DC
PUBLIC
CHARTER
SCHOOL
BOARD

January 11, 2021

Corey Ealons, Board Chair
Mundo Verde Bilingual Public Charter School
30 P Street NW
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mr. Ealons:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Review (QSR) visits 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 because it is eligible for its 10-year charter review during school year (SY) 2020 – 21.

Qualitative Site Review Report
A QSR team conducted a virtual site review of Mundo Verde Bilingual Public Charter School – J.F. Cook from September 28, 2020 – October 9, 2020.

DC PCSB intended to conduct the QSR in the spring of SY 2019 – 20. However, the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in all DC public charter schools physically closing in March 2020 through the end of the school year. As a result, the observations in this report were postponed to SY 2020 – 21 and took place remotely. The disruption in traditional school programming due to COVID-19 has had an untold impact on classroom environment and instruction, the primary areas of focus in this report. Observers considered these factors while visiting classrooms. Enclosed is the team's report.

Sincerely,

Michelle J. Walker-Davis, Ed.D.
Executive Director

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: January 11, 2021

Campus Information
Campus Name: Mundo Verde Bilingual Public Charter School – J.F. Cook (Mundo Verde PCS – Cook)
Ward: 5
Grade Levels: Pre-kindergarten 3 through Fifth

Qualitative Site Review Information
Reason for Visit: School eligible for 10-year Charter Review during SY 2020-21
Two-week Window: September 28, 2020 – October 9, 2020
QSR Team Members: Three DC PCSB staff members and two consultants, including one English learner (EL) specialist, one special education (SPED) specialist, and one bilingual observer
Number of Observations: 17 unscored observations
Total Enrollment: 594[1]
Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 65
English Learners Enrollment: 110
In-seat Attendance on Observation Days: [2]
Visit 1: September 29, 2020 - 96.8%
Visit 2: October 1, 2020 – 97.3%
Visit 3: October 2, 2020 – 95.1%
Visit 4: October 5, 2020 – 96.0%
Visit 5: October 6, 2020 – 96.8%

Summary
According to the school's mission,

> Mundo Verde Bilingual Public Charter School aims to foster high levels of academic achievement among a diverse group of students by preparing them to be successful and compassionate global stewards of their communities through an engaging curriculum focused on sustainability and biliteracy.

---

[1] This enrollment figure is based on preliminary, unvalidated data as of October 5, 2020.
[2] During SY 2020 – 21, educational services are being provided both in-person and via distance learning. While during normal operations there is a consistent city-wide definition of what constitutes "present" (a student must be physically present for at least 80.0% of the instructional day), there is significantly more variation in what constitutes "present" during distance learning. In-seat attendance as presented here represents all students receiving educational services, whether in-person or remote. This rate is fundamentally different than in-seat attendance during a typical year.

The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team observed mixed evidence that Mundo Verde PCS – Cook is achieving its mission. Teachers created an environment of respect in their classrooms and held high expectations for student participation. However, the level of academic rigor ranged from highly cognitive discussions with the teacher stepping out of the central role to the use of single answer questions. Observers witnessed diverse groups of students across all observations speaking and reading in both Spanish and English. Additionally, the QSR team observed content classes delivered in both Spanish and English, promoting biliteracy.

During the two-week observation window, the team used a modified version of Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendices I and II). After careful consideration regarding the uniqueness of virtual instruction, DC PCSB elected to summarize the overall findings from the observations using specific examples that apply to each indicator of the rubric, rather than assess individual scores and percentages for each domain. Therefore, the review team did not score any of the observations. Instead, observers used Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* tool to make determinations about how well Mundo Verde PCS – Cook is meeting its mission, based on specific examples of evidence the team observed during remote visits.

In the Classroom Environment domain, observers noted that teacher and student interactions were mostly respectful. A hallmark of the observations was the component *Managing Classroom Procedures*. Teachers generally opened class with a transition period and allowed students to prep their materials during this time. Students appeared to be familiar with the routines and generally adhered to the rules with gentle reminders. In the Instruction domain, observers noted that teachers clearly communicated expectations for learning. Most lessons were related to a specific skill, although teachers inconsistently provided opportunities for rigor. Overall, students readily and willingly engaged in lessons with few exceptions.

