



February 11, 2019

Nick Rodriguez, Board Chair
Capital City Public Charter School – Lower
100 Peabody Street NW
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Rodriguez,

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 2018-19 school year for the following reason(s):

- School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2019-20 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Capital City Public Charter School – Lower from November 26, 2018 – December 7, 2018. Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review 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 Qualitative Site Review at Capital City Public Charter School – Lower.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Naomi DeVeaux.

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures

cc: Karen Dresden, Executive Director and Amy Wendel, Principal

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: February 11, 2019

Campus Information

Campus Name: Capital City Public Charter School – Lower School (Capital City PCS – Lower)

Ward: 4

Grade levels: Prekindergarten – 3 (PK3) through fourth grade

Qualitative Site Review (QSR) Information

Reason for Visit: School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2019-20 school year

Two-week Window: November 26, 2018 – December 7, 2018

QSR Team Members: Three DC PCSB staff members including one special education (SPED) specialist and one English Learner (EL) specialist

Number of Observations: 11

Total Enrollment: 324

Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 32

English Language Learners Enrollment: 143

In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:

Visit 1: November 27, 2018 – 96.2%

Visit 2: November 30, 2018 – 94.7%

Visit 3: December 4, 2018 – 96.2%

Visit 4: December 6, 2018 – 95.3%

Summary

The mission of Capital City PCS is to “enable a diverse group of students to meet high expectations; develop creativity, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills; achieve a deep understanding of complex subjects; and acquire a love of learning along with a strong sense of community and character. We will graduate young adults who are self-directed, intellectually engaged, and possess a commitment to personal and civic responsibility.”

The QSR team observed evidence that Capital City PCS – Lower’s classroom environment and instructional delivery support its mission. All teachers used strategies to support the school’s commitment to the research-based Expeditionary Learning Model¹, resulting in engaging instruction, relevant content, and extensive student participation. Teachers clearly anchored their lessons to learning expeditions: “long-term, in-depth studies that offer real-world connections.” Students were involved in original research, critical thinking, problem solving, and character building in the majority of observations.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction (see

¹ <https://www.ccpcs.org/program/el-education>

Appendix I and II). The QSR team scored 70% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest rated component was *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport* with 82% of observations proficient or distinguished, which supports the school's mission of helping students develop "a strong sense of community and character." The lowest rated component was *Managing Student Behavior* with 64% of observations rated proficient. Teachers at Capital City PCS – Lower were hyper-focused on academic content, so much so that sometimes misbehavior was ignored. These small infractions had a domino effect among students which led to more significant distractions. Notably, no observations in any component were rated unsatisfactory in this domain.

The QSR team scored 73% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The highest rated component was *Communicating with Students* with 82% of observations rated as distinguished or proficient. In all but two observations, teachers clearly explained how the lesson was situated within the students' broader Expeditionary Learning goals and expeditions. The lowest rated component was *Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques*. About half of observations were rated as basic. Although teachers attempted to engage all students in the discussion, the results were uneven.

Observers rated both domains slightly lower than the school's last QSR in 2014². Nevertheless, Capital City PCS – Lower's QSR scores are above average for schools serving a similar grade band.

Governance

Nick Rodriguez chairs the Capital City PCS board of trustees. The school has been compliant with the School Reform Act³ for the past five years, which requires the board to include two parent representatives and have a majority of DC residents.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the observation window, Capital City PCS – Lower described its special education program in a questionnaire. The school primarily uses an inclusion model "rooted in high expectations for strong academic performance for all students." Capital City PCS – Lower has an inclusion teacher for each grade level working in a co-teaching model most of the time. The school explained that inclusion often means small groups are held within the general education classroom. Inclusion teachers teach the same objective to a smaller group of students for additional support and reduced stimulation. Sometimes, inclusion teachers pull students out of the classroom to do the same work with even less stimulation. However, if a special education teacher uses specialized instruction that *differs* from the general education objective, it is considered a "pull-out."

² <https://www.dcpsb.org/qualitative-site-review/2014-15-capital-city-lower-qsr>

³ <https://www.dcpsb.org/policy/school-reform-act>

DC PCSB conducted five special education observations at Capital City PCS – Lower: one specialized pull-out session and four inclusion classes. Overall, the school implemented its stated program with fidelity as evidenced by engaging students in learning in all observations described below.

