DC
PUBLIC
CHARTER
SCHOOL
BOARD

July 9, 2019

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

Dear Mr. Snowden

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews (QSR) 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. While DC PCSB previously conducted a QSR at IDEA Public Charter School (IDEA PCS) from October 22 – November 2 in school year (SY) 2018-19, your school was selected to undergo an additional QSR in the same school year for the following reason:

- IDEA PCS appealed its original SY 2018-19 QSR

Qualitative Site Review Report
Per the school's request, a QSR team conducted a second series of on-site reviews of IDEA PCS during the month of May 1 – May 31, 2019. Enclosed is the team's secondary report. You will find that the QSR 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 both QSRs at IDEA PCS.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Justin Rydstrom, Head of School/CEO

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: July 9, 2019

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

Qualitative Site Review (QSR) Information
Reason for Visit: School appealed its original SY 2018-19 QSR
Observation Window: May 1 – May 31, 2019
QSR Team Members: Four DC PCSB staff members including one special education specialist and two consultants
Number of Observations: 19
Total Enrollment: 326
Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 77
English Language Learners Enrollment: n<10
In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:
Visit 1[1]: May 2, 2019 – 70.4%
Visit 2: May 13, 2019 – 85.8%
Visit 3: May 14, 2019 – 92.9%
Visit 4: May 15, 2019 – 88.0%
Visit 5: May 17, 2019 – 78.3%
Visit 6: May 23, 2019 – 86.1%
Visit 7: May 31, 2019 – 81.3%

Summary
The purpose of the QSR is to provide DC PCSB, public charter school leaders, and other stakeholders with qualitative evidence to complement the quantitative evidence gathered in the Performance Management Framework (PMF) that is used to determine a school's charter goal attainment and its eligibility for continuance at the time of high stakes reviews. Prior to a school's five- and ten-year charter review, or fifteen-year renewal, DC PCSB and the school agree upon a two-week window during which the QSR team may arrive at various times to observe classrooms and the school.

IDEA PCS is eligible for its twenty-year charter review in SY 2019-20. In preparation for this review, DC PCSB conducted a QSR at IDEA PCS during the two-week window of October 22 – November 2, 2018 in school year (SY) 2018-19. Upon receiving the report, the school requested a new evaluation citing that they "do not believe that the results are an accurate representation of the current teaching practices at IDEA PCS." Per DC PCSB's QSR Protocol:

> If a school disagrees with the results, the school must provide the following for DC PCSB:
>
> - Evidence/documentation of improvement efforts

---

[1] May 2, 2019 was Senior Skip Day. Attendance by grade: 9th – 82.8%; 10th – 91.9%; 11th – 85.7%; 12th – 17.7%

- A written request to receive a follow-up visit

If DC PCSB agrees to conduct a follow-up visit, the visit will occur over a one-month window, and evidence from the QSR and the follow-up visit will support the charter renewal/review process.

IDEA PCS requested a follow-up visit in an e-mail to Deputy Director Naomi Rubin DeVeaux on December 5, 2018 and DC PCSB agreed to conduct a follow-up visit over the month of May 2019.

Results from the first visit can be found here. The table below compares the results from both visits.

Observation Window	QSR Average Domain 2	QSR Average Domain 3
October 2018	52%	37%
May 2019	61%	46%

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." DC PCSB observed mixed evidence that IDEA PCS is meeting its mission. In some observations, students were engaged in rigorous, college-preparatory lessons about poetry and world religions. Most classes had multiple adults present and engaged to provide additional academic and social support to students. Small class sizes (none larger than 14 students) contributed to opportunities for adults to work intensively with students. However, student engagement was inconsistent. In the component of *Engaging Students in Learning*, 47% of observations were proficient or distinguished, meaning that in about half of observations the learning tasks and activities required only minimal thinking by students, allowing most students to be passive or merely compliant; in the other half, the learning tasks challenged students' thinking and resulted in active intellectual engagement by most students.

