DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

December 20, 2018

Wendell Johns, Board Chair
Howard University Middle School of Mathematics & Science Public Charter School
405 Howard Pl NW, Washington, DC 20059
Washington, DC 20059

Dear Mr. Johns,

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 to petition for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2019-20 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report
A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Howard University Middle School of Math & Science Public Charter School between October 22, 2018 – November 2, 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 Howard University Middle School of Math & Science Public Charter School.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Kathryn Procope, Executive Director

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: December 20, 2018

Campus Information

Campus Name: Howard University Middle School of Math & Science Public Charter School (Howard University PCS)
Ward: 1
Grade levels: Sixth through eighth

Qualitative Site Review (QSR) Information

Reason for Visit: School eligible to petition for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2019-20 school year
Two-week Window: October 22, 2018 – November 2, 2018
QSR Team Members: One DC PCSB staff member and two consultants including one special education (SPED) specialist
Number of Observations: 16
Total Enrollment: 281
Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 27
English Language Learners Enrollment: n<10
In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:
Visit 1: October 23, 2018 – 95.7%
Visit 2: October 24, 2018 – 95.7%
Visit 3: October 29, 2018 – 96.5%

Summary

Howard University PCS's mission is "to provide a sound foundation in all academic subjects, with a concentration in mathematics and science; the intellectual, social, and emotional growth of each student will be nurtured, while an appreciation for diversity and sensitivity for all individuals will be encouraged in an enriched educational environment that will prepare students to succeed in high school and beyond." During this review DC PCSB observed little evidence that Howard University PCS is fulfilling its mission. Overall, observers recorded a very low level of rigor and few examples where students were challenged to think critically.

The school uses a blended learning model where all students routinely take diagnostic exams in each core subject to dictate the skills each student prioritizes for the week. Observers noted that when teachers effectively managed student behavior to maximize learning time, the blended learning model was generally successful at engaging students, with personalized learning that was driven by goals they set each day. In many observations, however, classrooms were chaotic. Students spent significant time off-task when they were supposed to be working

independently on laptops. Meanwhile, observers also noted that whole-group lessons were strikingly low-level for middle school students. For example, in a history class, observers saw one student give a presentation about her family trip to the beach. In a science class students spent an entire class period coloring organelles on a poster.

During the Qualitative Site Review (QSR) two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teachin*g to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendix I and II). The QSR team scored 56% of observations proficient and none as distinguished in the Classroom Environment domain, which is almost 30 percentage points below the school's score of 83% in this domain during its last QSR in 2014.[1] In the components of *Establishing A Culture for Learning* and *Managing Classroom Procedures*, only one observation was rated as unsatisfactory, which indicates that teachers generally attempted to hold high expectations for students and maximize learning time. However, in the components of *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport* and *Managing Student Behavior*, multiple observations were rated as unsatisfactory. Many teachers struggled to establish standards of conduct and students were often disrespectful towards their peers and their teachers without consequence.

The QSR team scored just 27% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain, which is a marked decline from the school's score of 51% in this domain in 2014. Most observations were rated as basic in this component. There was little evidence that students were challenged with engaging assignments that required critical thinking. Most assignments required students to go through the motions and comply with teacher directions, without evidence of rigor or meaningful purpose to the lesson.

Governance

Wendell Johns has chaired Howard University Middle School PCS's Board of Trustees since school year 2013-14. The school's bylaws require the board to meet "at least quarterly," which the board has been compliant with for the past five years. The School Reform Act[2] requires DC public charter schools to have a majority of DC residents and two parents on the Board of Trustees. On December 18, 2018 Howard University PCS submitted an updated board roster with two parent representatives bringing the school's board into compliance with the School Reform Act.

[1] https://www.dcpcsb.org/qualitative-site-review/howard-university-public-charter-middle-school-mathematics-and-science-qsr

[2] https://www.dcpcsb.org/policy/school-reform-act

On October 5, 2018, DC PCSB Executive Director Scott Pearson and Deputy Director Naomi Rubin DeVeaux met with Howard University PCS's Executive Director Katherine Procope and Mr. Johns to address any questions they had about the school's upcoming fifteen-year renewal in school year 2019-20.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, Howard University PCS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's stated program. Overall, there was evidence that the school is implementing its stated accommodations, particularly the use of repeated instructions and assistive technology. However, in the majority of observations teachers assigned students to computers to complete various online academic tasks such as Summit Learning. As a result of the school's heavy reliance on technology to facilitate instruction, DC PCSB observed minimal direct student-teacher interaction and very little scaffolding of instruction to support students' understanding.