In one inclusion observation the inclusion teacher worked one-on-one with a student in the classroom, while the main group remained on the carpet with the general education teacher. The whole group worked on words with suffixes and compound words. The inclusion teacher worked with one student on using the strategy of “tapping out” words. The teacher started with the word “into,” and first asked the student to say the letter names. Then, the teacher scrambled the letters of the word using magnetic letter blocks and asked the student to correctly put the letters in order. The teacher said, “How would we use this word in a sentence?” Finally, the student wrote the word to “help his brain remember.” The teacher repeated this process and kept a running record of the student’s progress before moving on to digraphs.

In another inclusion classroom, the general education teacher and the inclusion teacher each led half of the class in a mini-lesson on adding and subtracting in word problems. The general education teacher explained to the students that the groupings were based on the exit tickets from the day before, indicating that teachers assess students regularly to inform strategic grouping, as explained in the school’s questionnaire. Students read a one-page story problem and then worked in pairs on white boards to come up with a strategy to solve the problem. Students then explained their different strategies on the main whiteboard for peer feedback.

In another inclusion classroom, the inclusion teacher sat on the carpet assisting students with behavior and questioning during the teacher’s whole group lesson. The teacher measured a pencil with a paperclip, a tile, and a cube and the students talked in pairs to determine why the measurements were different based on the unit. The inclusion teacher worked primarily to facilitate conversation among the same group of students who had been pulled out for specialized instruction earlier in the day, indicating that the teacher provides support in multiple settings for the grade level.

Finally, the QSR team observed a pull-out session in a specialized classroom. The same teacher who sat on the carpet during a whole group inclusion lesson pulled out five students. The teacher had two stacks of word cards: consonants and synonyms. The teacher asked students to first repeat what the teacher said: “A – apple - ah. B – bonnet – ba. What says ball? B says ball.” When students misspoke, the teacher said, “Can I hear you say it again? Look at my tongue like it’s curling. Say

loosey. Say lollipop. Good. I can see you're really persevering." Then, students each presented on a few number cards to their peers while the teacher took a record of each student's progress.

Specialized Instruction for English Learners

According to Capital City PCS, its English Learner (EL) Program "is designed to support students in mastery of academic content, while simultaneously accelerating English acquisition. Our [EL] program uses an inclusion model within the context of Expeditionary Learning, incorporating strategies and structures from the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model." DC PCSB observed that instructional staff at Center City PCS – Lower implemented this model with fidelity, as described below.

The QSR team observed students learning English language through academic content in the general education setting. For example, an inclusion teacher leading a lesson about the difference between fiction and non-fiction texts used strategies to support reading comprehension with the goal of understanding content. While asking the students to explain why a text was non-fiction, she also asked students to describe their strategies for understanding what they read. While asking students to support their argument that a text was non-fiction, she asked, "when you come across a word that you don't know while you're reading, what strategies can you use?" Further, EL students participated fully in expeditions with their peers with regular check-ins from both inclusion and general education teachers throughout the lesson.

Capital City PCS teachers incorporated strategies and structures from the SIOP model in the general education setting. For example, students were familiar with reading strategies such as eagle eye (using context to understand meaning) and chunky money (breaking big words down into smaller parts). Additionally, teachers used visual aids while working with students, such as having definitions written down for students to reference and word walls to help students sound out words as they are reading or writing.

DC PCSB staff also observed an "intensives" class, supporting EL students in a pull-out setting. Based on student and teacher schedules, students are pulled out twice a week to focus almost entirely on English language acquisition with additional support in students' native language as needed. In the intensives class, DC PCSB staff observed the EL Specialist supporting students with differing behavior needs and English language acquisition levels. Differentiation was limited by the lack of classroom management/control. Students who were not working directly with the teacher struggled to stay engaged.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT⁴

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 70% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Classroom Environment domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	<p>The QSR team scored 82% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component.</p> <p>In the distinguished observation the students led a conversation about how to collaborate before working together in teams on an expedition. One student shared that sometimes "you have to budge." Another said, "It means we have to let other people work and hear each other's ideas."</p>	Distinguished	9%
	<p>In all but two observations, talk between teachers and students was uniformly respectful. In one observation the teacher used "equity sticks" to give all students a chance to answer questions. The teacher said, "I want to make sure that I make this really fair." In these observations teachers successfully redirected disrespectful behavior among students. In one observation two students had a conflict and yelled at each other. The teacher walked over to the student and calmly asked, "Can you tell me what was going on during the lesson? I heard you yelling at him." The student explained and apologized to his peer.</p>	Proficient	73%