Governance
Corey Ealons chairs the Mundo Verde PCS Board of Trustees. The School Reform Act requires each DC public charter school to have a majority of DC residents and two parents on its board, which the school has been compliant with for the past five years.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities
Prior to the two-week window, Mundo Verde PCS – Cook completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities. Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. DC PCSB observed one special education classroom environment. Per the school's SPED questionnaire, the school offers a

combination of general education (inclusion), and pull out sessions. The observer was only able to observe a pull out session, which was one-on-one instruction. In general, DC PCSB found the school implements its stated special education program with fidelity as evidenced by co-planning by teachers, small group instruction (one-on-one), and specific strategies that support accommodations. Since general education classrooms could not be observed (due to break-out sessions,) it is unclear what systems are in place for sessions in the general education classroom. Key trends from the SPED observations are summarized below.

- To support the learning of students with disabilities, Mundo Verde PCS – Cook has created a variety of educational placements to best meet students' needs. DC PCSB saw evidence of teachers implementing strategy-based accommodations that were specific to future classwork, particularly in the general education classroom. It was also clear that the teacher worked closely with the student and the student's family on strategies for success such as organizing materials and fully engaging parents in class. The teacher's pace was appropriate for the student; however, some activities may have been less challenging as the student was able to complete many tasks with familiarity and ease. While lesson pacing and engagement were strong, much of the lesson was not connected to the new content. For instance, the teacher and students discussed symmetry, shapes, and math terminology, but the student's activity was creating number flash cards. The student played math games to build their confidence. However, due to time, the student was unable to move on to activities that supported the teacher's lesson.

- To provide accommodations according to the individualized education plans (IEP) of students with disabilities, "Students with disabilities have a variety of accommodations, which include: preferential seating, noise canceling headphones, frequent breaks, redirection, clarification and repetition of directions, read aloud, small group and individual testing, extended time, calculation devices, markup tools, masking tools, adaptive seating, text to speech/speech to text devices, hand fidgets (e.g., TheraPutty, stress balls), anchor charts, alphabet/number lines, adaptive paper, and pencil grips." During this observation it was difficult to tell if many accommodations were required and or present due to the student's hands being out of camera view.

- To provide modifications according to the IEPs of students with disabilities, the school wrote that "Only two students have significant intellectual disability. You will observe a modified standards-based curriculum in effect for these students." The observer was unable to observe a lesson where modifications were clearly implemented.

Specialized Instruction for English Learners

Prior to the two-week observation window, Mundo Verde PCS – Cook completed a questionnaire about how it serves its English Learners (ELs). The questionnaire included changes to the EL program based on the school's move to virtual learning. The QSR team looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. According to the school's EL questionnaire, the school currently uses a two-way, dual-language bilingual model that enables English Learners to develop academic skills while learning English…It is the responsibility of our Dual Language educators to provide language learner supports ourselves, inside the English and Spanish component classrooms, instead of expecting a pull out to satisfy this need.

As such, the QSR team observed full-group instruction to understand how lead teachers, teaching fellows, and classroom associates deliver language acquisition to EL students. Mundo Verde PCS – Cook uses the English Learner Instructional Tool for Evaluation (ELITE) rubric to track the supports provided to English learners. The ELITE rubric focuses on phonemic awareness, academic vocabulary, integrating English language comprehension into academic content, opportunities for writing, and small group intervention.

During DC PCSB's virtual visits, observers saw teachers integrate English language instruction into content-area teaching. There were also some opportunities for EL students to practice writing skills and receive small-group intervention. In a math workshop, the teacher used visual supports like a number line and drew pictures to help students solve the word problem. During a read-aloud, the teacher made the story's plot comprehensible by holding a picture walk, explaining what they saw in the illustrations, and asking students to share their ideas and predictions. In another observation, the teacher assigned all students to type their predictions into the chat box; however, not all students used complete sentences as stated in the directions. Students had additional opportunities to write during independent practice on a separate platform, but the observer did not have access to the prompts and was unable to see how students responded. Furthermore, the teacher assigned some students to work with the classroom assistants in breakout rooms, but DC PCSB staff was unable to observe the quality of these groups.

