DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

December 20, 2018

Calvin Snowden, Board Chair
IDEA Public Charter School
1027 45th Street NE
Washington, DC 20019

Dear Mr. Snowden,

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 Integrated Design Electronics Academy Public Charter School (IDEA PCS) between October 22 and November 2, 2018. Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report focuses primarily on the following areas: classroom environment and instruction.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at IDEA Public Charter School.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Justin Rydstrom, Executive Director

<h1 align="center">Qualitative Site Review Report</h1>

Date: December 20, 2018

Campus Information
Campus Name: Integrated Design Electronics Academy Public Charter School (IDEA PCS)
Ward: 7
Grade levels: Ninth through twelfth

Qualitative Site Review Information
Reason for Visit: School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2018-19 school year
Two-week Window: October 22 – November 2, 2018
QSR Team Members: Three DC PCSB staff members and two consultants including one special education specialist
Number of Observations: 16 including one special education (SPED) pull-out not included in scoring
Total Enrollment: 305
Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 91
English Language Learners Enrollment: n<10
In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:
Visit 1: October 22, 2018 – 89.8%
Visit 2: October 30, 2018 – 86.3%
Visit 3: November 1, 2018 – 82.4%
Visit 4: November 2, 2018 – 81.1%

Summary
IDEA PCS's mission is "to prepare students with the academic, social, leadership and occupational skills for post-secondary opportunities and to be responsible citizens who contribute to the community."

The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team observed inconsistent practices across academics and social learning opportunities. Many teachers accepted student disengagement without encouraging or insisting on participation. The QSR team also noted that instruction, particularly in math classrooms, was procedural and teacher-led with few opportunities for students to engage with the teacher or their peers.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine the school's classroom environment and instruction (see Appendix I and II). The QSR team scored 48% of observations as

distinguished or proficient in the <u>Classroom Environment</u> domain. This is significantly lower than the 2014 score of 85% in this domain during IDEA PCS' last QSR in 2014[1]. In the *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport* component, 60% of the observations were rated as proficient or distinguished. This was the highest score for the school in either domain. Adults in the hallways encouraged students to transition quickly, and several teachers made individual connections with students. *Establishing a Culture for Learning* and *Managing Classroom Procedures* were the lowest scoring components in this domain. Many teachers and students indicated through their actions and words that they were more interested in task completion rather than quality. Additionally, many classrooms had ineffective routines and procedures resulting in loss of instructional time. Off-task cell phone usage was prevalent among students.

The QSR team scored 34% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the <u>Instruction</u> domain. *Engaging Students in Learning* was the lowest scoring component in either domain with only 33% of observations rated as proficient. Most instruction was procedural with little to no time for students to engage with intellectually challenging content. Pacing was slow in several observations, leaving students with significant down time. In many observations only some students engaged with the lesson while others engaged in off-task behaviors. While many observations were rated as basic, only one observation was rated as unsatisfactory in *Communicating with Students*. This indicates that at some point, all but one teacher attempted to explain the purpose of the lesson and offer clear directions. In all other components there were at least two observations rated as unsatisfactory.

<u>In-School Suspension (ISS)</u>
Observers saw ten students and one adult in the designated ISS room. Two students worked with the adult or on their own on college applications and were not in the room for suspension purposes. The other eight students talked, played on their phones, or sat idly with nothing to do. Students could be placed in ISS during "all sweep" (when students are in the hallways instead of in their classrooms), if a teacher sends them out of the classroom, or from a referral.

<u>Governance</u>
Calvin Snowden chairs IDEA PCS's Board of Trustees. The school's bylaws require at least one annual meeting, which the school has been compliant with for the past five years. IDEA PCS has also complied with the School Reform Act[2], which requires a majority of DC residents and two parents, for the past five years.

---

[1]https://www.dcpcsb.org/qualitative-site-review/idea-qsr

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

<u>Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities</u>
Prior to the two-week window, IDEA PCS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program, which includes co-teaching, pull-outs, a self-contained classroom, and computer-based intervention programs. Overall, the school did not implement its stated strategies and accommodations with fidelity. During all observations of the scheduled pull-out block, teachers instructed students to go on IXL[3]. However, many students used this time to visit non-academic websites with no redirection from teachers. In one pull-out block students spent the period talking to each other and playing on their phones. Observers saw only one instance of co-teaching and one dedicated aide successfully help a student access the learning task through repetition and prompts. Across all SPED settings, there was a lack of questioning and many missed opportunities for student discussion.

