



January 26, 2018

Andrea Lachenmayr, Board Chair
District of Columbia International School
1400 Main Drive NW
Washington, DC 20012

Dear Ms. Lachenmayr,

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 2017-18 school year for the following reason:

- School eligible for 5-year charter review during 2018-19 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of District of Columbia International School (DCI) between November 27 and December 8, 2017. 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 DCI.

Sincerely,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Naomi DeVeaux.

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Mary Shaffner, Executive Director

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: January 26, 2018

Campus Information

Campus Name: District of Columbia International School (DCI)

Ward: 4

Grade levels: 6-12

Qualitative Site Review Information

Reason for visit: School eligible for 5-year charter review during 2018-19 school year

Two-week window: November 27 – December 8, 2017

QSR team members: Two DC PCSB staff members including one special education (SPED) specialist, six consultants including three language specialists (French, Spanish, and Mandarin)

Number of observations: 38

Total enrollment: 801

Students with Disabilities enrollment: 109

English Language Learners enrollment: 61

In-seat attendance on observation days:

Visit 1: November 28, 2017 – 92.4%

Visit 2: November 29, 2017 – 95.0%

Visit 3: November 30, 2017 – 95.2%

Visit 5: December 5, 2017 – 95.0%

Visit 6: December 6, 2017 – 93.8%

Visit 7: December 7, 2017 – 93.3%

Summary

DCI's mission is:

To inspire inquiring, engaged, knowledgeable, and caring secondary students who are multi-lingual, culturally competent, and committed to proactively create a socially just and sustainable world.

The school employs several strategies to support their mission including offering students flexibility in choosing how to spend time in and out of classrooms and individualized academic support. In several observations students had academic choice about where and how they completed assignments. During "brunch" each day students could play outside, socialize, or seek tutoring from teachers.

Overall, students were actively engaged in academically rigorous content that offered them opportunities to become culturally competent, socially just, and multi-lingual. Most students asked questions, participated enthusiastically, and used Chromebooks effectively. The QSR team observed classes taught in Spanish, French, and Mandarin. English-only classrooms had posters and information from other countries on their doors and around the rooms. Teachers and students spoke in several languages even when not in a language-specific class. Sometimes this

approach was used to build rapport, and other times, multiple languages were used to clarify content.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendix I and II). The QSR team scored 76% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. *Establishing a Culture for Learning* scored the highest, with 87% of observations rated as distinguished or proficient. In the vast majority of observations, teachers set high expectations for student learning and students responded by engaging and producing high-quality work. *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport* and *Managing Student Behavior* had the widest range of scores in either domain and included several distinguished observations as well as a few unsatisfactory scores. In the distinguished observations teachers demonstrated knowledge of their students as individuals both in the classroom and in their lives outside. There were also several classrooms with no misbehavior. However, in the unsatisfactory observations, students used disrespectful language with each other with little to no response from teachers. If the teacher did attempt to intervene, it was ineffective and/or inconsistent.

The QSR team scored 74% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The highest scored component in this domain was *Communicating with Students* where 84% of observations were rated as distinguished or proficient. Many teachers used rich language, clear communication, and connected learning with students' lives and/or current events. Almost all students were engaged in the learning tasks. The lowest scored component in either domain was *Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques*. Although no observations were scored as unsatisfactory, 35% were rated as basic. A challenge in many observations was engaging *all* students in discussion. In several observations, even if the teacher made modest attempts, several students sat idly and did not participate. In one class the teacher called on the same student at least three times in thirty minutes, while a number of students remained passive.

