



January 30, 2020

Terry Golden, Board Chair  
KIPP DC Lead Academy Public Charter School  
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. KIPP DC Lead Academy Public Charter School (KIPP DC Lead PCS) 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 the 2020-21 school year

**Qualitative Site Review Report**

A QSR team conducted on-site reviews of KIPP DC Lead PCS between November 11, 2019 – 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 Lead PCS.

Sincerely,  
Rashida Young  
Chief School Performance Officer

Enclosures  
cc: School Leader

### **Campus Information**

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

**Ward:** 6

**Grade levels:** First through fourth

### **Qualitative Site Review Information**

**Reason for Visit:** School eligible for 20-year charter review during 2020-21 school year

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

**QSR Team Members:** Two DC PCSB staff including one Special Education (SPED) specialist and two consultants

**Number of Observations:** 18

**Total Enrollment:** 405

**Students with Disabilities Enrollment:** 78

**English Language Learners Enrollment:** 6

**In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:**

**Visit 1:** November 12, 2019 – 96.8%

**Visit 2:** November 19, 2019 – 94.6%

**Visit 3:** November 21, 2019 – 90.4%

**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 QSR team observed mixed evidence that KIPP DC Lead PCS is fulfilling its mission. DC PCSB observers noted that most assignments were rigorous, but student engagement was mixed. Some of the instruction required student participation and challenged student thinking, while other instruction only required global responses from groups of students. Further, teachers attempted to hold students to high expectations with uneven effectiveness. In some observations, teachers insisted that students complete assignments and follow the classroom protocol, while in other observations student engagement with the content was largely passive. In these observations, activities required predetermined responses

and students generally had no choice in how they completed activities. Teachers often dominated the discussion or facilitated limited discussion with students. In some observations, student behavior interrupted academic instruction.

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 76% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest rated components in this domain were *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)* and *Managing Student Behavior(2d)*, with 78% of observations scored as distinguished or proficient. Observers noted that interactions between teachers and students were highly respectful. Teachers generally called students by name, encouraged them to participate, and demonstrated care by asking about their lives outside of school. In most observations, student behavior was entirely appropriate. However, in some observations students presented challenging behaviors that resulted in loss of instructional time as they required ongoing mediation by the teacher. The QSR team scored 65% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The highest rated component in this domain was *Communicating with Students (3a)*, with 76% of observations scored as distinguished or proficient and none as unsatisfactory. In these observations, teachers explained directions, procedures, and content clearly to students; and students participated in the explanation of the material by summarizing and asking questions. The teachers also provided models and used visual supports before asking students to complete independent work.

### Governance

Terry Golden chairs the KIPP DC PCS 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 Lead PCS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Overall, DC PCSB observed five SPED environments of which staff only scored four observations, given the small class size of the fifth observation. DC PCSB observers scored 53% of the school's SPED observations as proficient or distinguished in the Classroom Environment domain, while 62% of SPED observations scored proficient or distinguished in the Instruction domain. Overall, the school implemented its stated SPED program with fidelity, as evidenced by a rigorous curriculum and continuum of SPED services at the school. SWD had opportunities to learn in both general education and specialized classroom environments. In the inclusion classrooms, SWD learned with supports from an aide, a co-teacher, or both. In the out of general education classrooms, pull-