- To demonstrate that co-planning occurred, the school explained that co-teachers would teach the lesson with the general education teacher and it would not be obvious which teacher is the general education teacher and which teacher is the special education teacher. DC PCSB did not observe this. For the most part, the special education teachers followed the One Teach, One Assist model, in which the special education teacher circulated throughout the room to assist students and monitor behavior while the general education teacher served as the primary facilitator of instruction.

- To support the learning of SWD, the school reported that it offers resources such as the online Summit Learning curriculum; Goalbook Toolkit to guide teachers working with specialized student populations; and ST Math, a visual instructional program, to provide additional mathematics support through individualized, interactive programs for students. In each classroom, students have the option of using iPads or laptops that are equipped with text-to-speech software as needed. For students who struggle with reading, the school implements Wilson Reading – Just Words and iLit, which is an online reading platform that scales to a student's Lexile level. DC PCSB observed use of ST Math, Summit Learning, and iLit on iPads in each classroom observation. However, DC PCSB observed limited direct support from teachers to students, as each classroom activity relied heavily on students' use of individual computers and tablets. While students focused on using their instructional technology, the classroom teachers acted as behavioral monitors rather than content experts. The teachers monitored the students' use of technology, but rarely engaged with them about the content they were learning.

- DC PCSB primarily observed the One Teach, One Assist co-teaching model and Station Teaching as stated in the school's questionnaire. In one observation there were three teachers in the room as eight students worked to complete their Summit Learning Checkpoints. The teachers circulated throughout the room to assist students. In another observation, however, the single teacher in a class of ten students only monitored student behavior as the students worked on ST Math. The teacher sat as the students worked on their laptops and occasionally interjected: "Log back on to ST Math. What are you working on? You should be working. Take that laptop to Ms. X for the password."

- Summit Learning uses student data to prioritize focus areas for every student. To provide modifications according to the Individualized Education Plans (IEP) of SWD, the school wrote that it would use these focus areas and other alternative methods to help students demonstrate understanding. DC PCSB observed one example of the Summit Learning checkpoints in action with the students completing their missing checkpoints on their laptops. The teacher stated these checkpoints needed to be completed before the end of the grading quarter, indicating the checkpoints are used as a type of assessment. However, it was unclear how the checkpoints were used as modifications for SWD other than the text-to-speech feature. DC PCSB did not observe the teachers capturing alternative ways to demonstrate student understanding. Every teacher used the technological resources provided in the same way – complete the activity and submit.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[3]

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 56% 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 56% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. In these observations talk between teachers and students was uniformly respectful. Teachers spoke in a warm and friendly tone and encouraged student persistence with positive statements such as, "There you go!" and "Great job! I like how you're working so hard." Teachers often made connections to individual students by asking about their lives outside of the classroom. In one observation the teacher asked students individually about their weekend and showed interest in their responses. In another observation a student felt comfortable enough to share a difficult personal experience with teachers and classmates.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	56%
	The QSR team scored 25% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations interactions between teachers and students were uneven with occasional disrespect. In one observation students laughed at their peers who were giving a presentation. When one student introduced herself at the start of her presentation, her classmates teased her by saying, "Ugh. We know who you are!". In another observation a student had to defend himself to a peer, saying, "Just because I can't hear well that doesn't mean I'm retarded!" In another observation a student rereferred to a classmate as "stupid," and the teacher did not address the insult.	Basic	25%