Governance

A DC PCSB staff member reviewed the minutes from DCI's July 20, 2017 board meeting. A quorum was present. The board unanimously approved four new board members for the 2017-18 school year. The governance committee gave a report on their search for a new Executive Director and new board members. The Finance and Facilities committee gave a positive report on the budget, and the Public Affairs Committee shared updates on the planned events to celebrate the opening of DCI in its new location at Delano Hall.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Observers scored 50% and 45% of special education observations as proficient or distinguished in the Classroom Environment and Instruction domains, respectively. Prior to the two-week window, DCI completed a questionnaire about how students with disabilities (SWD) are taught and accommodated. Reviewers looked for evidence of the articulated "full continuum of services." Overall, the school's special education program successfully supports the needs of students with significant

disabilities by providing them with meaningful accommodations and modifications in a self-contained setting. However, the co-teaching in inclusion classrooms did not always effectively support the needs of all SWD in general education classrooms, resulting in few of less than half of the observations earning proficient or distinguished.

- To facilitate co-planned instruction, planning time for all co-teaching pairs is built into the master schedule, and each pair completes a co-teacher agreement to determine shared expectations. The school explained that “Station teaching and Parallel teaching are the norm, and we try to steer pairs away from One Teach, One Assist model as much as possible.” As evidenced by the schedule, every special education teacher has designated common planning time with their co-teachers. Nonetheless, only one out of six co-taught observations used the Parallel or Station teaching models. In the other five co-taught observations, the teachers used the One Teach, One Assist model for at least 50% of the lesson.
- In all co-taught settings, both teachers circulated to monitor behavior and provide feedback, but there was no further evidence of co-planning. In these settings only some SWD were able to intellectually engage in the lesson; others were unable to complete the assignments with the level of support provided by the teachers. Of note, the special education teacher in one classroom did not participate in the lesson; instead, for the entire period, he/she stood in the back of the room and sporadically reminded students not to call out.
- To accommodate the needs of students, especially SWD, the school stated that reviewers might see: scaffolding, gradual release of responsibility, graphic organizers, flexible seating, check-ins, more frequent breaks during class, and small group instruction. The QSR team observed many of these accommodations, but their implementation did not consistently increase academic engagement. Students still required additional supports to access the general education curriculum. Some students successfully used a graphic organizer and teacher check-ins to read and annotate a challenging text, but others struggled to comprehend it. The teachers encouraged students by saying, “Don’t just stare at your screens; use your resources,” but some still sat passively, requiring more support. In another observation the activity encouraged higher-order thinking and incorporated scaffolding, graphic organizers, and check-ins; however, the teacher struggled to manage behavior and engage all SWD in learning. One teacher provided an off-task student with a break; however, this accommodation did not improve his/her behavior and effort.
- To provide modifications according to the IEPs of SWD, the school wrote that students with significant disabilities take their core classes in a self-contained setting where instruction is highly individualized. The school has one self-contained classroom, and the observation of this class scored proficient in each component of both the Classroom Environment and Instruction

domains. The teacher held high expectations for student effort and participation, and he/she differentiated by offering students choice in how and where to complete assignments.

Specialized Instruction for English Learners

DCI serves 61 English Learner (EL) students. Prior to the two-week window, DCI completed a questionnaire about how it serves EL students. The school uses a hybrid English language acquisition model comprising “inclusion/collaborative teaching,” a bilingual program, and sheltered instruction. Reviewers looked for evidence of the implementation of this model. Overall, the school’s EL program excelled at providing rigorous sheltered instruction; nonetheless, instruction in bilingual and collaborative settings did not consistently engage ELs in learning.

