



November 6, 2013

Cynthia Brown, Board Chair
Perry Street Preparatory PCS
1800 Perry Street NE
Washington, DC 20018

Dear Ms. Brown,

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 to petition for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2013-14 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report

A QSR team conducted on-site review visits of Perry Street Preparatory PCS between September 9 and September 20. 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 submitted to PCSB in order to observe the school’s governance as it relates to fulfilling its mission, and charter goals.

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 Perry Street Preparatory PCS. Thank you for your continued cooperation as PCSB makes every effort to ensure that Perry Street Preparatory PCS is in compliance with its charter.

Sincerely,



Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: School Leader

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Perry Street Preparatory PCS is a school serving nearly 1,000 students from pre-kindergarten-3 through 12th grade in Ward 5. The large school building is clean and has an abundance of staff members throughout, including several armed and unarmed security officers. During the pre-visit meeting with the Head of School, he reported that this year, the 15th year of the school's operation, the school was focusing heavily on the following: creating a positive school culture; discipline management; lesson plan design; teacher questioning; student discussion; problem solving; critical thinking; and writing. The observation team noticed a focus on a positive school culture in nearly all of the elementary and middle grades classrooms and some of the high school classrooms. Most classrooms observed had lessons plans posted in the classrooms, some following the I Do, We Do, You Do instructional format. However, there were limited observations of higher-level teacher questioning, student discussion, critical thinking or problem solving in the classrooms. Some of the classrooms were observed utilizing Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports (PBIS) and the Lee Canter approach to assertive discipline.

On average, less than one third of classroom observations school wide and less than 10% of the high school observations received a rating of proficient or advanced for the Instructional Delivery indicator¹. During many of the observations, students did not appear to be intellectually engaged in the lessons and just 12% of the observations scored proficient in using higher-order questioning and effective student discussion techniques.

On average, 58% of classroom observations school wide and 33% of high school observations received a rating of proficient or advanced for the Classroom Environment indicator. There were few behavior issues in the elementary and middle grades that were not easily corrected by the teacher. However, some of the high school classrooms struggled with classroom management and student participation. Most notably, two fights among high school students occurred during the observation window, one of which resulted in two teachers being struck by students.

Since the Board meeting occurred outside of the two-week observation window, PCSB reviewed board meeting minutes from their last meeting which was held in August 2013. According to the minutes, at this meeting the school leadership reviewed the results of the 2013 DC-CAS with the board, focusing on the results by grade level and subgroup. The board also discussed the upcoming charter renewal process and its partnership with Ten Square Consulting to support the school through this process; the status of staff vacancies; student enrollment; recommendations for parent board members; and the status of school finances.

¹ The high school Principal requested that PCSB disaggregate high school classroom observation scores.

CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

Last year, PCSB Board approved Perry Street Prep PCS’ amendment to its charter to adopt the Performance Management Framework (“PMF”) as its goals and academic achievement expectations. The school also chose two additional goals related to growth of their students with disabilities in reading and math and the growth of their English Language Learners on the annual ACCESS exam. The team looked for evidence of effective instruction to support student academic progress and achievement in reading and math, including an emphasis on moving students to advanced levels, securing reading proficiency by 3rd grade and math proficiency by 8th grade; evidence of AP instruction at the appropriate level; evidence of the students becoming “college ready”, particularly in the high school; evidence that students are present in classrooms; and evidence of a culture of learning and support.

Mission	Evidence
<p>Mission: Perry Street Prep PCS is a community of diverse learners that builds relationships with families to empower students to become college-ready and thrive in a global society.</p>	<p>PCSB observed some evidence of implementation of the school’s mission to create a “community of diverse learners” through its inclusion model for students with disabilities. Several classrooms had a general educator and a co-teacher and/or special education. During many classroom observations, it was unclear which teacher was the lead teacher as both teachers taught and supported students equally. However, differentiated instruction that would lead to students be empowered “to become college-ready and thrive in a global society” was generally not observed.</p> <p>The school attempts to accomplish its goal of building “relationships with families to empower students” by having a parent liaison office with information available for parents about healthy nutrition and academic and athletic opportunities in the area. There are also parent information boards posted on the lower level of the schools with general information. The parent liaison reported to a member of the review team that she was going out to buy shoes for a student in need and that the school wanted to increase the number of computers in the parent liaison office due to parent demand. A parent was observed in a 3rd grade classroom, where s/he appeared to be observing the lesson. The parent liaison reported that parents can make appointments to observe classrooms at any time.</p> <p>There were bulletin boards, displays, and college banners in corridors, administrative offices, and classrooms across the early childhood, elementary and high school wings. The classrooms were labeled as colleges and the teachers referred to students as “scholars”. In some classrooms, there were table-groups labeled as colleges. One teacher was overheard telling students that not only</p>