During the month-long QSR window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching to examine the school's classroom environment and instruction (see Appendix I and II) in core content classrooms: math, science, social studies, and science[1]. At the school's request, DC PCSB also observed the school's construction program, which is essential to its mission.

Overall, 61% of observations in the May 2019 QSR were rated as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain, which is an improvement from the school's score of 52% during its fall 2018 QSR. Most observations fell into the "basic" or "proficient" level, with only

---

[1] DC PCSB's QSR Protocol differs from the Danielson Group in the following ways: 1) DC PCSB does not score non-core content observations; 2) DC PCSB does not conference with teachers; 3) DC PCSB keeps teachers anonymous in all QSR reporting.

one observation rated as "unsatisfactory" in this domain and several falling into the "distinguished" level of performance. The average component score for all components in this domain ranged from 2.50 to 2.82, meaning teachers at IDEA PCS are generally performing just below proficient in the Classroom Environment domain, which includes *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport, Establishing a Culture for Learning, Managing Classroom Procedures, and Managing Student Behavior*. This domain range score is also higher than the fall QSR in which the average score in Classroom Environment ranged from 2.43-2.57.

In the Instruction domain, 46% of observations were rated as distinguished or proficient, which is another improvement from the school's original score of 37% for its fall 2018 QSR. Again, most observations fell into the "basic" or "proficient" level. However, in this domain, several observations fell into the "unsatisfactory" level due to student disengagement. The average component score for the components *Communicating with Students, Engaging Students in Learning, and Using Assessment in Instruction* ranged from 2.41-2.50, meaning the average teacher at IDEA PCS is performing right between "basic" and "proficient" in the Instruction domain, slightly higher than the school's fall QSR in which average component scores ranged from 2.21 to 2.31. However, the average component score for *Using Questioning Prompts/Discussion Techniques*, was 2.22, meaning the average teacher is performing slightly higher than "basic" in this component, which is a slight decrease from the fall QSR in which the average teacher earned a 2.31 in this component.

Governance

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, which requires a majority of DC residents and two parents, for the past five years.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the observation 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. Overall, the school implemented *parts* of its stated program with fidelity as evidenced by engaging students in learning in some of the observations described below. In total, fewer than half (40%) of special education observations scored proficient or distinguished in Classroom Environment, and only 25% of special education observations scored proficient or distinguished in Instruction. The evidence summarized below describes specific aspects of the school's special education program and DC PCSB's analysis of whether the school is implementing its program according to what IDEA PCS described in its special education questionnaire:

> To demonstrate that co-planning occurred, the school explained that general education teachers present the same content in different ways to meet the needs of various learners and address different learning styles through one-on-one, small group, and whole group activities. In four out of five classrooms, students were primarily seated in small mixed-ability groups, and at times they reviewed content as a whole group. Of these classrooms, only two were effective in engaging students in

learning and providing differentiated content beyond a classroom worksheet or video clip. In one classroom, the teacher used a video and worksheet to reinforce the lesson on pyramid volume, and then later asked students to solve word problems in small groups and explain their thinking in a whole group discussion. An aide supplemented the lesson spatially for one student with a 3-D pyramid made out of paper to demonstrate how to calculate volume while the teacher reviewed on a worksheet with the rest of the class. In another classroom, students were seated as a whole group, where DC PCSB observed several students disengaged from the activity as they played on their cellphones; and only a few students were engaged in a sentence completion lesson about a classroom novel.

The school reported in its questionnaire that IDEA PCS offers low student-teacher ratios, through a Team-Teaching (co-teaching) model and the addition of other personnel in the classroom to support the needs of all students. DC PCSB observed evidence of this in all push-in observations where a general education teacher and a special education teacher were present. Additionally, in some instances an aide or administrator pushed into the self-contained observation to provide added support to the teacher and students. Students working one-one with teachers, aides, or administrators were seen effectively participating and completing the worksheets at the same pace as their general education peers.