- As its self-described primary model of support, the school uses “inclusion/collaborative teaching” opportunities for all ELs, especially its large population of dually-identified learners. These classrooms feature “a general education and dual special education and EL teacher for Math and English...who have clearly co-planned.” In two inclusive settings it was unclear if the teachers co-planned because they only used the One Teach, One Assist model of co-teaching. Moreover, the teachers conveyed high expectations for only some students. By the end of class, few students had completed the assignment. Some had finished half of it; others engaged in off topic conversations; and another drew on his/her paper.
- To meet the needs of newcomers and students at Levels 1 and 2 of English language proficiency, the school also provides sheltered instruction. In an exemplary sheltered reading class, the teacher articulated clear content and language objectives for students. Most activities and assignments were appropriate for the English acquisition levels of each student, and almost all students were actively engaged in exploring the differentiated content. One group quizzed each other on Spanish/English flashcards, then practiced fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary using the *Read Naturally Live* computer program. Another group read over comprehension questions and sentence starters. After, they enthusiastically participated in a discussion, listened to one another, re-read the text aloud, and wrote down their responses using textual evidence.
- As the third feature of its English language acquisition model, the school wrote that it offers a “dual language bilingual program” that features instruction in a student’s native language. In three observations Spanish was the primary language of instruction, and native Spanish and English speakers comprised these classes. Two additional lessons featured whole-group instruction in English, while teachers provided feedback in Spanish and English during small group and independent practice. The explanation of content was clear across bilingual classrooms; however, the pacing and assignments allowed some students to be passive or merely compliant.

- Across its hybrid English language acquisition model, the school wrote that observers will see explicit instruction, word walls, visuals, small-group instruction, and “a culture of learning about others and incorporating student’s background into lessons.” All EL observations featured word walls, visuals, explicit instruction, and small group instruction, although these instructional resources and methods were incorporated unevenly across classrooms. In one classroom there was a rich “culture of learning about others.” The teacher showed respect for students’ backgrounds by making an effort to learn new Spanish words from them. During another observation, teachers incorporated visuals during math instruction, but many EL students struggled to solve problems independently.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT¹

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 76% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	<p>The QSR team scored 74% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Caring and respectful interactions were evident in many observations. Most teachers stood at the door and greeted all students as they entered the room. The QSR team often overheard friendly banter between students. In a few instances the teacher spoke with a student who needed some extra attention outside of the room, and the student was able to re-enter the classroom without disruption.</p>	Distinguished	11%
	<p>In distinguished observations teachers demonstrated genuine care for and knowledge of individual students. One teacher asked students to teach her new words in Spanish as part of their lesson. Another teacher sensitively asked a student about what was happening outside of class, following up on a previous conversation. In a different observation students respectfully disagreed with each other and helped each other as they worked through an interpersonal conflict.</p>	Proficient	63%

¹ Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 21% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations there were inconsistencies in interactions. A few teachers spoke disrespectfully to students and/or reprimanded them harshly. In other observations students were disrespectful to the teacher or each other. One student used the phrase, "shut up, you retard" to a peer. In another observation students made obscene gestures without teacher intervention.</p>	Basic	21%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	5%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 87% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component, making this the highest scoring component in this review. The vast majority of teachers conveyed high expectations for students and many specifically recognized effort. One teacher said, "I'm so impressed with your perseverance. Not a single person has given up!"</p>	Distinguished	8%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>Another teacher said, "Please don't call out. My job is to make sure every student has an understanding so I need to hear from every voice, not always the same voices, although I appreciate your enthusiasm." Students responded by putting forth effort, demonstrating excitement for the work, and asking questions to deepen their own understanding.</p> <p>In many observations teachers insisted on precise vocabulary usage and proper grammar. In most of the language classes, the target language was expected at all times and the teachers reminded students of this expectation when needed.</p>	Proficient	79%
	<p>The QSR team scored 13% of the observations as basic in this component. In several observations the teacher reserved high expectations for some students and not for others. When some students struggled to meet the expectation, the teacher did not offer encouragement or support, resulting in incomplete work.</p> <p>In one of these observations, the teacher did not engage with students during group work and instead prepared materials for another task. This resulted in several students becoming disengaged from the work and talking off-topic. In another observation students became visibly frustrated with the expectation to speak in the target language and did not take initiative for their own work. The teacher insisted on the expectation but was only minimally successful.</p>	Basic	13%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>The QSR team scored 74% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Classroom routines and procedures were smooth and efficient in these observations. Students productively engaged during independently work and transitioned to group work efficiently. In several observations students chose to work in spaces outside of the classroom. In these observations students used instructional time responsibly.</p> <p>Many teachers had clear procedures to set the tone for work times. Teachers used posters and PowerPoint slides to clearly communicate expectations. In a few observations teachers played classical music during work times to maintain a peaceful environment.</p>	Distinguished	3%
	<p>In one observation the teacher passed out the opening work at the door upon students' arrival. Several teachers had specific locations for class materials, including a bathroom pass, and students knew where to access what they needed. Some teachers used projected timers and positively narrated transitions to maximize learning time. The QSR team noted that even when students needed their Chromebooks, the transition to technology was fluid and non-disruptive.</p>	Proficient	71%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 26% of the observations as basic in this component. In these classrooms, the QSR team noted a trend of disengagement when students were not working directly with the teacher. In several observations procedures were clearly established, but implementation was inconsistent. When one teacher called for students to transition from computers to worksheets, the transition took several minutes.</p> <p>In another observation not all students responded to the teacher’s directions to clean-up, and some used their Chromebook to search for unrelated items. The process took over ten minutes, resulting in several students waiting for classmates to follow directions. In another observation the teacher spent approximately fifteen minutes working with one student to get their annotation program to work. Other students remained idle and unproductive during that time.</p>	Basic	26%

