



November 9, 2017

Ms. Abigail Smith, Board Chair
E.L. Haynes PCS – Middle
3600 Georgia Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20010

Dear Ms. Smith,

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews (QSR) to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, DC PCSB shall monitor the progress of each school in meeting the goals and student academic achievement expectations specified in the school's charter. Your school was selected to undergo a QSR during the 2017-18 school year for the following reason:

- School eligible to petition for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2018-19 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report

A QSR team conducted on-site reviews of E.L. Haynes Public Charter School – Middle (E.L. Haynes PCS – Middle) between October 9 and October 20, 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 E.L. Haynes PCS – Middle.

Sincerely,



Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures

cc: Ms. Hilary Darilek, CEO

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: November 9, 2017

Campus Information

Campus Name: E.L Haynes PCS – Middle

Ward: 1

Grade levels: 5-8

Qualitative Site Review (QSR) Information

Reason for visit: School eligible to petition for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2018-19 school year

Two-week window: October 9, 2017 – October 20, 2017

QSR team members: 3 DC PCSB staff and 1 consultant including an English Language (EL) specialist and special education (SPED) specialist

Number of observations: 15 (includes 1 pull-out observation not included in scoring)

Total enrollment: 353

Students with Disabilities enrollment: 71

English Language Learners enrollment: 54

In-seat attendance on the days the QSR team conducted observations:

Visit 1: September 27, 2017 – 97.7%

Visit 2: October 4, 2017 – 97.7%

Visit 3: October 5, 2017 – 99.1%

Summary

E.L. Haynes Public Charter School's mission is:

Every E.L. Haynes student of every race, socioeconomic status and home language will reach high levels of academic achievement and be prepared to succeed at the college of his or her choice. Every E. L. Haynes student will be adept at mathematical reasoning, will use scientific methods effectively to frame and solve problems, and will develop the lifelong skills needed to be a successful individual, an active community member, and a responsible citizen.

The QSR team observed some evidence of E.L. Haynes PCS – Middle School working towards meeting its mission. In one of the 15 observations, the teacher required exit tickets in both English and Spanish and gave directions in both languages. A student-created mural about Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) affirmed that every student has a right to be at E.L. Haynes PCS - Middle and that every student's voice matters. In math classes students engaged with age-appropriate objectives following clear modeling by teachers. In some observations teachers used rich vocabulary and provided clear expectations for

learning, however observers saw no evidence of the scientific method in any observations and multiple observers noted missed opportunities to push students towards high levels of academic achievement. Campaign posters for student government as well as college pennants and banners were prominent in hallways.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendix I). The QSR team scored 36% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. This score is down significantly from the 79% E.L. Haynes PCS – Middle earned four years ago in 2013-2014.

Scores in this domain varied widely. In 57% of observations, classrooms earned a proficient rating for the *Establishing a Culture for Learning* component. In these classrooms teachers conveyed the importance of the content, established clear expectations for learning, and students appeared to take pride in their work. Yet teachers in the other 43% of classrooms observed appeared to be “going through the motions” and both teachers and students demonstrated minimal commitment to learning.

Scores in *Managing Classroom Procedures* and *Managing Student Behavior* showed a more consistent pattern of lower scores with 78% of classrooms earning basic or unsatisfactory ratings for struggling to execute consistent routines/procedures and 64% earning basic or unsatisfactory ratings for ineffective behavior management. Across all observations, reviewers noted evidence of established routines and classroom norms and yet saw minimal follow-through or consequences for students who ignored or refused to follow these practices. Students rarely demonstrated egregious disrespect; rather subtle or passive behavior issues marked many observations. Students muttered under their breath, ignored directions, sat still when the teacher tried to get attention through a clapping sequence, or continued side conversations after multiple teacher redirections. Teachers in most situations attempted to address non-compliance and disrespect but frequently moved on when students made no change and then tended to ignore the behavior for the remainder of the class.

The QSR team scored 41% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain as opposed to 76% earning this score in school year 2013-2014. In this domain observers also noted contrasts in observation scores across classrooms. The greatest percentage of classrooms (64%) earned proficient ratings in the *Communicating with Students* component. Most teachers communicated expectations for learning, provided clear directions for activities, and explained content using clear language and appropriate scaffolding. More than half of classrooms earned basic or unsatisfactory ratings for the other components in this domain. Classrooms varied most in terms of *Using Assessment in Instruction*. Teachers inconsistently communicated assessment criteria and many

appeared to monitor student learning haphazardly if at all. Some teachers provided specific feedback to students and others provided no feedback.