⁴ Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, interactions between teachers and students were uneven with occasional disrespect. In one observation a student mocked another student using a fake accent. The teacher did not address the teasing. In another observation one student crumpled up his paper because he was upset. Once the student calmed down, he was reprimanded by the teacher who said, "You will not get another one; you made that choice. Everyone gets one piece of paper so let it go." The student later went to a corner of the room where he scraped his clipboard against the floor in anger. The teacher continued to ignore him.</p>	Basic	18%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 73% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the proficient observations teachers demonstrated high regard for students' abilities. In one observation the teacher insisted that students explain their answers. The teacher said, "Take a look at your picture, what is another way you can visualize this problem?" The teacher called on multiple students to explain their process. Each student was required to use a different method (word problem, picture, number line) to show their work. In these observations students were eager to participate. In one observation a student asked, "Can I have an eraser? I messed up." The teacher responded, "I love how you noticed that something was not right and worked to fix your mistake. I can tell you are trying your best."</p>	Distinguished	9%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>In one observation the teacher asked, “What is a strategy you can use if you don’t feel like you are doing anything and your team members are doing all the work?” A student offered, “Well, you can ask to contribute.” The teacher responded, “Yes, you have to advocate for yourself. It’s part of your job in this class.”</p> <p>In the distinguished observation the teacher anchored directions and expectations for all students to plan their projects carefully, stating, “Students who really think through each step will have the most success.”</p>	Proficient	64%
	<p>The QSR team scored 27% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations teachers conveyed high expectations for only some students. In one observation the teacher only visited a few learning centers to engage with students. Other students were left to wander the room or engage in other off-task behaviors. In another observation the teacher conveyed that he/she was “going through the motions.” The teacher said, “Let’s do some literacy before writing so we can earn our wiggle break.” Many students groaned loudly. The teacher responded, “Come on, let’s just get through it.” In another observation some students were deeply engaged in trying to complete word problems on their personal white boards, but others drew pictures for the entire independent work time and did not attempt the word problem.</p>	Basic	27%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>The QSR team scored 63% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations students worked efficiently in small groups for over twenty minutes. The teacher provided a labeled folder with each student's project supplies. Labeled bins contained extra materials that students accessed as needed. As a result, both teachers provided instructional support and did not have to manage procedures at all. In another observation, one student used a bell and led the transition to small groups. Another student passed out white boards and markers to the class.</p>	Distinguished	18%
	<p>In the proficient observations students were productively engaged during small group work. In one observation six out of seven groups engaged with the learning task independently. One group of students worked quietly on the carpet with counters and manipulatives to complete the assignment. In these observations routines for distribution and collection of materials worked efficiently. In one observation the teacher counted down from ten seconds as students gathered supplies within the allotted time. In another observation a teacher maximized learning time by conducting a read-aloud during snack while the other teacher passed out materials for the next lesson.</p>	Proficient	45%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 36% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers' repeated attempts to move students along or help them manage their time were largely unsuccessful. In one observation students wandered the room without consequence after they were told to clean up. Some students continued to play while others transitioned to the carpet without instructions, leading to a significant loss in instructional time. In another observation one student attempted to distribute markers and white boards. This caused students to fight over getting specific colors. The transition lasted several minutes. Students continued to argue over markers within their small groups. In another observation one group of students worked on the task but did not effectively manage their time.</p>	Basic	36%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Student Behavior	<p>The QSR team scored 64% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished. In these observations teachers frequently acknowledged appropriate behavior. In one observation the teacher complimented students on their transition saying, "I want to acknowledge that you guys did that really safely." Another teacher thanked students for their behavior saying, "Oh my, if I would have closed my eyes, I wouldn't have even known you were moving." Teachers in these observations also effectively responded to student misbehavior. One teacher said, "Excuse me, it's getting a little too loud. I can't hear and I'm conferencing with a student." The class quieted and students remained engaged.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	64%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 36% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers spent significant instructional time redirecting student misbehavior. As a result, the behavior issues of some students distracted all students from paying attention. In one observation, a student yelled loudly at a peer over a paper. The teacher attempted to have the student apologize but the student refused. In another observation a teacher became frustrated with a student and yelled at him saying, "It is not ok to fight over a tool. We don't do this to our materials." The student became angry and threw his body against the door before being taken into the hallway. Once the student returned, he continued to exchange words back and forth with the teacher. The teacher said, "This is going on your chart." The student whined loudly and followed the teacher around the classroom but was ignored.</p>	Basic	36%