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

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 19% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations, students showed blatant disrespect for their teacher. Students ignored directions, and teachers did not respond to disrespectful talk among students. In one observation, two students shared disrespectful words that escalated into a verbal altercation. Other students in the class silently listened to the altercation before both students were removed from the classroom. The students were sent back into the classroom by a hallway monitor, but the teacher did not address the conflict and the students continued to argue.	Unsatisfactory	19%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. In these observations the teachers demonstrated a high regard for students' abilities. In one observation the teacher encouraged students to apply themselves by saying, "I know that you all have great ideas. I am excited to hear them!" In another observation the teacher queried students by asking, "Why are we doing this?" to which a student responded, "To increase our fluency." In another observation the teacher insisted that students set "SMART" (Specific, Measurable, Assignable, Relevant, Timebound) goals for themselves by telling students, "It's not enough to tell me what you're going to do. You have to be able to explain to me *how* and when you're going to do it." Students showed they understood their role when working independently and eagerly participated in classroom discussions. Teachers insisted that all students participate in discussions by providing wait time and calling on students who did not initially volunteer.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	47%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations the teacher conveyed high expectations for only some students. In one observation the teacher encouraged students by telling them, “This is important for your future,” however many students kept their heads down throughout the lesson. In these observations, some students complied with teacher expectations, while others did not. In one observation students merely copied and pasted information from the internet onto a worksheet. Teachers in general did not demand high-quality work or active participation from students. In one observation the teacher told a student, "If you don't have your Interactive Notebook, that's fine." The student did not participate in the rest of the lesson.	Basic	47%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	7%
Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team scored 69% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. In these observations routines functioned smoothly. In one observation students quickly transitioned from the whole group to small groups with minimal loss of instruction time. Students stood up and pushed their chairs in with little prompting from the teacher other than a countdown. In several observations’ students used hand signals to gesture that they needed to leave the room for a bathroom or water break. As a result, there was little to no loss of instruction time. Teachers used timers to efficiently transition students between activities.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	69%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 25% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations' classroom routines functioned unevenly and inconsistently. In one observation students lost instructional time by starting side conversations while turning in their assignments. Another teacher had to repeat directions multiple times when asking students to transition to the next activity. As students put away their iPads, the teacher said, "I've asked four or five times for you to put away your iPad." When students continued to talk through the transition, the teacher responded by saying, "I'm sorry ladies and gentlemen, the expectation is that you're at a zero." Students continued to talk until the end of the class period.	Basic	25%
	Less than 10% of observations were scored as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	6%
Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 50% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. In these observations, student behavior was generally appropriate. In one observation the teacher proactively monitored student behavior and consistently referenced the schoolwide behavior management system. Students were eager to earn points and responded immediately without argument when they were warned. In another observation the teacher quickly addressed and reprimanded inappropriate behavior. One teacher simply looked at a student and said, "That's not cool" and the student immediately fixed his behavior.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	50%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 25% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations the teacher's response to student behavior was inconsistent. In one observation the teacher made multiple attempts to get students to return to the circle for a group discussion. At times students complied and returned to the circle. At other times, students either did not return to the circle or quickly returned and then left again. In one observation students repeatedly told one another to "shut up," got out of their seats, and teased one another. The response from the teacher was inconsistent. One student was sent out of the room for saying "shut up," while other students did not receive a consequence.	Basic	25%
	The QSR team scored 25% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations the teacher rarely monitored student behavior. Students ignored or laughed at the teacher when s/he gave directions. In another observation the teacher yelled over students and pled with them to "turn down the volume." Students yelled at one another and the teacher. The teacher attempted to regain control of the classroom by deducting points, but students were not deterred. In another observation students involved in an argument were made to stand in the hallway. When the students returned to the classroom, they continued to argue, but the teacher stayed at the other end of the classroom and did not notice. In one observation a student responded negatively to being reprimanded by the teacher and hid underneath his desk. This caused other students in the classroom to laugh loudly as they continued to engage in off-task behavior.	Unsatisfactory	25%