Governance

A DC PCSB staff member attended the E.L. Haynes PCS board meeting on September 21, 2017. A quorum was present. Before the meeting, teachers and staff had an opportunity to meet with the board over dinner. The chair announced that meetings would be more focused on rich discussions per the LEA's year-long focus on feedback. The Chief Executive Officer gave updates on the new volleyball team, homecoming spirit week activities, high school team building trips, and the formation of SPED and EL parent advocate groups. The finance committee reported on enrollment and the budget, and the governance committee noted they are making an effort to recruit a parent representative from each campus. The academic committee detailed E.L. Haynes' progress toward internal goals and the 2016-17 Performance Management Framework. The observer noted that board members were exceptionally engaged in discussion around strategic issues.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, E.L. Haynes PCS – Middle completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program, and observed four inclusion classrooms and one pull-out session. Overall, the school program implemented several described resources and accommodations to support inclusive learning and provided more significant support to students in the Functional, Academics, Social Skills, and Transition (FAST) pull-out classroom. However, most teachers in the inclusion classrooms applied little to no instructional modifications, strategies for differentiation, or assessment to effectively achieve the quality special education program described in the questionnaire. This is noted by just 6% of special education observations scoring either proficient or distinguished in both the Classroom Environment domain and the Instruction domain.

- To demonstrate that co-planning occurred with special education teachers, the school explained that both general educators and special educators are actively engaged in each section of a lesson. The observer noted one of four inclusion classrooms where both teachers circulated the classroom and addressed instructional misconceptions. In three out of four inclusion classrooms observations, the special educator was not present during the entirety of the lesson (arrived late, left early) and/or mainly provided support to classroom teachers in classroom management.
- To support the learning of SWD, the school reported that they offer several resources such as Kindles, Chromebooks, anchor charts, Assistive

Technology (AT) devices, Occupational Therapy (OT) tools, and visual presentations. To assist with notes students are provided highlighters, posted notes, and class notes taken by others. The observer noted all five out of five observed classrooms using visual presentation of materials during guided instruction and the reference to, or observation of, class notes (e.g., notebooks, worksheets).

- The school explained that reviewers would observe various types of co-teaching models including: One Teach/One Assist, Alternative, Team, or some Station Teaching, based on the content area and lesson. The observer saw One Teach/One Assist in one of four observed inclusion classrooms. In three of four observed inclusion classrooms, teachers attempted One Teach/One Assist or Alternative teaching, but the special education teacher was not present for the entirety of the observation or was busy with classroom management concerns instead of content pertinent to the lesson.
- To provide accommodations according to the IEPs of SWD, the school stated that students receive accommodations such as preferential seating, calculators, noise buffer headphones, extended time, Kindles for read aloud, and/or instruction in small groups. The observer saw all applicable forms of accommodations.
- To provide modifications according to the IEPs of SWD, the school wrote that students receive modified assignments, pre-generated class notes and/or assistance with note-taking and organization. The observer saw the teacher assisting a student with placing finished work in designated folders in the FAST pull out classroom and pre-generated class notes were common in several classrooms.

Specialized Instruction for English Learners

Prior to the two-week window, E.L. Haynes completed a questionnaire about how it serves EL students. The school wrote that it uses a content-based English acquisition model, and reviewers looked for evidence of its implementation. Overall, the school EL program attempts to integrate general education content and language teaching aims; however, the quality of instruction did not consistently engage students. The reviewer noted varied levels of specific support as described in the questionnaire.

- As a program that utilizes content-based English language acquisition, the school stated that students receive most EL services in inclusive settings and mostly in English. EL teachers may push into the general education classroom or provide small-group pull-out instruction. The observer saw English-only instruction in all settings and observed EL teachers in both push-in and small-group pull-out instruction. In push-in observations the

observer noted that the EL teacher appeared to provide minimal specific support to students. In one class the EL teacher spent a majority of the time quiet on the periphery of the classroom, periodically addressing behavior issues or redirecting an off-task student and at one point helping a student spell. In another class the EL teacher led the whole class through a review game for an upcoming test while the lead teacher sat at a computer or redirected off-task students. In one observation the EL teacher worked directly with a small-group of three students at a table in the general education classroom. The reviewer noted evidence of collaboration between the lead and EL teacher in two observations. In both observations teachers seemed to seamlessly take over from one another in leading the classroom discussion/progression. However, there was no evidence in these classes of students receiving specific EL services and the presence of an additional adult did not appear to correspond with additional academic support to students. When one adult led, the other tended to focus on behavior or remain passive off to the side of the room.

