



June 7, 2017

Thomas O'Hara, Board Chair  
Center City Public Charter School – Brightwood Campus  
6008 Georgia Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. O'Hara:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, DC PCSB shall monitor the progress of each school in meeting the goals and student academic achievement expectations specified in the school's charter. Your school was selected to undergo a Qualitative Site Review during the 2016-17 school year for the following reason:

- School eligible for 10-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year

**Qualitative Site Review Report**

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Center City PCS - Brightwood Campus between March 27, 2017 and April 7, 2017. Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report focuses primarily on the following areas: charter mission and goals, classroom environments, and instructional delivery.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at Center City PCS - Brightwood.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux  
Deputy Director

Enclosures  
cc: School Leader

# Qualitative Site Review Report

**Date:** June 7, 2017

## **Campus Information**

**Campus Name:** Center City PCS – Brightwood

**Ward:** 4

**Grade levels:** PK3-8

## **Qualitative Site Review Information**

**Reason for visit:** School eligible for 10-year Charter Review during 2017-18 school year

**Two-week window:** March 27, 2017 - April 7, 2017

**QSR team members:** 2 DC PCSB staff including 1 English Language Learning Specialist, 2 consultants including 1 Special Education specialist

**Number of observations:** 18

**Total enrollment:** 276

**Students with Disabilities enrollment:** 27

**English Language Learners enrollment:** 77

**In-seat attendance<sup>1</sup> on the days the QSR team conducted observations:**

**Visit 1:** March 27 - 97%

**Visit 2:** March 30 - 96.6%

**Visit 3:** March 31 - 94.3%

**Visit 4:** April 4 - 98.1%

## **Summary**

Center City Public Charter School's mission is to empower students for lifelong success by building strong character, promoting academic excellence and generating public service throughout Washington, DC.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environments and instructional delivery (see Appendix I). Overall the visit was positive with strong evidence that the school is meeting its mission. More than 80% of observations were scored as distinguished or proficient, and none received a score of unsatisfactory.

The QSR team scored 83% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. This is the exact same score for this domain as the one from the QSR team visit in April, 2013. The highest scoring component in this domain was *Establishing a Culture for Learning*. The QSR team rated 94% of the observations as proficient or distinguished. This was also the highest scoring component four years ago. In most classrooms, teachers demonstrated high expectations for student learning and hard work, and students clearly understood their role as learners. Overall there was a strong sense of conviction that everyone can and would learn. Also noteworthy is that 28% of observations scored distinguished in the component of *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport*. In these classrooms, there was genuine warmth and teachers were

---

<sup>1</sup> This data has not been validated by the school. DC PCSB pulled the data in May 2017.

highly sensitive to all students as individuals. There was also a value on intellectual risk taking, as evidenced by the high levels of student participation even when students were asking questions or were unsure of the answer.

The QSR team scored 85% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain compared with approximately 75% of observations in 2013. The highest scoring component in this domain was *Communicating with Students* where 100% of observations were rated as distinguished or proficient. All teachers explained the content clearly, and focused on modeling, scaffolding, and/or strategies students could use when solving problems on their own. Teachers used rich vocabulary in context and insisted on the same usage from students.

### Governance

DC PCSB reviewed the meeting minutes from Center City PCS' Board of Directors meeting on March 15, 2017. A quorum was present. The board discussed the recent science fair among all six Center City PCS campuses. The CEO shared that he is working to improve employee retention and academic achievement. The Finance and Academic Committees discussed a joint meeting to finalize the current and three-year budgets of each campus. The Academic Committee reviewed midyear MAP results and explained that Principals and Assistant Principals are coaching teachers in preparation for the PARCC test. The CEO informed the Board that Center City PCS received official notification of accreditation.

### Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, Center City PCS – Brightwood provided answers to specific questions posed by DC PCSB regarding the provision of instruction to Students with Disabilities. A Special Education specialist looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Overall the school effectively implemented their special education program as described in the questionnaire.

