blocks (for both math and ELA) were grouped by student ability. A teacher, staff member, or parent volunteer worked with each small group to assist them with skills to succeed in both subjects. Most other classes used whole class instruction. The review team did not observe the rotation charts described in the pre-visit meeting.</p>
<p>6. HCCS will involve parents and the community as active partners in support of student education.</p>	<p>The QSR team observed evidence that the school is meeting this goal. Parents were welcomed in the school. During drop-off and pick-up, parents were in the hallways and often stopped by teachers who mentioned how their child performed in their class. Multiple classrooms had parent volunteers. Additionally, at least one parent volunteers daily during ELA intervention hour to work with a small group of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students "Parent News" bulletin boards were present in some classrooms and in the hallways. These boards contained the</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>monthly PTO dates and other information for parents.</p> <p>The parent resource room had books and other resources available to parents. A school staff member oversaw this room.</p>
<p>7. Parents will indicate satisfaction with the school's program.</p>	<p>The QSR team neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this goal.</p>
<p>8. HCCS students will regularly attend school.</p>	<p>The school appears to be meeting this goal. Most classrooms appeared to be full with very few empty chairs. QSR members heard a few teachers discuss their “Perfect Attendance” goal with the class and a few classrooms had “Perfect Attendance” calendars posted inside or just outside the room.</p> <p>The only day observed with some students absent was a day with a two-hour delay after two cancelled days of school due to snow.</p>
<p>Board Governance</p>	<p>A PCSB staff member was unable to attend the January 21, 2014 board meeting as the meeting was cancelled due to inclement weather. A review of the last board meeting minutes from the November 5, 2013 meeting shows a quorum was present. Principals from both Hope Community PCS campuses reported ANet test scores and the collaboration between campuses to the board. TenSquare, an independent consulting group, has also evaluated both campuses and will present a report at the next board meeting. The board also</p>

<b>Mission and Goals</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
	received updates on finances and the playgrounds.

## CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENTS<sup>1</sup>

This rubric summarizes the school’s performance on the Classroom Environments elements of the rubric during the unannounced visits. PCSB considers any rating below "proficient" to be under the standard of quality expected of DC charter schools. On average, 61% of classrooms received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Classroom Environment domain.

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
		Rating	Percentage
<b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>	<p>The QSR team rated 67% of observations as proficient or exemplary in this element. These teachers displayed consistent patterns of warmth and caring exhibited in smiles and verbal comments such as, “Good job!” and “I am proud of you!” Students were respectful to their teacher and to each other and helped each other, especially in the younger grades (e.g., turning on a computer or sounding out a word for a classmate).</p> <p>In one-third of the observations, the quality of interactions between the teachers and students was uneven. At times, students were disrespectful to each other (e.g., “He won’t do that, he’s lazy.”) The teacher was sometimes disrespectful to students, “I know what I am doing, close your mouth.”</p>	Limited	4%
		Satisfactory	29%
		Proficient	63%
		Exemplary	4%
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	<p>Reviewers rated 71% of observations as proficient or exemplary in Establishing a Culture for Learning. Teachers in these classrooms held high expectations for students and continually let them know that with hard work, they can learn anything. Teachers said to their students, “We have to work hard to get smart, we can all do this, it is just putting the time into doing it,” and “ ‘Can’t’ is a bad word, if we work hard, we can all do this.” Teachers reinforced student effort and recognized student achievement.</p>	Limited	4%
		Satisfactory	25%

<sup>1</sup> Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>In approximately 30% of the observations, the teachers' energy was neutral and they did not convey high expectations for all students. For example, one teacher had high expectations for only some students to learn; when introducing the lesson, she only talked and looked at the front row of students, leaving the back two rows to either talk to each other or lay their heads on the desks.</p>	Proficient	63%
		Exemplary	8%
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	<p>Approximately 50% of observations were proficient in Managing Classroom Procedures with none scoring exemplary. In these proficient classrooms teacher management of instructional groups and materials was consistently successful with minimal loss of instructional time. Teachers used countdowns and timers to get students' attention or to signal the end of an activity.</p> <p>In the other half of the observations teachers had established procedures for transitions and distribution of materials but they were not fully operational. Students often ignored the signals to transition or required teachers to repeat directions multiple times, causing a loss of instructional time. In one room, the teacher was late in transitioning students to another class. The students became increasingly disorganized and confused as they were rushed. Students asked "How are we going to do this quicker?" while some ran around the classroom frantic.</p>	Limited	4%
		Satisfactory	46%
		Proficient	50%
		Exemplary	0%
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	<p>Fifty-four percent of observations were proficient in this element with none scoring exemplary. In some classrooms there was a general absence of student misbehavior. Teachers consistently implemented the posted standards of conduct</p>	Limited	8%