- To meet the academic needs of EL students, the school reported that teachers scaffold and differentiate the general education curriculum, “with emphasis placed on the development of the four language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.” In a pull-out setting, students interacted with the same text as students in the general education class. The EL teacher read aloud from the text and paused to ask questions and define vocabulary. All three students had an opportunity to speak and respond to questions. In a general education classroom, the lead teacher called on most students to provide their answers to a Do Now, or respond to questions about a text that she read aloud to the class. The reviewer saw students in both of these settings also engaged in writing exercises.
- To provide supports to EL students, the school explained that EL students have access to resources such as translated or modified texts, graphic organizers, sentence stems, bilingual dictionaries, and illustrated vocabulary. The reviewer did not observe the use of translated, modified text, or bilingual dictionaries. In multiple observations, however, teachers provided sentence stems and graphic organizers. In both small-group and pull-out environments, teachers modified the pace of instruction and supported students by reading aloud and pausing frequently to discuss vocabulary and content. In one class, the lead teacher provided a student an alternate vocabulary word to use when the student struggled to explain his answer to an assignment question.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT¹

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 36% 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	The QSR team scored just 29% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. Teacher and student interactions remained uniformly respectful. In one class when a student interrupted another, the teacher said, "Sorry [student] we are listening to [student] and tracking him." The student immediately stopped talking. In another observation the teacher encouraged a sleepy student to stand and stretch.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	29%

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

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team rated 64% of the observations as basic in this component. The quality of interactions remained uneven throughout the lessons. Some students demonstrated respect (e.g., tracking the teacher, saying please to other students) while others attended to side conversations, cursed at peers, or sucked their teeth when the teacher addressed their behavior. In one observation students laughed when a student answered questions incorrectly. In another classroom the teacher ignored a student who was crying while her peers hugged and consoled her. Observers noted a pattern of subtle disrespect among students and from students towards teachers that pervaded classroom culture and largely remained unaddressed by teachers.</p> <p>Teachers attempted to redirect students having side conversations with mixed results. In one observation several students purposefully rattled their seats to make noise. The teacher told them to stop and they pointed their fingers at other classmates and said, "He did it!" The teacher did not follow-up or issue a consequence.</p>	Basic	64%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	7%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Establishing a Culture for Learning	<p>The QSR team scored 57% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. In proficient observations, teachers conveyed enthusiasm about the lessons. Teachers moved around the room to support students in their work and redirected off-task students. Teachers called on students who did not initiate participation and most students worked during the assigned time. When a student struggled to describe his rationale for an answer, a teacher provided some additional vocabulary and definitions to help him. When one class finished a test review, the teacher said, "most of you have it down....I know you are ready to do really well on this." In another observation a student described the work as "good because it was hard."</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	57%
	<p>The QSR team rated 36% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations students demonstrated little commitment to learning and teachers spent considerable time and energy focusing on establishing routines or addressing behavior. Most students appeared to go through the motions of copying down work and did not participate during discussions. Teachers in these instances called on a few students while others students displayed disinterest towards completing their work. In one classroom the teacher asked, "Are you working?" to which the student responded, "No, I'm not." The teacher ignored the students' response. In another observation the students and teacher moved through the motions with the teacher commenting, "You should have at least two things written down" or "Just look on the board and read it off" when students couldn't figure out the answer.</p>	Basic	36%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	7%
Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team scored 21% of the observations as proficient in this component and no observations as distinguished. In these observations routines were established and students carried them out smoothly. Students began working on a Do Now when they entered a classroom and did not need additional teacher direction. Students placed binders back in a central location in a classroom when the teacher indicated that they could pack up to leave. When necessary, teachers provided clear instructions for transitions. In one observation the teacher provided directions from the front of the classroom while another teacher ensured students followed instructions. Students followed the directions while the teacher gave a countdown.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	21%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team rated 64% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers took a large role in leading routines and procedures, resulting in loss of instructional time. Students waited while teachers passed out papers and waited on instructions for where to put finished work. In one observation the desks were unarranged and instead of engaging the students in a procedure to fix the desks, the teacher moved each one herself.</p> <p>Routines were established, but students did not execute them smoothly. In one observation the transition to choice work (in partners, independently, or on the carpet) did not function smoothly; multiple students chose the same spot and the teacher had to move people on the carpet. In another class students talked loudly and required redirection from multiple teachers as they moved from a whole-class instruction to group work. In another observation, while some students took out books to read when they entered the classroom, others sat idly. Teachers used countdowns as students transitioned from one activity to another but students often needed reminders about what to do next. In another observation the teacher appeared unaware of which materials the students already had and asked many clarifying questions such as, "Did I collect that already?"</p>	Basic	64%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations students spent the majority of class time transitioning from break, entering class, or preparing to leave. In one observation the teacher asked students to line back up outside because students spent the first 15 minutes of class time ignoring the teachers' instructions. In another class a teacher spent substantive time picking paper clips off the floor after students refused to help. A student left his seat to ask a question. The teacher said "Go back to your seat, I will come to you" and the student got out of his seat another six to seven times after teacher's instructions to stay in seat.</p>	Unsatisfactory	14%
Managing Student Behavior	<p>The QSR team scored 36% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. Teachers in these observations consistently monitored behavior by moving around the room, speaking to students one on one, and explaining behavior expectations to the whole class. Students demonstrated few and minor behavior infractions (talking) which the teacher successfully addressed.</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>The QSR team rated 43% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers in these observations attempted to maintain order with uneven success. Students held side conversations and talked over the teacher and other students. In multiple instances the teachers ignored talking students or attempted to redirect but did not follow-up. One teacher repeatedly reminded students not to talk, saying, "I need you guys to stop talking" and "Make sure you're on task- I'm looking around and seeing people having some off-topic conversations." The assistant teacher stood by saying "voices off" as students kept talking.</p>	Basic	43%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 21% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations, standards of conduct appeared to be nonexistent, or the students did not follow them. Teachers often ignored or did not see misbehavior and when they did attempt to address it, appeared helpless when their attempts to effectively redirect behavior failed.</p> <p>In one classroom students flipped water bottles, wrote on their skin with markers and walked around the room for several minutes at the beginning of the class period. Students screamed the answers to questions out loud or sat and played on the floor during the lesson. The teacher ignored nearly all of the classroom behaviors and no student received a warning or consequence.</p>	Unsatisfactory	21%