- To demonstrate that co-planning occurred, the school explained that observers would see the teachers working together, presenting the same content differently to meet the needs of and address various learning styles. SPED observers did not see teachers working together to present differentiated materials. In the self-contained classroom, the second teacher alternated to read some passages but there was no differentiation or modifications. All students sat through a read aloud; there was no questioning. In a co-taught general education observation, a lead teacher and two additional teachers were in the classroom, but their roles were unclear and did not match the co-teaching model that IDEA PCS stated observers would see. The two additional teachers circulated the classroom and responded to students' questions and redirected student behavior. These teachers reiterated instructions, but did not lead small group instruction, offer alternative explanations, or deliver academic accommodations, as described in the school's questionnaire.

- To support the learning of SWD, the school reported that it offers resources such as dedicated aides to address academic and behavioral concerns. The SPED observer saw one dedicated aide during the observation window, and that aide effectively included and supported a student in a general education classroom by prompting the student to complete the class worksheet (an evaluation form for classroom presentations) and repeating the directions: "Write your name and write the title of the presentation." The aide also encouraged the student to ask his/her peers a question during their classroom presentation. The school also reported that SWD use the computer programs IXL and Achieve 3000 and are placed in intervention groups monitored by the special education teachers. Members of the QSR team observed students using IXL in multiple pull-out

---

[3] IXL.com: IXL is a subscription-based online learning platform.

sessions; however, the use of these online programs was ineffective in engaging students in learning. In one pull-out observation, all screens were faced away from the teacher and four of the six students in the room toggled between IXL and other non-academic websites such as Chick-fil-A and Forever 21. The teacher seemed unaware that students were not on the correct website.

- In another pull-out session, the teacher worked individually with a student to solve a simple division problem on the board, while two other students in the small group were completely disengaged as they sat near the wall to charge their cell phones, watch a soccer game on YouTube, and share hair products. In that same observation, many students were cursing, another student ate chips while staring into space, students got into a small fight about paper, and they talked for the remainder of the class. The teacher did nothing to address or redirect these behaviors.

- The school indicated that reviewers would observe various co-teaching models such as parallel teaching, station teaching, team teaching, and alternative teaching. Observers saw only one instance of co-teaching in the self-contained classroom in which two teachers read a novel aloud to the class. DC PCSB did not observe Parallel Teaching, Station Teaching, or Alternative Teaching.

- To provide accommodations according to the IEPs of SWD, the school stated that reviewers would observe frequent breaks, repetition, and clarification of directions, some reading of questions, use of calculators, and preferential seating. These accommodations were inconsistently implemented. The SPED observer saw a grade-level novel read aloud by teachers and by an audio recording as students followed along with their own copies of the text, but no other accommodations were observed in this classroom. In one of the pull-out sessions, an observer saw students using calculators to compute algebraic equations. Directions were repeated and clarified in two out of the four SPED pull-outs, but no accommodations were observed in the other two SPED pull-outs. In multiple classrooms, students seemed to have choice about where to sit; however, this led to students facing their computer screens away from the teacher and spending time on non-academic websites.

- To provide modifications according to the IEPs of SWD, the school wrote that reviewers may observe some students working on the same assignment, but the students may be assigned different questions and they may be given different assignments altogether. In one general education classroom, students presented to the class and each student was responsible for a different aspect of the presentation. This was an effective example of modifying tasks to include differentiation.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[4]

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 48% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Classroom Environment domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	The QSR team scored 60% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component, the highest scoring component for the school. In just over half of the observations, interactions among students and teachers were generally polite and respectful. In the distinguished observation, the teacher encouraged students to be both competitive and supportive, leveraging groups to encourage teamwork and collaboration. Peers enthusiastically debated with one another, created presentations in small groups, and participated in group discussions.	Distinguished	7%
		Proficient	53%
	The QSR team scored 20% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers did not consistently or effectively address instances of disrespect. In several observations students engaged in non-academic tasks or off-topic conversations, often talking over the teacher. In one observation students taunted one another and threw papers when the teacher turned his/her back.	Basic	20%