Mission	Evidence
	<p>should they be striving to attend college but to finish college, go to graduate school and do these things for free. An observer overhead two students discussing the colleges that they planned to apply for in the future.</p> <p>Every classroom had technology, which teachers in some classrooms were using. In several classrooms observed, teachers used non-fiction text and made connections to history connections. In the AP US History class observed, students and the teacher discussed current US-Syria relations, perhaps evidence of Perry Street's commitment to preparing students to “thrive” in a global society.</p> <p>The review team questioned the rigor of the AP courses offered at the school. The AP Language and AP Literature classes were taught during the same class period by one teacher – in other words, one teacher was teaching two Advanced Placement (“AP”) classes with widely different curricula during the same period. The teacher managed this by having one group complete a worksheet while s/he led the other group in sentence-writing using the vocabulary word, “recreational”. During the AP US History class a student reported that during the same class period the students studied the difference between servants and slaves, learned about Jamestown, reviewed the Constitution and discussed Syria. The observer was uncertain that all of these topics were aligned to a common objective.</p>

Evidence of Goals

PMF Goal #1: Student Progress – Academic improvement over time

Effective instruction supporting student academic progress and achievement in reading and math

PCSB observed limited evidence of effective instruction throughout the classroom observations. Only 33% of the observed classrooms scored proficient on this indicator, and none scored exemplary, the highest rating. The team observed literacy instruction in early childhood and elementary classrooms with the Wilson Reading program being used for students in need of additional reading support. According to the master schedule, the high school implements the Advancement Via Individual Determination (“AVID”) program, which is a college readiness program that is designed to increase school-wide learning for first generation college-goers. However, other than Cornell note-taking occurring in three classrooms, observers saw no evidence of it being implemented. The teachers supported the development of questions while students were taking their notes. There were several observations of students being exposed to complex text; however, during the observations, teachers were always seen reading this text to students, students were only seen reading short paragraphs independently.

PMF Goal #2: Student Achievement – Meeting or exceeding academic standards

Moving students to advanced levels of proficiency in reading and math

PCSB observed limited evidence of students moving to advanced levels of proficiency in reading and math throughout the classroom observations. In nearly all observations, all students were doing the same task, which was at or below grade-level, according to the Common Core State Standards. Differentiation was observed in one of the elementary grade classrooms, where three groups were reading leveled books. However, all of the groups completed a similar task. There was evidence of exit tickets being used in several observations, but there was no evidence of the teachers using the exit tickets to differentiate or inform instruction. There were a few instances observed of content being taught incorrectly. Assessment of student learning was particularly strong in the Early Childhood grades, but there were limited examples of quality assessment beyond these grades. Outside of the Early Childhood grades, the students did not appear to be intellectually engaged.

PMF Goal #3: Gateway – Outcomes in key subjects that predict future educational success

Promotion of reading proficiency by third grade and math proficiency by eighth grade

PCSB observed some evidence of students mastering reading proficiency by third grade and math proficiency by eighth grade. In the early childhood and elementary grades, the teachers followed a schedule that required 90 minutes for literacy instruction and 60 minutes for math each day. There were lesson plans and word walls in most classrooms and a heavy focus on literacy/reading development in early elementary. The middle grades math teachers were observed teaching appropriate grade level content according to Common Core State Standards. The teachers also used appropriate mathematical vocabulary throughout the lesson and insisted that their students do the same.

HS: Effective instruction for AP/IB programs

PCSB observed limited evidence of this goal throughout the classroom observations. Please refer to the section above on the school's implementation of its mission for additional information on the observations in the AP classes.

HS: Equipping students to be college-ready

PCSB observed limited evidence of this goal throughout the classroom observations. Please refer to the section above on the school's implementation of its mission.