	<p>The QSR team scored 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 73%% 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	
<p>Communicating with Students</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 82% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In most observations teachers clearly stated what students would be learning and how the lesson fit into the broader learning goal or expedition. Many teachers took time for questions and modeled before releasing students to work. One teacher said, "We are going to write four simple sentences and then we are going to share. I'll give you an example and then come around to you one at a time." Students in these observations were engaged and knew what to do. For example, in one observation students worked productively in groups for forty minutes. They each had a packet with a planning organizer, a copy of the rubric for the task, and guiding questions to discuss with one another. This allowed the teacher to circulate the classroom and conference with each group about their projects.</p>	Distinguished	9%
		Proficient	73%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers had to clarify the learning tasks so that students could engage. In one observation the teacher asked students to build with Legos. Instead students threw the Legos on the floor and tossed them across the room. The teacher attempted to clarify the instructions multiple times without success. In another observation two students made booklets out of their worksheets instead of completing the assignment. The teacher asked them to complete the task to which one student responded, "I'm tired." The teacher said, "Oh please" and walked away. The teacher did not clarify the learning task any further.</p>	Basic	18%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<p>Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 54% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the proficient observations teachers used open-ended questions and invited students to think and/or offer multiple possible answers. During a whole group lesson the teacher asked students "What is another way you can visualize this problem?" Multiple students had the opportunity to respond to the teacher and to one another. One student wrote out a problem while the teacher probed: "Tell me where those numbers came from?" The student gave a detailed explanation and said, "I came up with these numbers because this is 52 inches and 67 is the sum." The teacher invited other students to respond and asked, "Any other thoughts?"</p> <p>In another observation the teacher had students explain what shapes they used to make a design. The teacher asked, "How can we cut this rectangle into two equal pieces?" and "What shape would we make if we put a line straight down the middle?"</p>	Distinguished	9%
		Proficient	45%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 45% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations the teacher asked questions centered around behavior management and did not use questions to expand the discussion. Teachers asked questions such as, "What have you done so far?" and "What should you be doing right now?" During centers, a student asked the teacher what an object was to which the teacher responded, "I don't know." The student queried, "A pizza maker?" The teacher responded, "It could be a pizza maker," and the discussion ended. Although the object was incorrectly identified, the teacher did not correct this misunderstanding.</p>	Basic	45%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
Engaging Students in Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 73% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the proficient observations most students were intellectually engaged in the lesson. In one observation students practiced writing letters as the teacher dictated which lines they should write. The teacher used white boards and markers to guarantee all students participated. In another observation the teacher allowed students the freedom to complete the assignment as they wished. The teacher said, "You can work how you want. You have options." The teacher provided students with a variety of counters and other manipulatives to complete the activity.</p>	Distinguished	9%
	<p>In the distinguished observation students initiated inquiry without direct teacher guidance and created content to teach their peers.</p>	Proficient	64%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 27% of the observations as basic in this component. Students in these observations had no choice in the way they completed activities. In one observation the teacher gave step-by-step handwriting instructions as students followed along. When students deviated from the exact instruction, they were reprimanded. When one student drew a picture (after writing the correct letter) she was sent to the carpet as a punishment.</p> <p>In another observation the teacher read a passage aloud to students and did not insist that they follow along. As the teacher read, some students had their heads on the table while other played with papers or talked to their peers.</p>	Basic	27%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
Using Assessment in Instruction	<p>The QSR team scored 82% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the proficient observations, feedback was specific and timely. When one student wrote an answer incorrectly the teacher said, "One thing I am noticing in our work is that we do a great job with addition but when we get to the number line we get mixed up." The teacher modeled for students how to do "jumps" on the number line before she/he had them correct their own work.</p> <p>In another observation the teacher checked for understanding by having students build sentences using sight words they reviewed. After each student added a word, the teacher would ask the class "Is she/he correct?"</p>	Distinguished	9%
	<p>In the distinguished observation students contributed to a rubric that had four levels of performance for each component of their project. Students used their rubric throughout the lesson to guide their work.</p>	Proficient	73%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component.	Basic	9%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	9%

APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT 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 RUBRIC

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

Appendix III: SCORE BREAKDOWN BY COMPONENT

Percent of:	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%
Basic	18%	27%	36%	36%	18%	45%	27%	9%
Proficient	73%	64%	45%	64%	73%	45%	64%	73%
Distinguished	9%	9%	18%	0%	9%	9%	9%	9%
Subdomain Average	2.91	2.82	2.82	2.64	2.91	2.64	2.82	2.82

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	70%	73%
Domain Averages	2.80	2.80