	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<p>Managing Student Behavior</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 68% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Student behavior was generally appropriate, and when necessary, teachers effectively responded to misbehavior by having quick, private, and respectful conversations with students. Some teachers anticipated possible misbehaviors and responded proactively. One teacher said, "I'm hearing some chatter that is telling me maybe you can't sit that far away from me." Other teachers used variations on the "countdown" strategy as well as positive reinforcement of good behavior when trying to redirect students, and these attempts were generally successful. One teacher counted down with the expected behavior, "Three: chrome books closed. Two: get out your punch card. One: eyes on me. Thank you for everyone who is ready, we are just waiting for one person."</p> <p>In the distinguished observations there was no misbehavior. Teachers used proximity to monitor and swiftly respond to behaviors as needed. In a few observations, students helped each other get back on the right track.</p>	Distinguished	13%
		Proficient	55%

	<p>26% of observations were scored as basic in this component. Even though many classrooms had a "behavior ladder" outlining the consequences for misbehavior, teachers in the basic observations did not use this management tool consistently and/or effectively. In several observations the teacher threatened to use consequences but students neither changed their behavior nor received a consequence. In other observations teachers ignored or did not respond to misbehaviors including several inappropriate comments by students. The QSR team heard students saying "shut up" to each other and making inappropriate noises without redirection or response from the teacher.</p>	Basic	26%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	5%