PMF Goal #4: Leading Indicators – Predictors of future student progress and achievement

Culture of learning and support in the classrooms

PCSB observed some evidence of supportive classroom environments, particularly in the elementary and middle grades. Most of the elementary and middle grades classrooms were positive, student-centered cultures of learning. Co-teachers were evident in classrooms where they are assigned, performing a variety of roles (one-on-one instruction, small group instruction and team teaching). The students were mostly engaged in the learning, yet not all students were cognitively engaged. Most of the classrooms were physically designed to support the culture of learning. One of the elective classes observed did not appear to have had a lesson structure that had students engaged in learning for the entire class period. Support was provided to students who are not on the general level of instruction taking place in the classroom. In some of the classrooms observed, there were curriculum consultants supporting teachers with the implementation of the new curriculum. In another classroom, one of the administrators modeled a lesson with a teacher to model instructional and classroom management strategies.

Daily attendance of students in each classroom

The Head of School reported that the average in-seat attendance rate school wide was 90% during the two-week observation window. Most classrooms appeared to be full school wide. Few students were observed arriving late to classes and little to no instructional time was lost in the upper grades when students transitioned between classes.

Goal #5: All students with disabilities will make at least 5% growth in the areas of reading and math on the district approved statewide assessment annually.

The QSR team neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this goal.

Goal #6: Eighty percent of non-proficient English Language Learners will make improvements within their English language proficiency level as demonstrated on the annual ACCESS exam, which measures students' speaking, writing, reading, and listening comprehension skills.

The QSR team neither looked for nor observed any evidence related to this goal.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENTS²

This rubric summarizes the school's performance on the Classroom Environments elements of the rubric during the unannounced visits. Per the request of the school, the high school rating for each indicator is also shown below. The label definitions for classroom observations of "limited", "satisfactory", "proficient" and "exemplary" are those from the Danielson framework. PCSB considers any rating below "proficient" to be under the standard of quality expected of DC charter schools. On average, 58% of classroom observations received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Classroom Environment domain.

Class Environment	Evidence Observed		School wide Rating	High School Rating
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	In 78% of the elementary and middle school classrooms, there was a strong environment of respect and mutual warmth between the teachers and the students. The team observed friendly, polite interactions between the teachers and the students, such as the teachers referring to the students as “ma’am, sir, or scholars”. Posted norms in some of the classrooms included respecting others. Most teachers were heard giving positive feedback to students.	Limited	12%	33%
	In one classroom, the only time that the lead teacher spoke to students with disabilities was to reprimand them for being out of their seats. These students were physically isolated from the rest of the class.	Satisfactory	10%	8%
	The majority of the high school classrooms reflected environments of respect and rapport. However, in some high school classrooms, the students did not acknowledge that the teacher was talking to them, they talked while the teacher was talking or engaged in other off-task behaviors (talking to each other, texting, etc.). Students’ interactions in some of the high school classrooms were not kind, respectful or polite. In fact, some of these behaviors resulted in two fights within high school classrooms. The teachers often tried to correct instances of disrespect, but these attempts were not always successful and at times ignored by the students.	Proficient	76%	58%
		Exemplary	2%	0%

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

Class Environment	Evidence Observed		School wide Rating	High School Rating
Establishing a Culture for Learning	<p>Less than half of the observations scored proficient, and none scored exemplary, in establishing a culture of learning.</p> <p>Teachers were heard referring to their students as “scholars” and as “being intelligent or being smart”. In the early childhood and lower elementary classrooms, the teachers maintained high expectations for their students and acknowledged student effort and persistence. In these classrooms, students participated at high levels and teachers displayed student work throughout the classrooms and the hallways. In several of the middle and high school classrooms, the students complied with the teacher’s expectations for learning. In a few classrooms observed, some of the class time was devoted to socializing. In some of the high school classrooms, students were committed to learning and stayed on task throughout the lesson. However, in other high school classrooms, students acted confused about the teachers' expectations of their assignments. In three high school classrooms observed, teachers seemed more concerned with managing the class than establishing a culture for learning. Throughout most of the school, worksheets were the main mode of instruction in most of the classrooms, particularly in the high school.</p> <p>1 observation given n/a score</p>	Limited	14%	25%
		Satisfactory	38%	50%
		Proficient	45%	17%
		Exemplary	0%	0%
Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>In the early childhood classrooms, instructional time was maximized due to effective classroom procedures and routines. The teachers used signals such as, “catch a bubble” or “1, 2, 3, all eyes on me” to quickly get students’ attention. Less than half the teachers of elementary and middle grades used effective classroom procedures and routine while the other half struggled with basic classroom management and organization. Most of the middle and high school classes had similar blackboard configurations: essential questions, standard, homework, do now and an agenda. Just 16% of the high school classes had clear procedures for group work, entering the classroom and independent activities. In most of the high school classrooms observed, students not working with the</p>	Limited	10%	25%
		Satisfactory	38%	58%

