



January 30, 2020

Terry Golden, Board Chair
421 P Street NW
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mr. Golden:

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. Your school was selected to undergo a QSR during the 2019-20 school year for the following reason(s):

- School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2020-21 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report

A QSR team conducted on-site reviews of KIPP DC Grow Academy Public Charter School (KIPP DC Grow Academy PCS) between November 11, 2019 to November 22, 2019. Enclosed is the team's 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 the QSR at KIPP DC Grow Academy PCS.

Sincerely,

Rashida Young
Chief School Performance Officer

Enclosures
cc: School Leader

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: January 30, 2020

Campus Information

Campus Name: KIPP DC Grow Academy Public Charter School (KIPP DC Grow Academy PCS)

Ward: 6

Grade levels: Prekindergarten-3 (PK3) – Kindergarten

Qualitative Site Review Information

Reason for Visit: School eligible for 20-year review during the 2020-2021 school year

Two-week Window: November 11, 2019 - November 22, 2019

QSR Team Members: Two DC PCSB staff members including one special education (SPED) Specialist and one consultant

Number of Observations: 12 including one unscored SPED pullout

Total Enrollment: 319

Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 30

English Language Learners Enrollment: 8

In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:

Visit 1: November 13, 2019 – 90.9%

Visit 2: November 20, 2019 – 92.9%

Visit 3: November 21, 2019 – 91.9%

Visit 4:

Summary

According to its mission,

KIPP DC is a non-profit network of high-performing, college-preparatory public charter schools in Washington, D.C. All KIPP DC schools are tuition-free, open enrollment schools, and actively recruit and serve students in the city's most educationally underserved communities. At KIPP DC, there are no shortcuts. Highly skilled teachers and leaders, more time in school, a rigorous college-preparatory curriculum, and a strong culture of high expectations and support help our students make significant academic gains and continue to excel in high school and college.

The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team observed mixed evidence that KIPP DC Grow Academy PCS is meeting its mission. DC PCSB observers saw strong evidence that teachers held students to high standards for academic engagement and behavior expectations. Students retold stories, used related vocabulary in context, and rotated through differentiated learning centers. At times, teachers asked rapid-fire questions to check for student understanding and only a few students participated. Teachers used highly scripted activities and prompts, and as a result, students rarely engaged in organic conversations with their peers or teachers.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendix I and II). The QSR team scored 75% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest-rated components were *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)* and *Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b)* with 82% of observations scored as proficient or distinguished in each of these components. Interactions between teachers and students were highly respectful and reflected genuine warmth and caring. Teachers often asked students about their lives outside of school and referred to them as “friend.” Observers noted that teachers often praised students for modeling positive behaviors and used school-wide reward systems to highlight positive student behaviors. Teachers in many observations ensured that students put forth good effort to produce high quality work. Students frequently complied with teacher expectations while both working alongside the teacher and independently.

The QSR team scored 59% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The highest-rated components in the Instruction domain were *Communicating with Students (3a)* and *Engaging Students in Learning (3c)* with 73% of observations scored as proficient and none as distinguished in each of these components. Teachers clearly communicated the purpose of each activity and explained how lessons connected to the broader learning goal. Student engagement was high in most observations with students having choice in how they completed many of the activities. Teachers used a range of materials like puzzles, picture books, and manipulatives to maintain student engagement. Notably, only 45% of observations in the components of *Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques (3b)* and *Using Assessment in Instruction(3d)* scored proficient with none as distinguished. Teachers in these observations often exclusively asked closed-ended questions with a single correct answer and rarely checked for student understanding as they moved rapidly through classroom discussions.

Governance

Terry Golden chairs the KIPP DC Board of Trustees. The School Reform Act requires all DC public charter schools to have a majority of DC residents and two parents, which the school has been compliant with for the past five years.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, KIPP DC Grow Academy PCS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). The QSR team looked for evidence of the school’s articulated SPED program. Overall, DC PCSB observed two SPED classroom environments, one was an inclusion classroom and the other observation consisted of two small groups of pull-out services. DC PCSB

staff only scored one of the observations, given the small number of students in the pull-out groups. Notably, KIPP DC Grow Academy PCS indicated in its SPED schedule and teacher roster that the school has two SPED teachers on staff. However, at the time of the QSR, the co-teacher present shared that the second SPED teacher went on medical leave the day of the QSR observation. The co-teacher present indicated that they were not aware of the substitute or contingency plan for the second SPED teacher's absence. As a result of this matter, DC PCSB's SPED Specialist only observed instruction conducted by the SPED staff who were present at the school.