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 41% 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 64% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. Teachers in these observations stated what students would be learning or doing during the lesson. One teacher described how students would be focusing on word choice as the teacher(s) read aloud from a text; another teacher explained how students would receive work from the past week, then prepare for a test.</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>The QSR team rated 29% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers repeated directions multiple times before some students appeared to understand the learning task and other students still continued to ask clarifying questions to other adults once work time began. In one classroom the teacher projected a learning task on the board and referred to it in passing but provided no explanation or elaboration. In another observation the teacher communicated the lesson objective and posted it on the board but still needed to repeat nearly all instructions due to misbehavior.</p>	Basic	29%
	<p>The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	7%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques	<p>The QSR team scored 42% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. In these observations teachers used open-ended questions and encouraged student thinking. Teachers provided wait time; several asked the question of the whole class, and then repeated the question when she called on a specific student. Questions included examples such as, "Why is ____ the least vivid word?", "Why is this so important?", "What do you notice about...?", and "How do you think the character felt when....happened?"</p> <p>In one observation, the teacher prompted students to come up with unique ways to start with 8 and result in the value of zero ($8 + -5 + -3$). The teacher had students work with number lines and dry erase markers and asked, "What operation are we using when we have the same sign?" Students correctly answered, "Adding."</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>The QSR team rated 50% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations, teachers framed some questions to elicit student thinking but many were single answer. In basic observations only a few students engaged in the discussion or activity, such as a review game in which students worked in groups of four and in most groups, one or two students answered all of the questions. In another observation the teacher regularly asked students to provide evidence from the text when they answered questions. The teacher asked other students to add onto what their classmates had already stated. However, only a few students volunteered to answer questions or were involved in the classroom discussion. In another observation the teacher had students do several turn and talk discussions but few students discussed the content or responded to questions posed by the teacher.</p>	Proficient	42%
	Basic	50%	