out or resource, class sizes were much smaller for students to receive more individualized supports. While there was evidence that the school had strong interventions in place to support SWD, like the presence of at least two teachers in most observations, there was also some evidence of uneven results regarding students' engagement and behavior. In most observations, some of the students were engaged in learning most of the time. In three of the five observations, students exhibited problematic or unsafe behaviors. In two observations, students were escorted from the classroom by the additional teacher in the room for fighting and elopement. In one of these observations the teacher tried to reintegrate the student into classroom environment after returning to class with another adult. The second adult assisted the student with catching up with the assignment. When the second adult left, the student was non-compliant, walked around the classroom and eventually walked out of the class. Another adult approached the student in the hallway and student did not return during the observation. In another observation, the SPED specialist was unable to collect evidence for some of the instructional components on the rubric, given the classroom instruction was interrupted by students fighting. In this observation, once the fighting ensued, teachers were unable to restore the classroom to an environment of learning while the observer was present. 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. One of the four SPED observations completed during this QSR was in an inclusion classroom where co-teaching occurred. In this classroom, it was evident who was the SPED teacher versus the general educator because the general education teacher primarily monitored and provided whole-group instruction, while the SPED teacher provided direct instruction to two students on the carpet. In this observation, a third adult supported other students at a table, but primarily focused on one particular student. While the instruction was not “seamless,” the three adults taught the same material to students which demonstrated some level of co-planning.
- To support the learning of SWD, KIPP DC Lead PCS reported that it offers a continuum of SPED services to educate students in the least restrictive environment. Per the school's questionnaire, its continuum includes SPED services in inclusion classrooms, resource rooms, workshops, and fulltime SPED services at the KIPP DC Learning Center. The SPED specialist observed students in the inclusion, pull-out and resource setting. During observations of both the inclusion setting and the out of general education classroom environment, SWD worked on rigorous content, however not all students

were intellectually engaged. The teachers were patient and responsive to students' emotional needs and it was evident that there is a hierarchy of support beyond the classroom for SWD with challenging behaviors. Additional staff supported students and tried to re-integrate students back into the classroom following incidents of students fighting or getting off-task. Academically, the teachers attempted to support students by providing repetition of directions, simplification of directions, re-teaching of the content, and providing frequent breaks. Some teachers effectively scaffolded lessons to keep students engaged. In other classrooms SWD continued to struggle with accessing the content in spite of teacher explanations and re-teaching.

As a program that uses co-teaching, the school stated in its questionnaire that KIPP DC Lead PCS trains its teachers on the six co-teaching models by Marilyn Friend<sup>1</sup> of which KIPP DC Lead PCS primarily uses alternative team-teaching, parallel co-teaching, and station teaching. The SPED observer saw evidence of co-teaching in an inclusion classroom where the model implemented was alternative teaching. In this observation, the SPED teacher worked with two students and the general education teacher worked with the remaining students. A third adult supported students at a table, and primarily focused on giving the most support to one student. In this observation, student behavior was generally appropriate, and most students engaged with the content. The SPED teacher left ten minutes earlier to prepare for an IEP meeting and transitioned the students to the computer. The other two adults transitioned the other students to the computers and remained until the end of class.

- To provide accommodations and modifications according to the Individualized Education Plans (IEP) of SWD, KIPP DC Lead 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, small-group, individualized instruction, preferential seating, visuals, and graphics. Teachers used timers to keep students on task and to help with the pacing of their lessons. The school also stated that it provides modifications according to the IEPs of SWD that may include adjustments in the content and curriculum or the use of read-aloud activities and manipulatives. In a few instances, the SPED specialist saw a teacher scribe for a student, and another teacher read the directions aloud and provided individual students support during testing.

---

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

**THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT<sup>2</sup>**

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 76% 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 <sup>3</sup>	
<p><b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored 78% of 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 the teacher called students by name to compliment them on completing their work. The teacher said, 'I see student X working hard,' and "Let's make it a positive day." In another observation, students demonstrated their respect for the teacher by immediately following directions. Teachers in these observations used endearing terms like, “Boo,” and “Sweetie,” when they addressed students.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	78%
	<p>The QSR team scored 17% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations the quality of interactions between teachers and students, or among students was uneven with occasional disrespect. In one observation the teacher greeted some students saying, “Good morning, sir,” but did not greet other students. In another observation the teacher attempted to address disrespectful behavior among students but was unsuccessful. Students in these observations encroached upon classmates’ personal space, kicked chairs, and yelled.</p>	Basic	17%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	6%