Based on the observations, DC PCSB observers found that the school implemented its stated program with fidelity, as evidenced by students' engagement in the least restrictive environment and the school's use of supports for academics and social emotional learning. These supports were evident in both the SPED and general education environments. In the pull-out classroom, the teacher set clear expectations for students and provided learning tasks that were equally challenging to instruction in the general education classroom. The teacher provided scaffolds and accommodations such as chunking words, coordinating language with physical movement, repeating directions, and providing manipulatives to ensure that students could access information. In the inclusion environment, both a general education and a SPED teacher were present, and the SPED teacher taught a small group of students the same content that the general education teacher taught the rest of the class. In that same observation, the SPED teacher also supported students who required more individualized assistance by using the one teach- one support model. While it was evident that the school implements its SPED program sufficiently, it was unclear if all SPED students were receiving their required services per their Individualized Education Plans (IEP), given the unexpected absence of one of the school's SPED providers. Key trends from the SPED observations are summarized below.

- To demonstrate that co-planning occurred, the school explained that DC PCSB staff would see evidence of general education teachers and SPED teachers working together seamlessly, in which the observers should not be able to easily identify which teacher was the SPED provider versus the general educator. While this was the case in some classrooms, it was not universal. During the observation of an inclusion classroom where co-teaching occurred, the SPED observer noted it was evident who was the SPED teacher versus the general educator. The general education teacher primarily facilitated the lesson in front of the class, while the SPED teacher circulated the classroom and supported students with academic work and behavior. There was a clear distinction between students' behavior when the SPED teacher was present and when they weren't in the classroom, because once

the SPED teacher arrived, the level of student engagement and positive behavior increased during the observation.

- To support the learning of SWD, the school stated in its SPED questionnaire that it offers resources and SPED through a continuum that includes, inclusion (e.g., co-teaching or consultation in the general education classroom); workshops that consist of individual or small-group instruction; a resource room where students receive targeted core subject instruction; full-time specialized instruction and support out of the general education setting at the Learning Center; and related services provided by aids and specialized service providers in and out of the general education setting. DC PCSB observed two sessions in a pull-out classroom and one inclusion classroom. In the pull-out observations, class sizes were small and the content was both grade-level appropriate and challenging for students. The teacher provided targeted support for students and addressed students' social and emotional needs effectively through scaffolds and accommodations. Additionally, teachers exhibited patience when students became frustrated with work or a challenging social situation. For example, one teacher said, "Thank you for not giving up and showing grit." The teacher encouraged the student through the lesson and helped them arrive at the correct answer. The SPED Specialist found that teachers maintained a high level of expectations for students in and out of general education settings; however, the level of discussion and feedback was stronger during the pull-out observation. In the pull-out observation, the teacher explained content clearly, used metaphors and analogies, and brought content to life. During one observation, the teacher stated, "Who can tell me the power that we use when we read?" Students responded, "The pointer power." The pointer power referred to using the index finger as a pointer to ensure that students read every word. Students attentively pointed their index finger in the air before they began to read. The teacher went on to say, " You make sure that when you read you touch every single word, got it, got it."
- As a program that uses co-teaching, the school stated in its questionnaire that KIPP DC Grow Academy PCS trains its teachers on the six co-teaching models by Marilyn Friend,¹ of which KIPP DC Grow Academy PCS primarily uses alternative team-teaching, parallel co-teaching, and station teaching. The SPED specialist saw evidence of co-teaching in an inclusion classroom where the models implemented were One Teach, One Assist and Alternative

¹ Marilyn Friend 6 co- teaching models, <https://ctserc.org/component/k2/item/50-six-approaches-to-co-teaching>

teaching. In this observation, the SPED teacher taught a small group of students the same content that the general educator was teaching the rest of the class, which is an example of alternative teaching. The SPED teacher also used the one teach, one assist model to support students who exhibited extremely challenging behaviors while the general education teacher continued to teach the rest of the class.