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. Overall, the QSR team scored only 27% 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	The QSR team scored 31% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations the teacher clearly stated what students would be learning. In one observation the teacher said, "Today we will be working on presenting to the class. You are going to finish your picture, read the essay, and show the picture of your superhero." Students began working right away and did not have to ask any questions to clarify the directions. In another observation the teacher explained to students that they would be comparing and contrasting a book they read with the movie. Throughout the movie, the teacher paused the film and asked students to describe what differences they saw between the book and the movie. All teachers in these observations used appropriate vocabulary to explain the content.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	31%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team score 69% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers had to clarify the learning tasks so that students could complete assignments. In one observation students worked on the incorrect assignment. The teacher realized mid-lesson and had to clarify what students should be doing. Explanation of content in these observations was strictly procedural. One teacher asked students to read word problems aloud, but there were no opportunities for students to think critically or engage with the content in a meaningful way. The teacher completed the problems on the board, and the students simply copied his/her work. In another observation the teacher misused a vocabulary term and repeated this error throughout the lesson. This led to confusion among students.	Basic	69%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques	The QSR team scored just 20% of observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. In these observations the teacher used open-ended questions that invited students to think and/or offer multiple possible answers. In one observation the teacher asked as the discussion question, "What would you do if you were president for the day?" The teacher allowed multiple students to answer and only interjected when necessary to move the conversation forward. In another observation students were invited to engage in a dialogue about a text. Students asked questions, responded to one another, and made connections between the text and their personal lives.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	20%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 53% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations' questions were not designed to promote higher-order thinking. For example, one teacher's questions only required a single correct answer: "What is the height? What is the base? What do I do next?" In one observation, a student responded incorrectly and was met with harsh criticism from the teacher, who said: "What's the problem? You have the height right here. Why are you acting like you don't know it? This is ridiculous. What were you doing when we went over this?" In another observation students were invited to ask questions of their peers, but the teacher allowed the discussion to continue despite incorrect or incomplete answers. As a result, the discussion fell flat as the teacher did not provide support to help correct student misunderstandings. In another observation the level of questioning varied among groups of students. One group was engaged in scientific questions, while other groups were using the internet to answer fill-in-the-blank worksheets.	Basic	53%
	The QSR team scored 27% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations, questions were asked in rapid succession and did not invite student thinking. In one observation the teacher did not ask students to explain their thinking, and the work included only multiple-choice questions and answers. In another 40-minute observation, the teacher only had one academic discussion with a student. Other students were either engaged in off-topic discussions or coloring in their posters.	Unsatisfactory	27%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team scored 38% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations students were intellectually engaged in the lesson. In one observation students engaged in a classroom discussion based on a group reading where most students participated. The teacher used a variety of resources, including Cornell notes and a video to support student engagement. In another observation students were eager to finish their work so that they could share it with their classmates. Before sharing, students worked on iPads to create a presentation and write a descriptive essay. Lesson pacing encouraged active student participation and engagement. In the twenty minutes allowed for this activity, 100% of students finished the task and enthusiastically moved on to other assignments.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	38%
	The QSR team scored 50% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations only some students were engaged in the lesson. In one observation students clicked through slides and merely copied text onto a worksheet. The pacing of some lessons led to downtime and decreased student participation. During independent work time students had side conversations or wandered around the room. In one observation classroom engagement was mixed. Some students completed peer reviews of lab reports, while others used Google to complete a fill-in-the-blank activity. During the observation students became disengaged while the teacher worked exclusively with one group of students. In another observation students were not required to think critically or explore the content beyond the most basic level.	Basic	50%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 13% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations only a few students were engaged in the lesson. Several students were observed with their heads down. Learning tasks required only recall or had a single correct response. The pacing of one lesson was uneven, in which students had only completed the “Do Now” activity after twenty-five minutes of the class period had passed. At the conclusion of the lesson, only a few students had completed the planned assignment for that day.	Unsatisfactory	13%
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team scored 19% of observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. In these observations, students were invited to assess their own work and make improvements. In one observation some students peer reviewed each other’s lab reports and gave one another feedback. In another observation, the teacher elicited evidence of student learning through direct questioning. The teacher posed a series of questions to check for student understanding of different vocabulary words. The teacher asked, “On a scale of one to five, how well do you understand and think you can use this word?” The students submitted their answers to be discussed in real time. In another observation, the teacher used a student exemplar as a model to describe for the class exactly her expectations for the assignment before having them to create their own. The teacher later asked students to present to the class and provided individual feedback to each student at the end of their presentation. One piece of feedback was, “I like how you included a reason for your superhero kidnapping police officers. It helped me to understand his motivation better.”	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	19%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 69% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations there was little evidence that students understood how their work would be evaluated. One teacher said, "I looked at your presentations, and they look great so far. If you turn it in on time, you'll receive extra points." Feedback given to students was not specific or geared towards future improvement of their work. Some pieces of general feedback were, "Overall decent job," and "I'm proud of you for getting up there." The expectation appeared to be for students to complete the assignment with no mention of what quality work should look like. In another classroom the majority of the teacher feedback was focused on students getting their laptops, working and being on the correct website. The teacher repeated, "You should be on ST Math and nowhere else. This is what I'm looking for."	Basic	69%
	The QSR team scored 13% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations it appeared students were unclear on how their work would be evaluated. All feedback from the teacher was strictly procedural and focused on the completion of the task. The teacher asked, "Do you need help?" and "Are you ok or are you stuck?" Another adult present in the room also did not provide individual feedback. The teacher asked, "Are you going to do the next one?"	Unsatisfactory	13%

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

APPENDIX III: SCORE BREAKDOWN BY COMPONENT

Percent of:	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	19%	7%	6%	25%	0%	27%	13%	13%
Basic	25%	47%	25%	25%	69%	53%	50%	69%
Proficient	56%	47%	69%	50%	31%	20%	38%	19%
Distinguished	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Subdomain Average	**2.38**	**2.40**	**2.63**	**2.25**	**2.31**	**1.93**	**2.25**	**2.06**

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	56%	27%
Domain Averages	**2.41**	**2.14**