- The school reported in its Special Education Questionnaire that general education teachers have the support of the inclusion teacher so that co-teaching can happen for a majority of the day. In these observations the two special educators pulled students out of the general education classroom and one pushed in and taught a small group.
- The school reported using informal assessment measures for students with disabilities during instruction. Two special educators were observed taking anecdotal notes while they were with their students. One teacher used student class work to gauge their understanding of the material presented.

### Instruction for English Learners

Prior to the two-week QSR window, Center City PCS – Brightwood completed DC PCSB's English Language Learners (ELL) Questionnaire. The questionnaire captures critical aspects of the school's ELL program. During the QSR window, an ELL specialist looked for evidence of fidelity to the school's self-reported ELL program. Overall, DC PCSB staff found that the school is implementing its ELL Program with fidelity. A more detailed explanation of our findings is laid out below.

- According to Center City PCS – Brightwood’s ELL Questionnaire, the school uses an inclusion model to support most of its ELLs. All general educators work in collaboration with ELL inclusion teachers. DC PCSB staff observed ELL inclusion teachers in two classrooms. In one classroom the general education teacher and ELL inclusion teacher both circulated the classroom and provided one on one support to students as needed. In another observation an ELL inclusion teacher worked with a small group of ELL students in a corner of the classroom.
- The school uses a newcomer curriculum for level 1 and 2 ELLs. Per the school’s questionnaire, students participating in the newcomer curriculum are the only students who receive pull-out instruction. DC PCSB staff observed a pull-out session, with six students and one ELL teacher. In the pull-out setting, students learned about sentence structure, formatting, and basic punctuation.
- The school said DC PCSB would see inclusion teachers modifying content for ELLs. DC PCSB staff observed evidence of modified content through the class agenda and homework assignments written on the board. Students were grouped depending on need and assigned to work independently or in small groups with an ESL inclusion teacher. It was clear from reading the assignments on the whiteboard that homework was assigned based on student groups ability level.
- The school noted that teachers would teach differentiated lessons for ELLs in “parallel, station, or small group teaching structures.” DC PCSB staff saw teachers using primarily small group and station teaching structures to differentiate for ELL students. In one observation an ELL inclusion teacher read aloud with ELL students, answered their questions, and helped them track their words as they read a chapter book.

**CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS**

This table summarizes qualitative evidence related to the goals and academic achievement expectations as detailed in the school’s charter and subsequent charter amendments. Some charter goals can only be measured quantitatively. The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team recorded evidence of what the school is doing on the ground to meet these quantitative goals. During the charter review or charter renewal process, DC PCSB staff will use quantitative data to assess whether the school met those goals.