---

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

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 20% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations students were disrespectful towards one another with little to no redirection from the teacher. In one observation students talked over the audio recording of the book while they were supposed to be listening and the teacher did not address disrespectful behavior. In another observation two students had their heads down on their desks the entire time, and the teacher did not address either of them.	Unsatisfactory	20%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team scored 53% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In many observations teachers encouraged students to put forth their best effort, using positive words and motivational messages such as, "You got this – use your brain!" In one observation students were required to re-do each question they missed on the previous day's quiz, demonstrating a commitment to ensure mastery of the content. In a few other observations, teachers communicated a genuine passion for the content and a belief that with hard work, students would develop a strong understanding.	Distinguished	0%
	For example, one teacher explained the importance of "close reading" and annotating a passage for understanding. This teacher extended the time allotted so that all students had time to persist through the assignment. In one observation students engaged with the tasks inconsistently, but the teacher persisted with them. The teacher continuously returned to each student to ask questions and ensure all students remained engaged.	Proficient	53%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 27% of the observations as basic in this component. The focus in these observations was about getting the work done, rather than on hard work and deep understanding. Many students sat passively during these observations and the teachers did not urge students to continue trying. In one observation the teacher stated that most of the class was "not skilled" enough to try mathematical strategies outside of the designated procedure to work with algebraic equations. In another observation the teacher attempted to encourage students to take academic risks, but was unsuccessful. Most students sat quietly without engaging in the small group conversation.	Basic	27%
	The QSR team scored 20% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. There was little to no investment from teachers or students in these observations. For example, one teacher noted, "You keep getting Fs because you don't do anything" to the majority of the class but did nothing further to reinvest or re-engage students. In another observation the teacher stated that students should be working on IXL, but about two -thirds of the class switched between IXL and online shopping websites when the teacher was not looking at their screens. In a few observations the teacher conveyed mixed expectations for students, reserving high expectations for some and conveying to others that the content was too challenging for them. For example, one teacher said to a student in front of the class, "You didn't do that bad for you."	Unsatisfactory	20%
Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team scored 40% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations, there was little to no time lost on procedures or routines. The majority of teachers efficiently passed out materials and facilitated classroom transitions. Many teachers used visual timers. In several classrooms materials were available at the tables for	Distinguished	7%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	students to use. Students transitioned promptly and often knew what to do if they were absent the prior day to get caught up. Several teachers had designated and clearly labeled folders from which student could retrieve missed assignments.	Proficient	33%
	The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as basic in this component. Some instructional time was lost in these observations because either teachers did not have all the materials ready or students did not have what they needed. For example, in one observation, the teacher spent a significant amount of time programming tardy students' calculators and reprinting worksheet pages for students who had lost them. In other observations small groups of students were only partially engaged when not working directly with the teacher. In several observations, teachers asked students to transition to small groups, but pockets of students did not respond, resulting in a loss of instructional time. The QSR team also noted that cell phone use became a significant distracter during instructional time. Throughout the school, signs were posted to indicate that cell phones are not permitted. Tardiness also resulted in a loss of instructional time. In basic observations, there were no procedures for students who came in late to engage or get the materials they needed in a timely manner.	Basic	47%
	The QSR team scored 13% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Teachers in these observations did not have routines or procedures established, or they were implemented ineffectively. In a few observations the teachers left the room for minutes at a time to retrieve needed materials, leaving students without a clear direction of what to do next. In one observation a student wandered around the classroom and spent several minutes trying to find the bathroom pass.	Unsatisfactory	13%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 40% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Student behavior in these observations was generally appropriate. Several teachers in the proficient observations used positive behavior narration or a point system as a technique to monitor and respond to students. Other teachers effectively redirected misbehaviors. In the distinguished observations, students corrected one another to prompt more encouraging language in groups. In one distinguished observation the teacher consistently pre-empted off-task behaviors with clear expectations such as "Let me get voices off unless all of the problems are done."	Distinguished	13%
		Proficient	27%
	The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers in these observations either inconsistently responded to student misbehavior or had inconsistent results when they did respond. In many observations teachers did not address misbehaviors with all students. In some situations the teachers asked a few students to take off a jacket or put their phone away, but then ignored the same behavior from other students. In other observations teachers attempted redirection, but students often ignored the request or responded immediately and then went back to the same infraction a moment later. A few teachers threatened consequences, such as taking away points, but then did not follow through when misbehaviors occurred.	Basic	47%
	The QSR team scored 13% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Students in these observations challenged teachers and remained disruptive even if the teacher attempted to intervene. The classroom environment in these observations was chaotic as students threw papers across the room and engaged in off-task behaviors. In one observation, random students walked into the room several times looking for friends. The teacher attempted to respond but was ineffective at getting this behavior to stop.	Unsatisfactory	13%