Class Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>and awarded Husky Bucks for positive behavior. Many teachers used preventative strategies to avoid classroom disruptions, such as, “I will start when I see the ready position,” or a teacher gently touching the shoulder of a student attempting to misbehave.</p>	Satisfactory	38%
	<p>However, in almost half the classrooms teachers were unable to effectively engage in instruction due to inadequate classroom management. One teacher turned the lights off multiple times to gain the students’ attention. There were instances of students not working with the teacher and misbehaving and without the teacher noticing. In one PK classroom the teacher or aid was not aware of students struggling over a toy animal during center time, which turned into an altercation. In another room, students were allowed to continuously walk around the classroom hitting other students, which the teacher never stopped. Even though most classrooms had a list of consequences posted on the wall (for example: 1<sup>st</sup> warning, 2<sup>nd</sup> warning, loss of specials time, sent to dean, letter sent home, then call home) observers did not hear teachers giving warnings or other consequences in any classroom observed.</p>	Proficient	54%
		Exemplary	0%

## INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY

This rubric summarizes the school’s performance on the Instructional Delivery elements of the rubric during the unannounced visits. PCSB considers any rating below "proficient" to be under the standard of quality expected of DC charter schools. On average, only half of classrooms received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Instructional Delivery domain.

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
<b>Communicating with Students</b>	<p>Approximately 70% of observations were proficient or exemplary in this element. Teachers clearly stated what the students were learning, modeled the learning task when appropriate, and explained the content clearly, repeated directions, and invited student participation and thinking. Many teachers also used rich, age-appropriate vocabulary and then included a definition and example for the students. In one classroom the students jumped in to extend the content of the lesson by helping explain how to complete a long division problem that the teacher pretended not to know how to do. When the teacher finally had the correct answer (after a few corrections), the class clapped and cheered for the teacher, who then took a bow.</p>	Limited	0%
		Satisfactory	29%
	<p>In other classrooms, even though the Common Core State Standard and objectives were posted on the whiteboards, the teacher did not clearly state what the students were learning. In a few classrooms, the whiteboard was not up-to-date or the lesson stated conflicted with the lesson being taught. In one classroom the teacher was discussing “their friend, the letter ‘o’” with the students, but the letter of the week posted was “I.” The teacher corrected the board when the QSR observer looked at it confusedly. In another classroom, two different topics in math were presented, but it was unclear to the students how mixed numbers and improper fractions were connected. The teacher clarified the learning task three times and the students were still asking questions.</p>	Proficient	63%
	Exemplary	8%	

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
<b>Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</b>	<p>The QSR team rated 54% of observations as proficient or exemplary in this element. Teachers in these classrooms used open-ended questions, inviting students to think and respond. Questions had multiple correct answers, which allowed the teacher to facilitate a class discussion. In one classroom students were asked where they have seen integers. The teacher and students came up with a list of uncommon places to view integers, such as when looking at stocks or deep sea diving. During an ELA intervention block, the teacher discussed the main idea and details. The students had to search in the passage for the answer to the open-ended questions, learning that answers to questions on passages could always be found by within the text and that re-reading can often help one find the answers.</p> <p>In the other half of the observations teachers asked many yes/no questions or questions with a single answer. One teacher answered her own questions without students having the opportunity to respond. In a few classrooms the students let the teacher know they had answered these questions previously. Some teachers asked questions that were focused on student behavior (“Are we talking again?” and “Excuse me, why are you talking?”) or on the procedure (“What do you do first?” “What comes second?”). The questions did not extend the learning.</p>	Limited	0%
		Satisfactory	46%
		Proficient	46%
		Exemplary	8%
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	<p>Student engagement was inconsistent across all grades. Only 46% of the observations were proficient or exemplary in this element. In these classrooms pacing was effective for student engagement and activities kept students interested and engaged. Students working on their math workbooks were focused and intent on their work. Students worked on warm-up exercises, excitedly writing down their responses. In some classes student engagement was high at all times. An observer overheard one teacher asking her students to grab a book and line up to go to the bathroom. She said reading in line was the perfect way to pass time. In the two exemplary</p>	Limited	0%
		Satisfactory	54%



Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>classrooms, games and diverse center activities kept the students 100% engaged in the learning activities.</p> <p>In other classrooms student engagement with the content was largely passive. Students who were not directly working with the teacher were either off-task talking with a neighbor or had their head down on the desk. Many students finished classwork before their peers. When this happened teachers did not find extension activities prepared for them, but had them wait with nothing to do. One teacher told the students to “sit tight and relax.” This slow pace and lack of engaging materials left many students waiting for the teacher.</p>	Proficient	38%
		Exemplary	8%
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	<p>Only 42% of observations were proficient in Using Assessment in Instruction with none scoring exemplary. In these classrooms, teachers posed specific questions to elicit student understanding. In one classroom, the teacher had students write what they knew about a topic on sticky notes prior to introducing the topic. Around the room were posters with sticky notes under “K” for I already knew this” and “L” for I learned this today.” A few teachers cited exit tasks for students to answer. For example, students had to answer three questions on the passage before the end of the period. Some students graded each other’s work, They knew the expectations for the assignment and how it was to be evaluated.</p> <p>However, in over half of the observations student feedback was general or the teacher used global indicators of understanding, such as “Do you have any questions?” and “Is that clear?” In one classroom students were confused about how their work would be evaluated and the teacher did not give an example of the expectations. Students asked multiple questions including,</p>	Limited	4%
		Satisfactory	54%
		Proficient	42%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>“Do I need to write this down?” In another classroom when students were clearly confused on how to answer the problems, the teacher did not reteach. In two classrooms, feedback to the students centered on behavior management (e.g. “Sit in a ready position when you are finished.”) The teachers did not assess the quality of the students’ work.</p>	Exemplary	0%

**APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC**

<b>Class Environment</b>	<b>Limited</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<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: INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY OBSERVATION RUBRIC**

<b>Instructional Delivery</b>	<b>Limited</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<b>Communicating with Students</b>	Teacher’s oral and written communication contains errors or is unclear or inappropriate to students. Teacher’s purpose in a lesson or unit is unclear to students. Teacher’s explanation of the content is unclear or confusing or uses inappropriate language.	Teacher’s oral and written communication contains no errors, but may not be completely appropriate or may require further explanations to avoid confusion. Teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose, with limited success. Teacher’s explanation of the content is uneven; some is done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow.	Teacher communicates clearly and accurately to students both orally and in writing. Teacher’s purpose for the lesson or unit is clear, including where it is situated within broader learning. Teacher’s explanation of content is appropriate and connects with students’ knowledge and experience.	Teacher’s oral and written communication is clear and expressive, anticipating possible student misconceptions. Makes the purpose of the lesson or unit clear, including where it is situated within broader learning, linking purpose to student interests. Explanation of content is imaginative, and connects with students’ knowledge and experience. Students contribute to explaining concepts to their peers.
<b>Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</b>	Teacher makes poor use of questioning and discussion techniques, with low-level questions, limited student participation, and little true discussion.	Teacher’s use of questioning and discussion techniques is uneven with some high-level question; attempts at true discussion; moderate student participation.	Teacher’s use of questioning and discussion techniques reflects high-level questions, true discussion, and full participation by all students.	Students formulate many of the high-level questions and assume responsibility for the participation of all students in the discussion.
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	Students are not at all intellectually engaged in significant learning, as a result of inappropriate activities or materials, poor representations of content, or lack of lesson structure.	Students are intellectually engaged only partially, resulting from activities or materials or uneven quality, inconsistent representation of content or uneven structure of pacing.	Students are intellectually engaged throughout the lesson, with appropriate activities and materials, instructive representations of content, and suitable structure and pacing of the lesson.	Students are highly engaged throughout the lesson and make material contribution to the representation of content, the activities, and the materials. The structure and pacing of the lesson allow for student reflection and closure.

Instructional Delivery	Limited	Satisfactory	Proficient	Exemplary
<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.