IDEA PCS explained that observers might see the following examples of co-teaching: parallel teaching, one-teach/one-assist, alternative teaching, or station teaching. Of DC PCSB's four special education push-in observations, staff observed parallel teaching in one classroom, teaming in one classroom, and one-teach/one-assist in the remaining two observations. In at least two of these observations, the special education teachers primarily responded to redirecting students' behavior and encouraging task completion. In these observations, only a few students were engaged and teachers were minimally effective in supporting all students with the learning activity.

To provide accommodations according to the Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) of SWD, the school stated in its questionnaire that it uses the following resources: special education teachers, leveled readings, behavior trackers, timers, clarification/reading of directions, calculators, preferential seating, and ClassDojo[2] as a behavior management tool in the self-contained room. Some students have safety plans in place that allow them different ways to express themselves, or to take a break and see a specific individual in the building to process their feelings or emotions. The special education observer saw examples of all the listed accommodations except for leveled readings, behavior trackers, and safety plans for students to take breaks. In math classrooms, all students used calculators to find the volume of a pyramid. In the self-contained classroom, the teacher collected all the students' cellphones and gave students ClassDojo points for complying with instructions, and to positively reinforce when students were on track with behavioral expectations. While the special education observer saw the use of timers in all classrooms, the teachers were

---

[2] Class Dojo is a classroom communication app used to share reports between parents and teachers. Teachers track student behavior and upload photos or videos.

inconsistent with adhering to the allotted time set for timed activities in three of five observations, in which teachers either shortened or extended work times.

To provide modifications according to the IEPs of SWD, the school stated that some students may have the same assignment but are responsible for different questions, while some students will also have a different assignment altogether. In various classes, the school stated that some students use Chromebooks (primarily Achieve 3000 and IXL), while others may work independently or in small groups. These adaptive technology tools are not limited to the use of only SWDs, as they modify reading and math literacy levels to help all students make academic progress individually. DC PCSB staff observed small groups in four of five observations, but students were grouped by ability level in only one observation. In two of these observations, students worked on modified questions, and in two other observations the reviewer saw students using Chromebooks to log into a Google Classroom to complete their assignments. It was unclear in the second observation what students were completing on the Chromebooks and whether it was related to the objective of the lesson. The reviewer did not see students working on academic content, remediation during advisory or intervention blocks, as described in the school's questionnaire.

<u>Construction</u>
Central to IDEA PCS's mission is preparing students with occupational skills. As such, DC PCSB observed a construction class with eight to ten students. The teacher started class with a "Do Now" activity and safety lesson on the use of boxcutter knives. All students were engaged in building, painting, and weather-proofing wooden doghouses. The objective for the lesson was, "Students will be able to attach trim with a brad nailer, identify how to use a utility knife safely, and cut shingles at 32 inches for roof." All students used materials safely and productively. At the end of the lesson, students completed a self-reflection and received individualized feedback from the teacher.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[3]

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Classroom Environment domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 61% 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 71% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations teachers connected with students as individuals. In one observation students laughed and joked as they finished an activity. Students cheered for one another and encouraged their peers to persist. In the proficient observations teachers made general connections with individual students. In one observation when a student used profanity the teacher responded, "Excuse me, anytime you are around me you don't use that language; you want to be in the military and I'm going to hold you accountable." Afterwards the student apologized. Students and teachers in these observations interacted with one another respectfully. In one observation a student interrupted the teacher as s/he conferenced with another student and was told to wait. The student patted the teacher on the back and said, "My bad, I'm sorry."	Distinguished	12%
		Proficient	59%

