DC
PUBLIC
CHARTER
SCHOOL
BOARD

April 5, 2019

Gina Mahony, Board Chair
Paul Public Charter School - Middle School
5800 8th Street NW
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Ms. Mahony:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, DC PCSB shall monitor the progress of each school in meeting the goals and student academic achievement expectations specified in the school's charter. Your school was selected to undergo a Qualitative Site Review during the 2018-19 school year for the following reason(s):

- School eligible for 20-year Charter Review during 2019-20 school year
- Tier 3 on 2018-19 Performance Management Framework

Qualitative Site Review Report
A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Paul Public Charter School – Middle School between February 4 and February 15, 2019. 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 Paul Public Charter School – Middle School.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Tracy Wright, Executive Director and Lanette Bacchus, Head of School

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: April 5, 2019

Campus Information
Campus Name: Paul Public Charter School – Middle School (Paul PCS-MS)
Ward: 4
Grade levels: Sixth through eighth
Qualitative Site Review (QSR) Information
Reason for Visit:
- Eligible for 20-year charter review during 2019-20 school year
- Tier 3 on 2018-19 Performance Management Framework

Two-week Window: February 4, 2019 – February 15, 2019
QSR Team Members: Three DC PCSB staff members including a special education (SPED) specialist and an English Learner (EL) specialist and one consultant
Number of Observations[1]: 11
Total Enrollment: 228
Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 42
English Language Learners Enrollment: 36
In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:
Visit 1: February 5, 2019 – 94.5%
Visit 2: February 6, 2019 – 94.4%
Visit 3: February 12, 2019 – 96.4%
Visit 4: February 15, 2019 – 94.9%

Summary
Paul PCS's mission is "to offer all students a quality academic education which will enable them to become responsible and productive individuals, critical and independent thinkers, cooperative team players and outstanding community leaders." Overall the QSR team observed mixed evidence that the school is meeting its mission. The quality of instruction quality varied widely, as did the observed commitment of teachers and students to create productive and cooperative learning environments. In some observations, students participated enthusiastically and shared resources readily; while in others, negative interactions impacted the learning environment.

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

---

[1] DC PCSB observed 2 co-taught SPED observations, 1 self-contained SPED observation, 2 EL observations, and 6 general education observations.

Appendix I and II). The QSR team scored 66% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. This is about the same as the school's previous score of 67% in this domain during its last QSR in 2014.[2] In the component of *Managing Classroom Procedures*, 91% of observations were scored as proficient and none as unsatisfactory, the highest rating in either domain. DC PCSB observers found the majority of classroom routines and procedures were effective. Students knew where to get materials and many teachers had routines in place for effective transitions. The QSR team scored 49% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. This is slightly higher than the school's previous scores of 43% distinguished or proficient during its QSR in 2014. For the Danielson components of *Communicating with Students* and *Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques,* each had more than half of the observations rated as proficient or distinguished. In several observations, teachers explained the purpose for learning or the content clearly and prompted students to explain their thinking and engage actively.

In-School Suspension
During the observation window, the QSR team visited the In-School Suspension room once. At that time, six students were in the room; four worked on laptops, one wrote out a reflection sheet, and one worked with the teacher in the room. The teacher informed the QSR observer that students were there for various reasons with some staying for a short period of time while others stayed for the full day. Classroom teachers provided work to those students staying for the day. For students there for a classroom infraction, they were assigned a reflection sheet to complete.

Governance
Gina Mahony chairs the Paul PCS board of trustees. The school requires the board to meet eight times per year, which the school has been compliant with for the past five years. The school has been compliant with the School Reform Act[3] for the past five years, which requires the board to include two parent representatives and have a majority of DC residents.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities
The QSR team scored 75% of special education observations as proficient or distinguished in Domain 2 of the Danielson rubric, and 50% proficient or distinguished in Domain 3. Prior to the two-week window, Paul PCS – MS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). Reviewers

---

[2] https://www.dcpcsb.org/qualitative-site-review/paul-qsr

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

looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Overall, the school implemented its stated program with fidelity as two out of three observations proficiently engaged students in learning, as described below.

- To enhance co-teaching and co-planning practices, the school wrote that co-teaching teams work together to write lesson plans, determine small groups, and designate co-teaching roles and models. Monthly professional development is also provided. Two out of two co-taught observations demonstrated parity between teachers. These classrooms used at least two different co-teaching models during the lessons, and the teachers each led instruction, provided behavior management, and assisted both general education students and SWD. Co-teacher parity contributed to high levels of student engagement.