<sup>2</sup> Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 77% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation students indicated through their questions and comments a desire to understand the content. For example, students asked questions like, "Is this right?" and "Can I do the next one?" During independent work time, one student asked the teacher to return to a slide so that they could use it as a reference while they worked.</p>	Distinguished	6%
	<p>In the proficient observations, teachers demonstrated a high regard for students' abilities. In one observation the teacher insisted that all students finish their work during the allotted time. The teacher said, "You need to finish up your plans today, we can look at them tomorrow during close reading, but I know that you can finish." In another observation, the teacher promoted persistence statements like, "It's a complicated, tricky word, but you can do it." And, "It's tough. It's tricky, so think. You're going to figure it out by yourself."</p>	Proficient	71%
	<p>The QSR team scored 24% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, teachers conveyed high expectations for only some students. In one observation, the teacher held high expectations for the student that they worked with directly, while the other four students remained on the computer during the class period with limited interaction with the teacher. During this observation some students either slept for the entire period or worked briefly before falling asleep at their desk. In another observation the teacher and student appeared to be going through the motions to complete the work. For the first twenty minutes of the observation (when the student schedule said Morning Meeting), students were eating their breakfast and completing a worksheet. The teacher's verbal praise was limited to a few students for getting started or for completing their work.</p>	Basic	24%
	<p>There were no unsatisfactory scores in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	The QSR team scored 72% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, transitions between large-and small group activities were smooth. In one observation, the teacher used a timer to indicate to students that it was time to transition. As students transitioned, the teacher counted down from five. Once the teacher got to zero, students sat at their desks ready to begin. In another observation students walked into the room, put their lunch in the designated area, handed in their worksheets and got breakfast with minimal prompting from the teacher.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	72%
	The QSR team scored 22% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, classroom routines functioned unevenly. In one observation, the teacher called each student one-by-one to get headphones. For a class of five students, this transition took roughly seven minutes. As students transitioned, one student did cartwheels and had to be redirected by the teacher. In another observation, as students' voices increased, the teacher repeatedly reminded students about the "STAR" position by saying, "Fix your body," and "Track me," but many students continued to talk.	Basic	22%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	6%
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	The QSR team scored 78% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation student behavior was almost entirely appropriate. In this observation the teacher praised students by saying, "I love how you're doing this silently!"	Distinguished	6%
	In the proficient observations, student behavior was generally appropriate. Teachers monitored behavior closely, and effectively redirected students as needed. For example, one teacher gently reminded students of expectations and they complied without incident. The teacher said, "Warning," and "Fix your body." In another observation, the teacher redirected student misbehavior by narrating the positive behaviors of other students. The teacher said things like, "I see student X who is reading silently," and "I cannot wait to give friends stars who have been following what you need to do."	Proficient	72%

	<p>The QSR team scored 22% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, the teacher attempted to maintain order in the classroom, referring to classroom rules, but with uneven success. In one observation, a student repeatedly got out of their seat despite being told to sit down. When that student attempted to ask the teacher a question, the teacher responded, "I will not address you because you are not in your seat." The student continued to stand and was ignored by the teacher. The same student later bumped the teacher as they way back to their seat. The teacher responded, "You just bumped me, say excuse me." The student did not respond. In another observation, the teacher unsuccessfully tried to mediate and de-escalate a conflict between two students. The teacher stood between the students and told one of them to leave the classroom. As the student left, they threw a pencil at another student, causing that student to leave the classroom to retaliate. A teacher in the hallway intervened immediately and another adult took the other students out of the class.</p>	Basic	22%
	<p>There were no unsatisfactory scores in this component.</p>	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 65% 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	
<b>Communicating with Students</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 76% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations teachers used rich language, offering brief vocabulary lessons where appropriate, both for general vocabulary and for the discipline. In one observation, the teacher led a lesson on fractions. The teacher said, "These are fractions. The number at the bottom tells us how many pieces there are. The number at the bottom is the denominator. What number is at the bottom?" Students responded, "My denominator!" In another observation, the teacher assisted students with identifying words to describe a character in their book. When one student said that the character ignores another character. The teacher responded, "You are telling me what she does. What kind of person does that?" The student responded, "disrespectful."</p>	Distinguished	13%
	<p>In the proficient observations teachers stated clearly at some point during the lesson, what students would be learning. For example, the teacher said, "We are going to learn something new. We are going to learn the word present and the word past. The word present means it is happening now." They then used these definitions to help further students' understanding of verb tenses.</p>	Proficient	63%