<b>Mission and Goals</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
<p>Mission:</p> <p>The mission of Center City Public Charter School is to empower our children for success through a rigorous academic program and strong character education while challenging students to pursue personal excellence in character, conduct, and scholarship in order to develop the skills necessary to both serve and lead others in the 21st century.</p>	<p>The QSR team saw strong evidence that Center City PCS – Brightwood is meeting its mission. Classrooms were inviting and discourse between students as well as between adults and students was respectful, encouraging, and very polite. Student work, displayed on the classroom walls and in the hallways, reflected feedback from teachers. Overall there was a strong sense of community throughout the building. For example, an administrator was observed actively engaging with a parent through the use of an interpreter to ensure clear communication about how the student was doing.</p> <p>In all observations the learning objectives and instruction were clear. Teachers used rich appropriate vocabulary for the grade and topic. For example, in one early childhood classroom there was evidence on the wall of the unit of archaeology and paleontology. In the sensory center, students explored pebbles and soil. Many teachers modeled the thought process for students before asking them to complete tasks on their own. Questioning was generally a mix of high and low level questioning, with many questions geared towards students improving their work, like “What can you do to improve this section?” Student engagement was high overall and most students exhibited a strong desire to learn. In over a quarter of the classrooms, we observed a strong value placed on intellectual risk-taking.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>While there were no specific observations focused on character development, teachers often incorporated positive narration, noting students who followed directions, as a way to reinforce behavioral expectations. Students encouraged each other with "shines" in several classrooms. Students demonstrated "excellence in character" by being respectful to each other and to adults throughout the building.</p> <p>Overall behavior was appropriate in all classrooms. Students responded to gentle redirection from teachers. In most classrooms standards of conduct had been well established. Many classrooms used similar signals for students to respond to each other and to gain access to materials or personal needs.</p>
<p>Goals:</p> <p>Center City PCS proposes that at least 70% of all students in grades K-8 will achieve at or above the 40th percentile or meet/exceed their spring growth target in math and reading based on NWEA MAP national norms by June of each year.</p>	<p>There is strong evidence that the school community is aware of and committed to student learning and growth. Data walls were present in many classrooms, including early childhood. Teachers assessed students individually and provided clear and appropriate feedback and support as needed.</p> <p>The QSR team saw many examples of differentiated instruction. For example, during one ELA observation, all students read the same text with differentiated support. One group worked with the teacher, one group was allowed to talk to each other and another group sat independently reading.</p> <p>In many math and ELA classrooms, dialogue about learning and problem solving dominated instruction and students expended effort to work accurately. There were two teachers in most classrooms who addressed students' questions promptly</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>and provided additional support when needed.</p> <p>See goals 2 and 3 for additional evidence and examples of reading and math instruction.</p>
<p>Students will read and comprehend grade level appropriate text in the core content areas.</p>	<p>Center City PCS indicated in their pre-observation documents that there is a focus on complex texts and the use of read alouds, close reads, and text sets aligned with the curricular topics. The QSR team did not observe evidence of most of these specific instructional practices. During one "listening and learning" time (as indicated on the schedule), the teacher read aloud a few lines of text and had a visual to match. There was a reinforcement of vocabulary and students made predictions about the text.</p> <p>The QSR team saw students in many classrooms engaged with text in various ways. In one science observation appropriate text was incorporated and the teacher highlighted key vocabulary. In some primary classrooms, this began with the morning message. Missing letters became a springboard for sound and letter formation practice.</p> <p>The QSR team also observed multiple classrooms where writing was the focus. For example, in a primary classroom, students worked on writing their own fairy tales with a scaffolded organizer for pre-writing. In another observation the teacher worked with students individually to write essays based on non-fiction text, modeling the thought process for writing the essay as she read. Additionally in one class students were introduced to a project for the text, "Animal Farm".</p>

<b>Mission and Goals</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
<p>Students will master and apply grade-level appropriate computation skills and concepts; they will use mathematical reasoning to solve problems.</p>	<p>Center City PCS indicated in their pre-observation documents a focus on conceptual development, mathematical reasoning and focused fluency practice. The QSR team saw a few examples of these practices in classrooms.</p> <p>The use of feedback was inconsistent across the school during math instruction. In one observation, students played a sorting game as they waited for other students to finish their breakfast. The teacher came over to look at what they were doing and then gave the students specific feedback on the sorting activity. In another math observation students worked on long division in a small group. There were a few global checks for understanding, but no follow up to determine how students were able to apply the strategies shown.</p> <p>Other math observations included modeling and probing questions that encouraged students to explain their thinking. In an elementary math class, the teacher presented content clearly, modeled her thought process, and then constantly assessed students by asking comprehension questions and reviewing their work. The teacher asked students to walk her through each part of the problem as she wrote it down for all students to see. In another math review observation, the teacher asked students to demonstrate their work on the board and probed with questions like, "If I divide it, does that mean my number will be higher? What does that mean? What am I finding?" There was also time for students to compare their strategies.</p>
<p>All Center City PCS campuses will achieve an average of at least 90% attendance each year.</p>	<p>On each day of observations, the school had attendance rates well above 90%.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p><b>In-seat attendance on the days the QSR team conducted observations:</b></p> <p><b>Visit 1:</b> March 27 - 97%</p> <p><b>Visit 2:</b> March 30 - 96.6%</p> <p><b>Visit 3:</b> March 31 - 94.3%</p> <p><b>Visit 4:</b> April 4 - 98.1%</p>
<p>All Center City PCS campuses should achieve an average of at least 75% re-enrollment each year.</p>	<p>DC PCSB will review quantitative data from the Performance Management Framework to assess this goal for the review.</p>
<p>Center City PCS students will build character by performing community service. Our goal is for at least 75% of students in grades 4-8 to participate in a minimum of two community service activities annually as measured by student exit tickets and tracked through PowerSchool.</p>	<p>During the observation window the school held a community service event in the gym. The activities were connected to why recycling is important. Students decorated boxes to use for recycling and made Earth Day posters.</p>