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	8%
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team scored 36% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. In these observations most students engaged in the lesson. In one observation some students read a passage and answered questions at their desk, while another group of students worked with a teacher in a small group. The pacing of the lessons in these observations appeared to give students sufficient time without rushing or dragging along. In a math class students remained engaged using manipulatives to solve integer problems. Students used expo markers to write on their number lines and other students worked in their table groups to solve problems. In another observation the teacher provided a graphic organizer that gave students choice in how they completed problems.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	36%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team rated 43% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers led discussions and students participated passively by taking notes or listening to a text read aloud by a teacher. Teachers provided few opportunities for students to engage with the material, or structured the lesson in such a way that is was not possible for students to participate.</p> <p>The materials in these observations generally supported the lesson objective. One teacher provided sticky notes to facilitate annotation. Students raised their hands and shook them in the air when given the opportunity to write their responses on the board. Pacing was a bit slow, however, and some students began engaging in off-topic conversations. Similarly, in another classroom students had some choice regarding how they completed an assignment independently. Students read a passage about DACA and chose their position on the legislation. The slow lesson pacing allowed some students to finish early and these students began to engage in off-task behaviors, which distracted other students from completing their work.</p>	Basic	43%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 21% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations few students engaged in the lesson. Teachers spent time addressing behavior issues resulting in rushed/incomplete lesson delivery. In one classroom the teacher showed an example of the work to the whole group, but only three to four students responding during the discussion. The teacher then divided up the classroom saying, "Who's working with me at the board? Everyone else put your head down and do your independent work by yourself." Students who chose not to work with the teacher chatted with their neighbors instead of working.</p> <p>In another class the students spent the entire observation on independent work. Most students appeared unclear about the learning task and the lesson dragged on as the teacher attempted to circulate the classroom to clarify the activity with individual students. Most students in this classroom sat with their hands raised during independent work as they waited for help.</p>	Unsatisfactory	21%
Using Assessment in Instruction	<p>The QSR team scored 21% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations teachers made assessment criteria clear and consistently monitored student learning. In a distinguished observation the teacher started the class by identifying key misconceptions from yesterday's exit ticket and re-taught to ensure everyone understood. During independent work time the teacher circulated and gave feedback to each student. In another class students used calculators to self-check their work. The teacher circulated and gave students individual feedback on their work.</p>	Distinguished	7%
		Proficient	14%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team rated 64% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers tended to monitor learning of the class as a whole and provided general feedback to students. In one class the teacher monitored understanding by asking students to raise their hands if they knew the answer, and then moved on without ensuring that all students knew the material. The exit ticket was an opinion question and did not target the lesson content.</p> <p>In other observations teachers used questioning to gauge student learning but students did not always respond or questions seemed phrased to the whole group. Several teachers said, "Give me a thumbs up if you understand." In one class the teacher acknowledged but did not follow-up with the student who put his thumb down to indicate that he did not understand. When checking in with students, teachers appeared to be looking for task completion versus understanding.</p>	Basic	64%
	<p>The QSR team scored 14% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations students did not appear to know the assessment criteria and teachers provided little to no monitoring of learning. In one classroom the teacher made no attempt to adjust the lesson based on the majority of the class raising their hands during the entirety of independent work. In another class the teacher made no effort to determine whether students understood the lesson.</p>	Unsatisfactory	14%

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

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

APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Communicating with Students	Teacher's oral and written communication contains errors or is unclear or inappropriate to students. Teacher's purpose in a lesson or unit is unclear to students. Teacher's explanation of the content is unclear or confusing or uses inappropriate language.	Teacher's oral and written communication contains no errors, but may not be completely appropriate or may require further explanations to avoid confusion. Teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose, with limited success. Teacher's explanation of the content is uneven; some is done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow.	Teacher communicates clearly and accurately to students both orally and in writing. Teacher's purpose for the lesson or unit is clear, including where it is situation within broader learning. Teacher's explanation of content is appropriate and connects with students' knowledge and experience.	Teacher's oral and written communication is clear and expressive, anticipating possible student misconceptions. Makes the purpose of the lesson or unit clear, including where it is situated within broader learning, linking purpose to student interests. Explanation of content is imaginative, and connects with students' knowledge and experience. Students contribute to explaining concepts to their peers.
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	Teacher makes poor use of questioning and discussion techniques, with low-level questions, limited student participation, and little true discussion.	Teacher's use of questioning and discussion techniques is uneven with some high-level question; attempts at true discussion; moderate student participation.	Teacher's use of questioning and discussion techniques reflects high-level questions, true discussion, and full participation by all students.	Students formulate 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	7%	7%	14%	21%	7%	8%	21%	14%
Basic	64%	36%	64%	43%	29%	50%	43%	64%
Proficient	29%	57%	21%	36%	64%	42%	36%	14%
Distinguished	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%
Component Average	2.21	2.50	2.07	2.14	2.57	2.33	2.14	2.14

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	36%	41%
Domain Averages	2.23	2.30