Class Environment	Evidence Observed		School wide Rating	High School Rating
	<p>teacher were not productively engaged in the class. Students were discussing off topic things with other students resulting in lost of instructional time, and, in two incidences, fights. While some classes have procedures established for entering the classroom, distributing work, assigned seats - the implementation of these routines was at times inconsistent.</p>	Proficient	38%	8%
		Exemplary	7%	8%
Managing Student Behavior	<p>In most of the elementary and middle school classrooms, student behavior was generally appropriate. The teachers positively reinforced appropriate behavior and closely monitored students to ensure they were on task. Overall, standards of conduct have been established and are effective in these grades. Many teachers frequently walked around the room to redirect individual students when needed. One teacher was observed using the Lee Canter method of acknowledging good behavior. Another teacher made addressing a behavioral issue by acting as if she needed the students help for the lesson and it solved the issue immediately. Three teachers were observed saying, "SLANT" which means S - Sit up straight; L - Lean forward writing position); A - Activate your thinking; N - Note important points; T - Track the talker. Several teachers were observed using PBIS-type language and assigning prizes and points to students who demonstrated good behavior. In some classrooms, systems for tracking student behavior were not observed at all. In these same classrooms, it appeared that the teacher was unaware of student misbehavior or they were addressed inconsistently and with limited success.</p>	Limited	7%	17%
		Satisfactory	29%	42%
		Proficient	50%	42%

Class Environment	Evidence Observed		School wide Rating	High School Rating
	<p>In 42% of the high school classrooms, the student behavior was appropriate. Students in the high school grades often greeted the observers in the hallways and in the classrooms. However, in several of the high school classrooms students were frequently off-task and had to be redirected by their teachers. In many of the high school classes, students engaged in a variety of misbehaviors (texting, talking to each other, not doing work, teasing others), only some of which was addressed, and which rarely was effective. One student who was caught texting was asked for her phone, but after pleading for it not to be taken, was allowed to keep it. Two students in another classroom began fighting though there was an adult standing between them when they were arguing. Attempts to redirect students' behavior were met with inconsistent success.</p>	Exemplary	14%	0%

INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY

This rubric summarizes the school's performance on the Instructional Delivery elements of the rubric during the unannounced visits. Per the request of the school, the high school rating for each indicator is also shown below. The label definitions for classroom observations of "limited", "satisfactory", "proficient" and "exemplary" are those from the Danielson framework. PCSB considers any rating below "proficient" to be under the standard of quality expected of DC charter schools. Less than one third of classroom observations received a rating of proficient or exemplary for the Instructional Delivery domain.