Per the school's EL questionnaire, "dual language programs have been proven highly effective in supporting the needs of language learners, when they share the same home language as the program's second language." The school's English language acquisition model is designed to support a Spanish-speaking EL student in a group setting. However, observers could not determine the extent to which the school's program is positioned to provide intensive supports to an EL student who speaks a language other than Spanish, especially with very low levels of English proficiency (e.g., a newcomer from a non-Spanish speaking country).

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[3]

This table summarizes the evidence collected on the Classroom Environment domain of the rubric during the unannounced virtual observations. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain.

Classroom Environment	Evidence
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Overall, the QSR team observed caring and respectful interactions between teachers and students. At the beginning of lessons, teachers consistently checked in with students and made connections related to their lives outside of school. Teachers asked students to rate their feelings using the chat box, acknowledged a student's absence from the day before and warmly welcoming the student back to class, and showed appreciation for students sharing about their weekend. The teacher said, "Thanks for sharing. That's so nice that you got out and were able to see a friend." While students demonstrated comfortability participating, the quality of interactions among students was uneven. In most classes, students encouraged one another with praise and by taking turns when talking. In one classroom, students were talking and writing in the chat while their teacher presented. One student respectfully corrected them by typing, "Shh!" Another student wrote, "Guys stop now!" to redirect their peers.
Establishing a Culture for Learning	Teachers demonstrated a genuine passion for the content. In one observation, the teacher was enthusiastic about the book the class read and stated she wanted the class to understand and feel confident with the book. In another lesson on fiction and non-fiction text, a teacher explained how they engage with both genres as an adult reader. Teachers praised students for their efforts, making statements like, "Oh that was so good. Do we think we can make it harder? Oh good!" and "I know those math problems were a challenge. Try your best." Classroom interactions sometimes supported learning and hard work. In one observation, two students struggled with the two-digit addition problems. The teacher told the first one to use the hundred board. To the second student, the teacher said, "try your best," and did not offer any concrete strategies. In most classrooms, students were cognitively busy. At times, students indicated that they were interested in completing a task rather than the quality of the work. After seeing some students' written predictions in the chat box, the teacher reminded them to use complete sentences. Moving forward, some but not all students responded with a complete sentence.

---

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

Classroom Environment	Evidence
Managing Classroom Procedures	Routines and the management of materials functioned smoothly. Teachers efficiently transitioned between screen sharing and breakout rooms. Students demonstrated proficiency in muting/unmuting in Zoom. Students and teachers generally had materials prepared and nearby. Students mostly engaged in the work. In one outlying observation, routines were not smooth, and the teacher was not clear at the start of the lesson that all students would need Google Classroom up on their computers. Many students using paper and pen were confused at the end of the lesson on how to get to the exit ticket. Some classes lost instructional time because of ineffective partnership between lead teachers and instructional assistants. There were effective partnerships in which the second adult modeled learning expectations and helped manage student behavior during instruction. In other observations, the teacher led both the instruction and behavior management of students without the second adult's support.
Managing Student Behavior	Overall, student behavior was generally appropriate. When necessary, teachers used positive redirection to manage student misbehaviors. Teachers called students by name, whispered gently to them, and restated expectations. Teachers monitored behavior through camera views and thanked students for following the virtual norms including raising their hands and leaving their cameras on. One teacher reminded students to turn their camera on. When one student became distracted by something off camera, the teacher said, "Put it away love." In one observation, the teacher attempted to maintain order (by referring to classroom rules) with uneven success. After students typed random words and letters in the chat box, the teacher removed the chat box briefly. Then, students began changing their display names on Zoom. The teacher responded in the chat box, "DO NOT CHANGE YOUR NAME." The aide also attempted to redirect behavior, asking the students to "please use the chat correctly." These attempts did not fully stop the misbehavior.

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the evidence collected on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced virtual observations. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain.