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 74% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Instruction domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Communicating with Students	<p>The QSR team scored 84% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Most teachers clearly explained the purpose for lessons, contextualizing where that day's focus fell within the larger unit. Many teachers explicitly incorporated vocabulary instruction within the content. Teachers also suggested strategies students could use during work times. One teacher noted, "I got a sense in the last class that some of us didn't understand what was going on. What I found helpful was to re-read what we did yesterday, and then start today's reading."</p>	Distinguished	11%
	<p>In the distinguished observations teachers often anticipated student misunderstanding and students explained the content to each other in small group work. One teacher offered brief vocabulary lessons with visuals on the terms "bait" and "lure" from the anchor text. A student then used 'lure' in a sentence to make an inference about the character's motivations.</p>	Proficient	73%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 16% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers had to give directions several times because students were confused. In other observations the purpose of the lesson or work was unclear. Even though students and teachers did the work, the academic focus was procedural rather than intellectually engaging. Some students remarked that they had fun doing a lab, but there was little to no discussion about the purpose of the lab or the resulting learning.</p>	Basic	16%
	<p>The QSR team rated 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 65% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Genuine discussion among students predominated these observations. Teachers used a variety of strategies to engage each student including calling on students who did not initially volunteer, stepping aside to let students respond to each other, and using colored dots to indicate roles and times to speak. Many teachers encouraged students to explain their thinking and use evidence from the text when appropriate. Several teachers also used questioning to help students connect content to their own lives.</p> <p>The distinguished observations were characterized by rich discussion where students often initiated topics or extended the discussion with questions of their own. In one observation the</p>	Distinguished	12%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	entire class got into a heated debate about the similarity of geometric shapes. The teacher asked leading questions to guide their discussions, but the students themselves led the majority of the questioning.	Proficient	53%
	The QSR team scored 35% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teacher questioning was either along a single path of inquiry with one-option answers and/or only a small number of students participated in the discussions. In one observation the teacher's questions were rapid-fire, neither leaving room for student discussion nor clarification of any misunderstandings. In another observation, the teacher asked questions that were opened-ended but settled for students giving only yes/no answers without any elaboration. Another lesson was comprised of rote activities such as fill in the blanks from listening to audio in the target language, matching words, and a word search.	Basic	35%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team scored 67% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Many learning tasks were aligned with instructional outcomes and were designed to engage students in challenging content. In one math observation students used	Distinguished	8%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>manipulatives to derive the formula for the area of a circle using their prior knowledge of circumference. In several observations long-term projects dominated class time. Student choice was evident in several observations. In one observation students engaged in reading and researching about South Sudan and had choice in their approach to answering the big questions of the assignment.</p> <p>Several teachers used a variety of groupings to allow students time to discuss together and ponder alone. In one math observation students were given a task to work on independently, then discuss with a partner, and then share out to the class. Differentiation was evident in some of the assignments and in strategic groupings.</p>	Proficient	59%
	<p>The QSR team scored 32% of the observations as basic in this component. In several observations the lesson was purely procedural in nature and did not require students to question or engage intellectually with the content. Student engagement in these observations was inconsistent. Pacing in some of these observations was also inconsistent. In one observation most students completed the assignment and engaged in off-task behaviors or bickered with their partners for more than half of the observation. The teacher did not provide any opportunity for reflection or closure on the lesson, but rather students were left unoccupied for a significant amount of time. In another observation a large portion of the class time was dedicated to a read-aloud. Students were asked to annotate, but most sat passively.</p>	Basic	32%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team scored 78% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Many teachers used questions to diagnose learning and adjusted instruction accordingly. Other teachers incorporated specific feedback, at times from peers, to advance learning. In one observation students engaged in self-assessment by writing annotations and answering universal clarifying questions about the anchor text. The teacher then followed up with individual students as needed during independent practice.	Distinguished	3%
	<p>Several teachers made expectations for work clear to students through the use of clear criteria, rubrics, or exemplars. One teacher said, we are going to split up into small groups and I will be looking for how you are discussing and working together to solve the problems. Everyone needs to contribute.”</p> <p>In another observation the teacher asked students to specifically name what they noticed in the exemplar so that they could then produce similar high-quality work.</p>	Proficient	75%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 19% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations feedback to students was vague or global and not oriented to future improvement or deeper understanding. One teacher repeatedly told students, "Revise your work," "Good job," or "Awesome" without details about what those comments meant. In another observation the teacher did not offer timely feedback. A few students struggled during the lesson but the teacher was unaware of this until papers were collected at the end of class.</p>	Basic	19%
	<p>The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	3%

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

APPENDIX III: SCORE BREAKDOWN BY COMPONENT

Percent of:	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	5%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Basic	21%	13%	26%	26%	16%	35%	32%	19%
Proficient	63%	79%	71%	55%	73%	53%	59%	75%
Distinguished	11%	8%	3%	13%	11%	12%	8%	3%
Subdomain Average	2.79	2.95	2.76	2.76	2.95	2.76	2.76	2.78

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	76%	74%
Domain Averages	2.82	2.81