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. Overall, the QSR team scored 34% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Instruction domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Communicating with Students	The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. Some teachers clearly communicated the purpose of the lesson and directions to students. A few teachers also modeled the learning tasks or provided resources to students to support their learning. In one observation the teacher modeled the process for the task and then scaffolded student work by giving some examples. In a math observation the teacher made effective use of manipulatives to demonstrate both strategies and applications of geometric transformations. In one observation the teacher encouraged students to make connections between the content and their own lives. The same teacher also insisted on precise vocabulary usage and asked students to identify synonyms to the key word.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	29%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated 64% of the observations as basic in this component. The majority of instruction relied on procedural explanations of the content with little emphasis on strategies students could use. In several observations students remained confused after the initial explanation. Several students then asked questions, but many did not receive answers that allowed them to proceed. In one observation the teacher repeated a confusing word with no further explanation. In another observation a student asked how to solve a problem to which the teacher responded with frustration, telling the student to simply follow the rule instead of addressing the student's misunderstanding.	Basic	64%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	7%
Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques	The QSR team scored 36% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations teachers asked thought-provoking and open-ended questions. In one observation the teacher challenged students to justify mathematical logic with underlying properties, encouraging students to exchange and evaluate different ideas. In another observation, the teacher invited students to discuss guiding questions in small groups. In these observations students were able to build on each other's ideas.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	36%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored half of the observations as basic in this component. In several observations, students were given the opportunity to interact with each other, but these interactions were often limited. For example, in one observation students simply told each other the answers. In other observations not all students were engaged in the discussion and were allowed to sit idly or engage in off-task behaviors. In another observation the teacher rapidly led students through a series of closed questions.	Basic	50%
	The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations, teachers posed few to no questions. Students did not ask any questions of their own either. Students were not invited to interact with each other about the content. In some observations only one or two students participated in answering the teacher's questions.	Unsatisfactory	14%
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team scored 33% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations teachers appropriately paced lessons to engage most students. One teacher adjusted the call-and-response part of the lesson when they saw that not all students were participating. The same teacher also encouraged students to continue working until they arrived to answer a question, and designed learning tasks to include multiple answers that allowed students to debate best approaches. In another observation students worked on a variety of tasks, and the teacher managed them well. A few teachers used timers to support pacing.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	33%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as basic in this component. In several observations the pacing was inappropriate for all students. Students who finished early did not have a clear follow-up, which left wasted instructional time and other students could not finish in the allotted time. In two observations students shared presentations, but their classmates had no task or encouragement to provide, leaving them to sit passively or engage in off-task behaviors. In other observations the activities required minimal thinking. For example, in one observation, students highlighted sentences but were not required to synthesize or do any writing themselves.	Basic	47%
	The QSR team scored 20% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. These lessons had no clearly defined structure and left very few students engaged intellectually. In one observation the teacher lectured for the majority of the observation and in another observation, the teachers read aloud a text with no opportunities for students to interact with the content. Other tasks required rote work only, such as copying guided notes or answering multiple choice questions exclusively.	Unsatisfactory	20%
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team rated 40% of the observations as basic and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations, teachers provided opportunities for students to either self-assess or assess their peers. In one observation students did an error analysis of their assessment from the day before. The teacher provided feedback and students redid their work. Another teacher provided a rubric, and asked students to self-assess and improve their work. In another observation, the teacher circulated during work time to provide support and feedback. When one student expressed concern that s/he was wrong, the teacher responded by saying, "You correctly found the evidence I wanted you to find."	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	40%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 40% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers either had limited strategies for monitoring student learning or monitored for completion rather than correct answers or student understanding. In a few observations teachers monitored or engaged only with students who asked questions. In several observations the teacher did not adjust the lesson when students showed they did not understand. In one example, the teacher asked rapid-fire questions and did not pause or adjust when students showed they were unable to keep up. Another teacher referenced that everything from class participation to work was for a grade, but the focus was on completion rather than quality.	Basic	40%
	The QSR team scored 20% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations there were no clear criteria for student work or no monitoring of student understanding. In one observation, the teacher asked, "Are we good?" after every presentation slide to check to see if students had copied the information but did not confirm or inquire to ensure students understood the information.	Unsatisfactory	20%

APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT RUBRIC

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

APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION RUBRIC

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

Appendix III: SCORE BREAKDOWN BY COMPONENT

Percent of:	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	20%	20%	13%	13%	7%	14%	20%	20%
Basic	20%	27%	47%	47%	64%	50%	47%	40%
Proficient	53%	53%	33%	27%	29%	36%	33%	40%
Distinguished	7%	0%	7%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Subdomain Average	2.47	2.33	2.33	2.40	2.21	2.21	2.13	2.20

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	48%	34%
Domain Averages	2.38	2.19