Instruction	Evidence
Communicating with Students	Teachers clearly articulated the purpose of each lesson, using slide shows stating the lesson objective. Teachers also modeled skills across classrooms (e.g., demonstrating how to use a ruler like a number line, referencing characters' emotions and actions in illustrations to make a prediction). Most of the teachers explained expectations more than once. In one observation, the teacher said, "Now you repeat back to me, friend." Directions for independent learning activities were sometimes unclear as evidenced by student confusion. In one observation, multiple students asked the teacher to clarify what assignments they should complete and in which order. The teacher moved students into breakout rooms to complete the assignment in groups. When the teacher returned to the main session from the first breakout room, students asked her to go over the instructions again. In some observations the teachers reviewed vocabulary prior to reading the text. Before proceeding into a math activity, one teacher said, "First, we'll review vocabulary for key words in unit." Teachers also invited students to explain their understanding to their classmates. Teachers made no content errors and cleared up misconceptions at times. As a teacher typed student ideas into a graphic organizer, a student asked, "Can we break it into three categories?" The teacher replied, "That's great that you want to take us to another level, but the third option actually fits inside the larger umbrella, because realistic fiction is still fiction."
Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques	The QSR team observed a mix of high- and low-level questions to foster student thinking and understanding. Teachers asked students to describe book illustrations, predict the story, and empathize with main characters in a book. Some questions had multiple correct answers (e.g., "What do we think the character will be like?"), while others had a single correct answer (e.g., "What color are the shoes?"). Many students actively engaged in discussions across most observations. However, discussions were largely mediated by the teacher with few opportunities for students to engage with one another about the material. At times, teachers dominated the conversation and did not use wait time to allow students to think before answering. In one observation, students challenged one another and their teacher to determine if a book was non-fiction or realistic fiction. One student asked, "What happens if you don't know the history and you don't know if it happened in real life, but it seems like it happened?" Overall, teachers made efforts to engage all students in participation, even those who didn't initially volunteer.

Instruction	Evidence
Engaging Students in Learning	Most students were intellectually engaged in lessons, sharing their predictions, responding to teacher's questions, and asking their own questions about the illustrations. Teachers prepared materials ahead of the lesson and aligned materials with learning goals. Students practiced counting with markers and whiteboards, used a digital hundred board and number line to solve addition problems, and sorted ideas by following along with their teacher's graphic organizer. Teachers inconsistently balanced calling on student volunteers with cold calling to give all students equal opportunities to participate. In one class, the teacher read a story aloud to the students. The teacher stopped at different points in the story to engage students in questions, although students were not required to explain their thinking. Pacing was inconsistent across observations. In some classrooms, teachers played videos of a read-aloud for more than five minutes without asking any questions of students. In other lessons, teachers provided students ample time to understand and engage with tasks. Teachers appropriately slowed the pace of lessons at times to ensure every student understood the task. In one observation, students helped one another. A student asked, "Can somebody help me?" and a classmate responded, "I can."
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team observed limited evidence that students understood how their work will be evaluated, as evidenced by student confusion on how to complete independent tasks. Teachers generally monitored student understanding using a single method, which was verbally posing a question to students during class. Most of the teachers looked for global indications of student understanding but did not elicit evidence of individual understanding. "Let's complete your drawings by the countdown," one teacher said. In another class, students were asked to give a "thumbs up" or "thumbs down" if they got the answer right. However, one teacher engaged in a brief discussion with two students after asking, "[Student X,] we're deciding which measurement is longer or shorter. Do you want to give it a shot?" The student responded and the teacher probed further. "Excellent! How much shorter is it? How do I find that out?" Although absent from most observations, in one classroom, the QSR team observed a teacher call on every student to engage them and to assess their understanding. When asking questions on the details, the teacher adjusted their questions so students could explain their work.

Work Sample Review
As an added accountability measure to account for the limits of virtual observations, during SY 2020 – 21, DC PCSB reviewed ten student work samples in addition to classroom observations. Mundo Verde PCS – Cook submitted five English language arts (ELA) samples and five math samples covering a range of grade levels and

assignment types. The QSR team evaluated the work samples based on grade-level alignment to college and career ready standards, including Common Core.[4] Each work sample was reviewed in the areas of content, practice, and relevance.[5] The review tools are based on The New Teacher Project's report: *The Opportunity Myth*.[6]

The goal of the review is to answer three essential questions:

1. Does this assignment align with the expectations defined by grade-level standards, including a high-quality text and text-based questions?
2. Does the assignment provide meaningful practice opportunities for this content area and grade- level?
3. Overall, does the assignment give students an authentic opportunity to connect academic standards to real world issues and/or context?