	<p>The QSR team scored 25% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers provided little elaboration or explanation about what students would be learning. In one observation, the teacher only gave students directions on behavior when using the computers. Students attempted to work on the computer while the teacher worked with one student. When the teacher threatened to take recess away from a student for not doing the work, the student told the teacher that they did not know what to do. The teacher re-explained to students individually what to do and some students attempted to do the work. In another observation, the teacher attempted to explain “character traits” with mixed success. The teacher assigned students to read in their books and write character traits on their post-it notes. However, many students summarized the events in the book rather than write the character traits, indicating they didn’t fully understand the teacher’s instructions.</p>	Basic	25%
	<p>There were no unsatisfactory scores in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<p><b>Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored 53% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation, the teacher built on and used student responses to questions in order to deepen student understanding. In one observation, the teacher began a lesson on fractions by showing students a visual of two cut circles. The teacher asked, “What is the difference between these circles?” Students replied, “One is the same.” The teacher followed up with, “What is another word for the same?” Students responded, “equal.” In this observation the teacher built on student responses to help them understand properties of fractions.</p> <p>In the proficient observations the teacher asked students to justify their reasoning, and most students attempted to do so. For example, one teacher asked, “Tell me how the character’s feelings change and why?” and “Which girl is your favorite jumper and why do you like her?”</p>	Distinguished	6%
		Proficient	47%

	<p>The QSR team scored 47% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers invited students to respond directly to one another's ideas, but few students responded. For example, the teacher asked one student to identify the tens place. When the student pointed to the incorrect number, the teacher responded, "Nope, those are not tens. Those are ones," without scaffolding or allowing other students to respond. In another observation, questions mostly led students down a single path of inquiry. The teacher exclusively asked questions such as, "How many apples are in each bag?" and "How many bags are there?" Students did not have an opportunity to explain their thinking any further.</p>	Basic	47%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory.</p>	Unsatisfactory	6%
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 67% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations most students intellectually engaged with the lesson. In one observation, a student completed their work independently after the initial lesson, while the teacher retaught the lesson in another way to a small group of students. Pacing in these observations was appropriate, and most students completed their work during the class period. In another observation, the three adults in the classroom taught the same lesson to students in different ways using different groupings. The differentiation and scaffolds allowed all students to be intellectually engaged. The students in the small group had repetition of directions, simplification of the directions and discussions were further mediated.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	67%
	<p>The QSR team scored 22% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations student engagement with the content was largely passive. In one observation, students worked independently on computers but only one student was actively engaged in the lesson.</p>	Basic	22%
	<p>The QSR team scored 11% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In the unsatisfactory observations few students intellectually engaged in</p>	Unsatisfactory	11%

	<p>the lesson. In one observation, most students did not engage in the learning task, as they got distracted by the teacher talking to a parent on the phone. Of the eight students, three of them made some attempts to complete the assignment, while many students remained of task during the entire class period. In another observation, students spent much of their time waiting in line for the teacher to grade their assignments. Later, students sat idle at the end of the period as they waited for dismissal.</p>		
<p><b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored 65% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers made standards of high-quality work clear to students. In one observation, the teacher explained, "I will be looking for a comparison, I want to see you comparing these two texts," and "You have to be able to pull out evidence. See the evidence and compare the text." In another observation the teacher asked students to write evidence to support their character analysis on sticky notes. The teacher verbally gave them a sentence stem, "The boy is blank." She also added, "Then tell me what in the book makes you realize that."</p>	<p>Distinguished</p>	<p>0%</p>
	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations feedback was vague and not geared towards future improvement. In one observation, as students worked on drafting individual stories, the teacher walked around and gave general feedback like, "Finish up your plan." When students asked clarifying questions, the teacher often repeated the question. For example, "Why is it important to visit family?' When one student gave an off-topic answer, the teacher responded, "Again, why is it important to visit family?"</p>	<p>Basic</p>	<p>29%</p>
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory</p>	<p>6%</p>

**APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC**

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

**APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC**

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

**APPENDIX III: DOMAIN AVERAGES BY COMPONENT**

Percent of:	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	6%	0%	0%	6%	11%	6%
Basic	22%	22%	25%	41%	22%	29%
Proficient	72%	72%	63%	47%	67%	65%
Distinguished	0%	6%	13%	6%	0%	0%
<b>Subdomain Average</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>2.59</b>

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	76%	65%
<b>Domain Averages</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.64</b>