- To provide accommodations and modifications according to the Individualized Education Plans (IEP) of SWD, KIPP DC Grow Academy PCS stated that accommodations and modifications frequently change to meet the needs of its students. During the observations, the SPED Specialist saw evidence of teachers using strategies, such as repetition of directions, re-teaching content, conducting small-group and individualized instruction, using manipulatives, and providing preferential seating. While the school also stated that it provides modifications according to the IEPs of SWD that may include adjustments in the content and curriculum, the SPED Specialist did not observe any evidence of such modifications during the observation window.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT²

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 75% 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 ³	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	The QSR team scored 82% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations talk between teachers and students was uniformly respectful. In one observation, as a student retold a story during centers, the teacher remarked, "They know so many parts of that story." After complimenting the student, the teacher high-fived the student saying, "That's right, high-five." In another observation, after a smooth transition, the teacher celebrated with the class saying, "We did it, whoa!" Students in these observations often used chants to celebrate their classmates when they answered a question correctly or received praise from the teacher.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	82%
	The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers attempted to respond to disrespectful behavior among students with uneven results. In one observation students repeatedly talked over the teacher during a lesson. The teacher attempted to redirect students by saying, "That's a one," but students continued to talk. During the same observation when a student asked a clarifying question, the teacher responded, "You don't know because you were talking," and did not provide any further explanation to the student. Teachers in these observations sometimes downplayed student emotions. For example, when one student expressed that they felt homesick, the teacher responded, "You are fine."	Basic	18%
The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%	

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

³ DC PCSB does not report out qualitative evidence if less than 10% of observations in any given component earned a "basic" or "unsatisfactory" level of performance.

Establishing a Culture for Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 82% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations students put forth good effort to complete high-quality work. In one observation as a student retold a story in centers, the student adapted their voice to reflect different characters and scenes through the book. The teacher complimented the student on their reading and pointed out the added detail. Teachers in these observations demonstrated a high regard for students' abilities. For example, after reading a story aloud, the teacher reminded students that it was important to pay attention because they would be responsible for retelling the story in the future using detail from the text.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	82%
	<p>The QSR team scored 18% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers conveyed high expectations for only some students. In one observation students at one table used materials inappropriately during centers and moved freely throughout the room when they should have been seated. As teachers worked with other groups of students, they attempted to reengage the group of students off-task, but with mixed success. In another observation the teacher conveyed high expectations for only some students. For example, during centers students who worked directly with a teacher remained on-task and used materials appropriately. However, students not working directly with the teacher yelled in each other's faces and at times wandered the room instead of working. The teacher often ignored this behavior and did not insist that students engage with the materials appropriately.</p>	Basic	18%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>The QSR team scored 64% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation students themselves ensured that classroom routines ran smoothly. During this observation, students lead the transition back to their seats on the carpet. Students sang, "Find your spot, find your spot," and transitioned quickly and quietly without any prompting from the teacher. In the proficient observations classroom routines and procedures functioned smoothly. In one observation the teacher used a timer and gave students warnings to indicate that it was almost time to transition to recess. With one-minute remaining, the teacher sang, "One more minute," and students repeated after the teacher. When the timer went off, students joined the teacher in an all-class chant and quickly transitioned to the carpet. In these observations teachers often used fun chants like, "Yo, yo, yo," to encourage students to transition quickly.</p>	Distinguished	9%
		Proficient	55%
	<p>The QSR team scored 36% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations classroom routines functioned unevenly. In one observation the teacher asked students to stop and put their hands on their heads as the timer went off. Some students stopped working while many others continued talking and playing in centers. During a transition to the carpet, several students ran and jumped into their spots instead of walking like the teacher asked. Students in these observations had to be redirected several times leading to a significant loss of instructional time.</p>	Basic	36%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 73% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations standards of conduct were established and implemented successfully. In one observation the teacher told students to put their “hands in a bowl,” to indicate they should be in a resting position. All students complied. Students in these observations worked independently in centers, managing their own behavior, with minimal support from the teacher. During instances of student misbehavior, teachers swiftly and respectfully redirected students. For example, one teacher called two students by name and said, “Eyes on your own computers,” when they got distracted. Both students immediately complied.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	73%
	The QSR team scored 27% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers attempted to keep track of student behavior but with no apparent system. In one observation the teacher repeatedly told students, “I’ll wait,” when they did not comply with the expectations for transitioning to the carpet. Despite the teachers attempt, students did not comply and had to be redirected several times. In another observation students rolled on the floor, playfully hit each other, and tossed materials during centers time. While the teacher was able to briefly get students to change their behavior, as soon as the teacher walked away, they again engaged in off-task and sometimes unsafe behavior.	Basic	27%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of “distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” and “unsatisfactory” are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 59% 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	<p>The QSR team scored 73% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations teachers’ explanations of the content was clear and invited student participation. In one observation the teacher did a detailed walk-through with students before opening a new center. The teacher used real-world pictures to show students actions they should take in the new restaurant-themed centers. During the explanation, the teacher used related vocabulary like drive, car, window, and cashier. Students modeled how they would order food and practice the related vocabulary words before transitioning to centers. In another observation the teacher used a think-aloud to describe how the teacher would write out a journal entry. In addition to the thinking process, the teacher modeled writing and drawing for students. Teachers in these observations always stated clearly at some point what students would be learning. For example, one teacher began a small group lesson by saying, “When we read the story this time, we are not going to talk about characters, we are going to talk about feelings.”</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	73%
	<p>The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers had to clarify the learning task so that students could complete it. In one observation the teacher attempted to ask students to fill in sentences using different vocabulary words. Several students gave incorrect responses despite the teacher’s attempt to clarify what they were asking. In another observation the teacher moved rapidly through a foundational skills lesson and only a few students participated.</p>	Basic	18%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	9%

Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques	<p>The QSR team scored 45% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations teachers used open-ended questions to invite student thinking and participation. In one observation the teacher used pictures of vocabulary words to initiate a discussion among students. The teacher showed the pictures and asked questions like, “What is the car doing?” and “How do you know that?” The teacher continued the discussion by asking, “What did you notice here?” Several students had the opportunity to respond. In another observation the teacher showed students different math tools and asked them to describe similarities and differences. After several students responded, the teacher followed up with “Which things help you measure how tall you are?”</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	45%
	<p>The QSR team scored 55% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers framed some questions to promote student thinking, but only a few students participated. In one observation the teacher asked a series of questions in rapid succession. Students who could answer the fastest participated while other students often missed the opportunity to speak. Eventually students who needed more time to respond stopped participating. In another observation, the teacher asked students what they would use to order food at a restaurant. While many students attempted to respond, the teacher only acknowledged the student who gave the correct response and did not address the incorrect responses to support student understanding. In some observations teachers exclusively asked rapid-fire questions and made no attempt to have students explain their thinking.</p>	Basic	55%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

Engaging Students in Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 73% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations materials and resources supported the learning goals. In one observation the teacher used pictures, vocabulary word cards, and materials from centers to model expectations for students. Students worked independently and with their peers throughout the entire observations. Students used materials in creative ways, engaged in rich discussions using related vocabulary, and rotated freely through centers. Most students in these observations intellectually engaged in activities with or without additional prompting from the teacher. For example, in one observation 17 out of 22 students independently engaged in an activity while the teacher supported a small group of students.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	73%
	<p>The QSR team scored 27% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations the pacing of the lesson was uneven – suitable in parts but rushed or dragged in others. In one observation a student quickly finished an activity in centers and was instructed by the teacher to “draw 20 circles.” It was unclear how this activity aligned to the lesson purpose.</p>	Basic	27%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

Using Assessment in Instruction	<p>The QSR team scored 45% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations teachers checked for student understanding. In one observation, during a handwriting lesson, the teacher told students to hold the pencil, "like a duck," and watched as they wrote out the strokes s/he modeled. In another observation the teacher asked questions to ensure that students understood how a character felt. The teacher asked, "How do you think she was feeling?"</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	45%
	<p>The QSR team scored 36% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers monitored student understanding through a single method. In one observation the teacher asked whole group questions like, "Who was first?" and "What do I do next?" The entire class responded in unison and individual students did not have the opportunity to respond or explain their answers. In another observation the teacher walked around the room and drew smiley faces on students papers as they worked. Outside of this check for understanding, students did not receive specific feedback that was geared towards future improvement.</p>	Basic	36%
	<p>The QSR team scored 18% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In the unsatisfactory observations feedback was global and only directed at a few students. In one observation the teacher gave feedback solely based on students behavior. For example, as the teacher circulated the room s/he said things like, "What's going on over here?" Teachers in these observations made few attempts to ensure that students understood the concepts. For example, one teacher asked a student to describe their picture. After the student gave a brief explanation the teacher simply moved on without providing any feedback.</p>	Unsatisfactory	18%

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION 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 sometimes 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 OBSERVATION 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 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.
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: DOMAIN AVERAGES BY COMPONENT

Percent of:	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	0%	18%
Basic	18%	18%	36%	27%	18%	55%	27%	36%
Proficient	82%	82%	55%	73%	73%	45%	73%	45%
Distinguished	0%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Subdomain Average	2.82	2.82	2.73	2.73	2.64	2.45	2.73	2.27

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	75%	59%
Domain Averages	2.77	2.52