---

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

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations the quality of interactions between teachers and students was uneven. In one observation the teacher asked three different students to put their phones away. The teacher said, "Please put your cell phone away; that is not a part of our classroom culture." All three students remained on their phones throughout the observation. When the teacher tapped one student on the shoulder for using a cell phone, the student ignored the teacher and remained on the phone. As a result, the teacher asked the student to step into the hallway and called another adult to come and get the student. Across several classrooms, many students refused to put their cell phones away when asked by the teacher.	Basic	29%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team scored 50% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation the teacher communicated a genuine passion for the subject. The teacher remarked, "Time just flew by today!" when the students finished the activity. In the proficient observations teachers demonstrated a high regard for student abilities. In one observation the teacher called on individual students and reminded them that everyone needed to participate in the "tribe talk." At the end of the observation the teacher encouraged all students to attend an upcoming session of Saturday school. The teacher said, "If you come you will see what I bring for you and it's a time to get individual help on your essays."	Distinguished	6%
		Proficient	44%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 44% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations students complied with teachers' expectations but did not indicate commitment for their own work. In one observation half of the students did not participate in a choral read-aloud. The teacher continued reading despite the lack of student participation. In another observation the teacher urged students to work in pairs simply to finish the work faster. The teacher said, "You definitely need to work with somebody because it goes quicker."	Basic	44%
	The QSR team less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	6%
Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team scored 62% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation, students took initiative to ensure that classroom time was used efficiently. Students worked independently in the hallway and took initiative to track how much time they had left. In the proficient observations classroom routines and procedures ran efficiently. In one observation the teacher gave students transition warnings to indicate that it was almost time to stop writing. In another observation the teacher used a timer to keep students on track as they wrote independently and later shared with their peers. In another observation the teacher used her/his laptop to track student progress towards a web-based activity in real-time. As students finished the teacher congratulated them and told them what to do next. This resulted in no loss of instructional time as students transitioned between activities.	Distinguished	6%
		Proficient	56%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 39% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations classroom routines functioned unevenly. In one observation the teacher lost several minutes of instructional time as he/she waited for students who refused to read aloud. In another observation there was no established routine for pairing students in groups. As a result, the teacher made the groups on the spot and called each group one by one to transition. Student confusion led to several minutes of lost instructional time.	Basic	39%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 63% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations student behavior was entirely appropriate. In these observations the students worked quietly and offered help to their peers. In the proficient observations students behavior was generally appropriate. In one observation students worked in groups to compose an original song. Students respectfully shared their ideas and built on the responses of their classmates. In another observation students patiently waited to be called on when they needed help from the teacher. As they waited, students remained engaged with the learning task.	Distinguished	16%
		Proficient	47%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 32% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers attempted to maintain order in the classroom with mixed success. In one observation a student got up and walked out of class after a dispute about putting their cell phone away. The teacher briefly followed the student into the hallway and kindly asked them to rejoin the class, but s/he did not comply and remained in the hallway. In this same observation multiple students ignored academic questions/prompts. For example, one student placed his/her head on the desk when asked to read. The teacher attempted to encourage the student by saying, "You said the answer earlier" but the student refused. Another adult in the room attempted to help the teacher manage student behaviors but was also unsuccessful. Despite student noncompliance, the high level of consistency and respect teachers used places these observations in the basic range.	Basic	32%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	5%