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed		School Wide Rating	High School Rating
Communicating with Students	<p>Less than half of the classrooms, and just 8% of the high school classrooms, scored proficient or exemplary in communicating with students.</p> <p>In most classrooms, the objective, aim and/or essential question for the lesson was posted on the whiteboard. In some of the classes, the teachers provided clear instructions and expectations about what students should be doing. In most classes, the special education teacher was a part of this process, often interacting with individual students to ensure understanding. Most classes used age-appropriate vocabulary with students and some of the middle school math classes observed also used rich academic language, aligned to the lesson. Some of the language used by teachers was confusing and students were unclear of the purpose of the lesson beyond the activity. In some cases, the teacher's explanation consisted solely of a monologue or directions written on the board, and students had to ask multiple times what was expected of them. There were also some content errors observed throughout the observation window. One of them involved incorrectly teaching students how to use a writing tool and another involved the incorrect teaching of a math concept.</p> <p>A reviewer observed a high school English teacher using incorrect verb tense while another had misspelled words posted in the classroom. In another high school classroom, the teacher's initial directions were unclear so s/he had to continuously clarify and conversations the teacher had with groups claiming to be complete suggested that none of the groups had met her expectations.</p>	Limited	7%	8%
		Satisfactory	48%	83%
		Proficient	43%	8%
		Exemplary	2%	0%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed		School Wide Rating	High School Rating
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	<p>Only 12% of all classrooms scored proficient on using questioning and discussion techniques, with none scoring exemplary.</p> <p>There were a few observations school-wide where teachers used innovative questioning, such as asking students to teach the teacher how to solve a math problem. Some teachers engaged their students in a discussion and some teachers called on a variety of students, even if they did not volunteer to answer. However, in nearly all of the classes observed, most of the questions asked by teachers lead students along a single path of inquiry. In several middle and high school classes, only a few students dominated the discussions. Most observers commented that the questions asked by teachers were of a low-cognitive level and rarely required open-ended responses from the students. When discussions were present, they were teacher driven and at times students were reluctant to respond to one another. Some middle and high school classrooms incorporated student discussion, but students seemed to be still getting used to working together. One of the high school classrooms was scheduled to have a Socratic Seminar, but students were only observed completing a worksheet on the traits of characters in a novel they had recently read.</p> <p>Overall, the most common form of instructional delivery was worksheets.</p> <p>2 observations given an n/a score</p>	Limited	17%	25%
		Satisfactory	67%	50%
		Proficient	12%	8%
		Exemplary	0%	0%
Engaging Students in Learning	<p>Just one-third of the classrooms scored proficient in engaging student learning, with none scoring exemplary and over 40% scoring in the lowest level.</p> <p>In the early childhood classrooms, teachers let students choose the activities they participated in, leading to a high level of student interest. However, differentiation was rarely seen in any of the classrooms and many teachers relied on worksheets as the primary method of instruction. Throughout the school, most students worked on the same assignment as their peers. In most of the classes, the majority of students worked</p>	Limited	42%	42%
		Satisfactory	45%	42%

Instructional Delivery	Evidence Observed		School Wide Rating	High School Rating
	<p>on the tasks at hand and many of the teachers adjusted activity times in order to allow students time to finish. During many of the observations, students did not appear to be intellectually engaged in the lessons. School wide, some of the activities and tasks aligned with the stated objectives, essential questions and exit ticket assessments. It was unclear if the instructional groupings observed were strategically created to align with the learning needs of the students. The materials used for the vast majority of lessons included worksheets and textbooks with little to no supplemental materials. In three of the high school classrooms observed, few students appeared intellectually engaged in the lessons. In several classrooms, the “Do Now,” which is meant to be an opening assignment that should take 5 minutes or less, took more than 30 minutes to complete and review.</p> <p>1 observation given an n/a score</p>	Proficient	33%	8%
		Exemplary	0%	0%
Using Assessment in Instruction	<p>Just over one-quarter of the classrooms scored proficient, and none scored exemplary, in using assessment in instruction.</p> <p>In the early childhood grades, teachers closely monitored student understanding through observation and questions and immediately gave feedback to students. In the elementary grades, most feedback observed was globally provided to the class, (i.e., Does everyone understand? Do you all agree?) In one class, despite a well-planned activity, the teacher did not make students elaborate on responses in an activity. In another class, only one student answered the teacher’s questions, and when students gave responses such as, “I wasn’t paying attention”, the teacher thanked them for their honesty and moved on. Many classroom boards indicated that an exit ticket would be given at the end of the lesson. One teacher specifically addressed a student who struggled at the end of the lesson with re-teaching. Evidence of feedback from student work on the walls was uniform and did not indicate specific areas for improvement; it merely consisted of number of problems answered correctly.</p> <p>2 observations given an n/a score</p>	Limited	21%	33%
		Satisfactory	46%	42%
		Proficient	28%	8%
		Exemplary	0%	0%

APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

Class Environment	Limited	Satisfactory	Proficient	Exemplary
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: INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY OBSERVATION RUBRIC

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

Instructional Delivery	Limited	Satisfactory	Proficient	Exemplary
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.