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

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Classroom Environments 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 83% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<p><b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored 89% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Throughout the school there was a pervasive feeling of respect, warmth, and genuine care and concern for students. Teachers used encouraging phrases, terms of endearment for students, and appropriate physical affection to calm students down and to help when needed.</p>	Distinguished	28%
	<p>In several distinguished observations teachers made connections to their lives and the lives of their students outside of school. One teacher shared how his grandmother had read the book the class was about to read. Other observations had an environment where everyone's ideas were valued and students participated freely.</p> <p>Students in many classrooms were eager to share their work and ideas freely with each other and with the teachers. There was a clear sense of pride from the students and enthusiastic responses from their supporting adults.</p>	Proficient	61%
	<p>The QSR team rated 11% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations the teacher was sometimes disrespectful to students. One teacher was visibly frustrated and sarcastic with students. This teacher's behavior included eye rolling and loud sighs.</p>	Basic	11%

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

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	<p>The QSR team scored an impressive 94% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Most classrooms were cognitively busy places where teachers expressed belief in all students and students worked diligently even when not working directly with a teacher. Many teachers used phrases such as, "You can do this. I believe you can do this" or "You don't learn if you don't make mistakes".</p> <p>During work time students in most classrooms worked the whole time whether it was on a writing task, silent reading, or center time. In a distinguished early childhood classroom, teachers worked with students individually on differentiated tasks and students assisted their peers in centers. In another observation all students were engaged and very lively. The teacher encouraged persistence with students, telling them things like "You got this!" after a student went up to the teacher to discuss his next project. The teacher expected excellence as she encouraged students to look at exemplar work from other students. Students put forth good effort to complete work of high quality, asking the teacher questions to improve their work.</p>	Distinguished	11%
		Proficient	83%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as basic in this component.	Basic	6%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	<p>The QSR team rated 78% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Routines were clearly established in most classrooms, allowing students to be productively engaged and uninterrupted during work times. Many classrooms had common non-verbal signals students could use to indicate a need, such as going to the bathroom or needing a pencil.</p>	Distinguished	6%
	<p>Transitions happened without incident and students knew how to move from one activity to another. In some classrooms teachers gave verbal directions at each step of the transition while in other observations students transitioned more automatically, however no instructional time was lost in either situation. In another classroom the teacher used a timer and asked students how long they needed to complete their work. Time reminders were given and students complied when it was time to clean up.</p> <p>In several classrooms students helped manage transitions, such as dismissing students to a new center or passing out materials.</p>	Proficient	72%
	<p>The QSR team scored 22% of the observations as basic in this component. Several classrooms were disorganized and students had difficulties finding their materials. This resulted in some loss of instructional time. In one observation the learning task was partially unplanned. Some directions were written on the student copy while others were typed onto the overhead by the teacher during class time. In another classroom, there was no clear next step after students completed their assessment. Many were observed doodling or staring into space. Although they remained quiet, there was a loss of instructional time.</p>	Basic	22%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	The QSR team scored 72% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Behavior was generally appropriate in most observations. Teachers used reminders and proximity to redirect as needed. Several teachers also narrated and named students who were following directions as an incentive for others. Some teachers referenced class systems during reminders, such as one teacher who said, "I'm listening to the noise - If I hear you, it's an automatic level." Another teacher used a "strike" system and when they used this term, students immediately redirected their behavior.	Distinguished	16%
	In one distinguished observation students were genuinely concerned when a student got sick. They helped each other navigate around the area that was off limits and reminded each other the other centers that were available.	Proficient	56%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 28% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers were either harsh with some students or did not have clear and effective systems for managing student behavior. For example, in one observation the teacher sent a student into the hall for over 15 minutes for standing at his desk. This was harsh in comparison to how other students received consequences. In another observation a student repeatedly requested help dealing with another student. The teacher ignored the plea and then got visibly frustrated that the students could not work together and told the initial student to brush it off. The student started to cry.