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 46% 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 50% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation all students understood the presentation. In this observation the teacher explained to students how to use primary sources. Students later researched their own ancestry using the U.S. census, asked questions, and explained their results to their peers. In the proficient observations the teachers explanation of the content was clear and invited student thinking. In these observations the teachers clearly explained the lesson outcomes, student expectations, and guidelines for how students would review one another's work.	Distinguished	6%
		Proficient	44%
	The QSR team rated 44% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers had to clarify the learning tasks so that students could complete them. During a whole group science lesson the teacher asked students to incorrectly identify a child as having a genetic disorder. When one student questioned the teacher s/he simply restated their position and continued with the lesson. In these observations teachers gave minor incorrect information that led to student confusion. For example, one teacher incorrectly shared how to identify the nutritional value of a snack. This led to consistent student misunderstandings during small group work.	Basic	44%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	6%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques	The QSR team scored 39% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations discussions enabled students to talk to one another without ongoing mediation from the teacher. In one observation students worked in small groups to analyze a text. The teacher gave students opportunities to respond to one another and expand on their classmates responses. For example, one student said, "He gave a really good answer" and "I agree with what he said." This led to an ongoing conversation where other students built on one another's responses. In these observations teachers asked open-ended questions designed to invite student thinking. For example, as students discussed a text, one teacher asked, "How does his power lead to him being corrupt?" and "How would you say that works for him?"	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	39%
	The QSR team scored 44% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations only a small number of students participated in the discussion. In one observation one student repeatedly answered all of the questions with simple one-word answers. The student later attempted to enrich the conversation by pointing out something they noticed. The teacher quickly moved the discussion back to the questions on the worksheet. In these observations teachers framed some questions to elicit student thinking but often quickly answered his/her own questions without engaging with students. For example, as students worked in groups to create a poster the teacher gave students answers to what was supposed to be an original project.	Basic	44%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 17% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In the unsatisfactory observations questions did not invite student thinking. In one observation the teacher asked rapid-fire closed ended questions like "What's the daughters name?" and "What is a parabola again?" Students quickly offered one-word responses. In another observation the teacher asked students to copy definitions as he/she read them aloud. This activity lasted for roughly twenty minutes of a thirty minute observation.	Unsatisfactory	17%
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation virtually all students engaged in the lesson. Students in this observation created graphic organizers as they discussed Jim Crow laws in the South. One student took it upon themselves to modify the learning task for the class. The lesson had a clearly defined structure and at the end students worked with their peers in small groups. In the proficient observations most students were intellectually engaged in the lesson. In one observation students worked collaboratively to create original songs. Students offered synonyms to use, proposed new sentence structures, and asked their peers for feedback. In another observation students reflected on a text they read and often referred back to it for evidence. Students freely raised their hands to participate and listened attentively to their peers.	Distinguished	5%
		Proficient	42%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 42% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations student engagement with the content was largely passive. In one observation the teacher asked students to work in pairs to answer comprehension questions. However, half of the class did not begin to work for several minutes before they eventually rushed through the assignment and gave incorrect responses. In another observation students practiced graphing equations but with mixed engagement. The teacher attempted to use different instructional groupings to encourage student participation but with mixed results. Some students worked with their peers while other simply asked the teacher for answers.	Basic	42%
	The QSR team scored 11% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In the unsatisfactory observations few students intellectually engaged in the lesson. During one observation students played a video game instead of working on their portfolios. The teacher's attempts to engage those students failed. In another observation one student used their cell phone for the entire class period, instead of completing the activity. In these observations many students continued to engage in off-task behavior despite repeated attempts by the teacher.	Unsatisfactory	11%
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations feedback included specific and timely guidance. In one observation the teacher asked, "What does the word ecstasy mean as it is used in line 9?" and "What are we looking for, are we talking about the drug?" Multiple students answered indicating that they understand the vocabulary. In another observation the teacher asked, "What did it mean when MLK said justice delayed is justice denied?" and "Who can share? Tell me what that means."	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	In another observation after students answered word problems the teacher called on several students to explain their rationale to the class.	Proficient	47%
	The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers requested only global indicators of student understanding. During a science lesson the teacher asked questions of the entire group and simply moved on if students did not participate. Student responses indicated that they did not understand the content. In another observation there was little evidence to indicate that students knew how their work would be evaluated. The teacher said "Complete independently. Everyone has to have their own work and no two projects can be the same." The teacher did not provide further guidance which led to student confusion. When students asked questions the teacher replied, "We will go over it later."	Basic	47%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	6%

APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

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	0%	6%	0%	5%	6%	17%	11%	6%
Basic	29%	44%	39%	32%	44%	44%	42%	47%
Proficient	59%	44%	56%	47%	44%	39%	42%	47%
Distinguished	12%	6%	6%	16%	6%	0%	5%	0%
Subdomain Average	2.82	2.50	2.67	2.74	2.50	2.22	2.42	2.41

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	61%	46%
Domain Averages	2.68	2.39