DC PCSB used the criteria below to assign an overall rating to each ELA assignment.[7]

	Content	Practice	Relevance
Sufficient	The assignment is based on a high quality, grade appropriate text and contains questions that reach the depth of the grade level standards.	The assignment both integrates standards and requires students to use what they learned from the text.	The assignment builds grade appropriate knowledge, gives students a chance to use their voice and/or connects to real world issues.
Minimal	The assignment is based on a high quality, grade appropriate text but does not contain questions that reach the depth of the standard.	Either the assignment does not integrate standards, or it does not require students to use what they learn from the text.	The assignment builds grade appropriate knowledge but does not give students a chance to use their voice and does not connect to real world issues.
No Opportunity	The assignment is not based on a high quality, grade appropriate text.	The assignment does not integrate standards and does not require students to use what they learn from the text.	The assignment does not build grade appropriate knowledge, does not give students a chance to use their voice and does not connect to real world issues.

Of the five ELA samples submitted, two assignments received an overall rating of sufficient. These assignments were based on grade appropriate texts and contained questions that reached the depth of the grade level standards. Students also had the opportunity to use their voice and/or make connections to real world issues. Three assignments received an overall rating of minimal. These assignments were not based on a high quality, grade appropriate text. Some evidence is captured below:

---

[4] See here for more information on the shifts in the college and career ready standards here: https://achievethecore.org/category/419/the-shifts
[5] Reviewers used this tool for ELA work samples: https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/Ss1Ffy9Ab7. Reviewers used this tool for Math work samples: https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/Ca2F7INXId.
[6] See here for more information: https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org/
[7] The overall assignment rating scale can be found here: https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/bzuOyBrYzK

- Second grade students read books about the tree-to-paper process and wrote opinion pieces to inform consumers of the importance of buying products made from sustainable materials. This assignment exposed students to grade-appropriate texts, while also giving students the opportunity to connect second grade writing standards to the real-world.

- Third grade students created posters to share why they believed diverse books are necessary in their school library. While this assignment gave students an opportunity to use their voice, it did not require them to answer text-dependent questions at the depth of the identified grade-level standards.

DC PCSB used the criteria below to assign an overall rating to each math assignment.

	Content	Practice	Relevance
Sufficient	All the questions on the assignment reach the depth of the targeted grade-level standard(s).	The assignment includes an opportunity to engage with at least one mathematical practice at the appropriate level of depth.	The assignment connects academic content to real world experiences and allows students to apply math to the real world in a meaningful way. It may also include novel problems.
Minimal	More than half (but not all) of the questions on the assignment reach the depth of the targeted grade-level standard(s).	The assignment includes an opportunity to engage with at least one critical math practice, but not at the level of depth required by the standard.	The assignment connects academic content to real-world experiences, but the problems do not allow students to apply math to the real world in a meaningful way.
No Opportunity	Less than half of the questions on the assignment reach the depth of the targeted grade level standard.	The assignment provides no opportunity to engage with critical mathematical practices while working on grade-level content.	The assignment does not connect academic content to real world experiences

Of the five math samples submitted, four assignments received an overall rating of minimal. While these assignments were aligned to grade-level standards, they did not connect academic content to real world experiences. These assignments were procedural in nature, many with only one possible solution. One assignment received an overall rating of no opportunity. On this assignment, less than half of the questions reached the depth of the targeted grade level standard. Some evidence is captured below:

- Fourth grade students used a place value chart to read and write multi-digit numbers. This assignment did not reach the depth of the grade-level

standards. Students did not have the opportunity to compare multi-digit numbers and move beyond representing numbers in expanded form.

- Second grade students determined whether a group of objects (up to 20) has an odd or even number of members. This assignment did not connect academic content to real world experiences.

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 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 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 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.