</p> <p>The QSR team observed unclear systems or guidelines for student behavior. For example, one teacher gave out positive and negative points, but that did not seem to curb the negative behavior. It was also unclear how the points were tracked by the teacher as nothing was recorded and many points were given out.</p>	Basic	28%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory 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 85% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Instruction domain.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<p><b>Communicating with Students</b></p>	<p>The QSR team scored a notable 100% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. All observed teachers stated what students would be learning and doing. This clarity was understood by students as evidenced by their on-task and productive work times.</p> <p>Many teachers modeled strategies or procedures that students could use. For example, one teacher modeled the thought process for students on how to distinguish a main idea from a detail.</p>	Distinguished	6%
	<p>Several teachers scaffolded the content. In one classroom there was differentiated homework assignments. In another observation the teacher began by reading a math problem and asking students to identify what they knew. Then the teacher asked students to describe the next steps, and modeled what they said. Additionally the teacher prodded students to consider multiple ways of approaching the problem.</p>	Proficient	94%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as basic in this component.</p>	Basic	0%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 78% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. There was a mix of low and high-level questions posed by teachers. In some classrooms students asked unprompted questions to clarify their own understanding. In one distinguished observation a few students asked questions about unfamiliar vocabulary. Some students in another observation asked the teacher for support with their work and the teacher then prompted them to talk to three classmates first. The QSR team also noticed students in several classrooms building on each other's ideas.</p>	Distinguished	6%
	<p>Some teachers provided time for students to engage in discussion themselves. In one classroom students were able to work with a partner or small group during independent work time. In another observation the teacher asked students to share their math problem solving strategy with a partner before sharing out with the whole group.</p>	Proficient	72%
	<p>The QSR team rated 22% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations the teachers often answered their own questions or did not probe further to help students understand the question and content better. Several teachers asked questions with only one correct answer in succession, without providing time for alternative ideas or discussion amongst the class.</p>	Basic	22%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 78% of the observations as proficient in this component. No observations rated as distinguished. Most students actively and productively worked alone and in small groups in many observations. Students could explain their thinking and the content was clear.</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>Student choice was prevalent in many observations. In one observation students' first task was to complete a mosaic of an emperor, and then they had a choice of three additional activities to demonstrate their learning of the emperors. These included an acrostic poem or a wanted poster. In another classroom students could choose how to demonstrate their understanding of the text and unit on their summative assessment.</p> <p>Pacing in most classrooms was appropriate and many lessons had a predictable structure. Center rotations in an early childhood classroom involved time working independently on computers, reading with friends, and doing individual assessments with the teachers. In another observation the teacher reviewed the purpose for student writing, asked students to connect to their reading of fairy tales, and then scaffolded support for students who had not yet finished their graphic organizer.</p>	Proficient	78%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 22% of the observations as basic in this component. In these lessons, the focus was on recall and correct answers. In one observation students had time for some discussion but then were told to copy what the teacher wrote for the cause and effect graphic organizer.</p> <p>In other observations pacing was uneven. One teacher moved quickly through the material. When students asked questions, they were told they would have to go back to it later.</p>	Basic	22%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 84% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. Many teachers frequently monitored student understanding through questioning and individual check in times. Teachers used a variety of strategies to gather this data. One teacher used white boards, others circulated and monitored student work. Some teachers called on</p>	Distinguished	6%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>specific students, not just those with their hands raised.</p> <p>Several teachers adjusted the lesson, or provided scaffolded support based on the data gathered. Students, who needed additional time or support, worked in a small group with an adult while other students continued independently. Other teachers provided targeted and specific feedback to individual students based on their work.</p> <p>To ensure students understood assessment criteria, some teachers provided a model. At times, these were examples of other student work and at other times, the teacher modeled the process for students to follow.</p>	Proficient	78%
	<p>The QSR team scored 16% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations, teachers would sometimes poll the class but not use the data. In one observation the teacher asked students to show a thumbs up or down whether they agreed, but then did not use that information to clarify misconceptions.</p>	Basic	16%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

## 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

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<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.