- Within its continuum of services, the school offers sheltered, self-contained classrooms. Students were only partially engaged in learning during an observation within this setting. The lesson had a clear structure, but the instructional materials, such as video clips and guided notes, provided little opportunity for students to show their thinking, allowing most students to passively copy down key ideas from the board. Furthermore, the teacher's explanations of content and directions were unclear to students as evidenced by the teacher's lack of success with clarifying the instructions after multiple attempts.

- To ensure that lessons are differentiated and responsive to students' needs, the school explained that instructional coaches provide weekly feedback on lesson plans. In most observations, all students engaged with the same content using the same activities; however, observers saw a few examples of differentiation and accommodations. In one setting, teachers coached students to refer back to their visual aids. At one point, the general education teacher pulled a small group for intensive support, while the special education teacher facilitated a whole-group review. A few students in two other observations used stopwatches to track their extended time and help them with time management. Lastly, in a different observation, the teacher assigned students to different groups based on student mastery; each group then answered a different part of an overarching question.

Specialized Instruction for English Learners
Paul PCS - MS relies on sheltered content classes and collaborative teaching to serve ELs. The school's sheltered content courses are designed to serve a newcomer population. In these courses "EL teachers adapt instruction in the content areas of science, social studies, and math to ensure comprehension." Additionally, "the academic language used in these content areas is used as a vehicle for language learning." During the QSR, DC PCSB staff observed a sheltered immersion class and

found that the school was implementing this model with fidelity. For example, ELs in a sheltered social studies class were learning about the life of Jesus Christ from a historical perspective. The EL teacher in this setting was able to stop instruction as needed to ensure students understood academic vocabulary such as *resurrection* and *crucifixion*, but still required higher order thinking from students. The teacher said, "We need to write a summary about the crucifixion of Jesus. That means we need to write something in our own words about what we just read together."

Paul PCS - MS's Collaborative Teaching Model is designed to support more advanced ELs. The school describes a collaborative teaching classroom as a model where "the EL teacher and the general education teacher collaboratively plan and instruction predominantly takes place in the general education classroom, with both the general education teacher and EL teacher present and participating." DC PCSB staff observed a collaborative teaching classroom and found that the school was not implementing this model with fidelity. For example, the general education teacher did not know whether the EL teacher would be present in class, demonstrating that the two teachers did not discuss or plan a lesson beforehand. Further demonstrating this issue, the EL teacher had to ask the general education teacher about the lesson during instruction time, including clarity about materials and instructions for students. The EL teacher asked, "They are using the same packet as yesterday? What number are they on?" As a result, EL students in the collaborative teaching class were unable to get the support they needed from the EL teacher, who was not prepared to support students with the higher-level math content being taught.

Finally, the goal of Paul PCS - MS's EL Programming is "to ensure that all ELs develop the linguistic, cognitive, cultural, and self-concept skills to successfully participate in the academic and social experiences provided by Paul PCS – MS and beyond." Further, "the EL Program is equally committed to creating a safe and positive environment that respects, understands, and celebrates the different languages and cultures represented in our community." While DC PCSB staff did not observe consistent implementation of the school's model, they did observe a general celebration of cultural and linguistic diversity across classrooms, as well as self-assurance among EL students. For example, classroom walls, in both the sheltered and collaborative teaching settings, had materials about countries from around the world, featuring Italy and Zambia this month. Staff observed ELs consistently raising their hands in both educational settings, demonstrating a willingness to take academic risks among both their EL peers and their general education peers.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[4]

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 66% 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 64% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. In these observations interactions between students and teachers were respectful and appropriate most of the time. Students listened to each other, shared resources, and participated willingly during class discussions. Teachers in these observations made general connections with students and praised their effort. A few teachers offered high-fives or verbal recognition. In one observation after a student generated a list of synonyms the teacher stated, "You came up with so many amazing synonyms. You are the Thesaurus for (our) block. Thank you for all of those amazing words."	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	64%
	The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations there were inconsistencies in interactions, with some instances of disrespect from students and uneven responses from teachers. During some interactions between students and the teacher, student body language indicated hurt feelings. For example, one student said they believed they had received a failing grade on their paper to which the teacher responded, "No, that's not true. I never give F's. I'm not taking questions now. It is time to get started."	Basic	18%

---

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

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations interactions were characterized by conflict such as students throwing things at each other, hitting each other, and exhibiting other unsafe behaviors. The QSR team noted several power struggles that occurred between teachers and students. In a few observations students indicated through their body language or verbally that they did not care about the teacher's attempts at redirection. Teachers demanded compliance in these situations which resulted in students talking back, walking out of the classroom, or continuing disrespectful behavior.	Unsatisfactory	18%
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team scored 55% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. Teachers in these observations ensured all students worked hard and students understood their role as learners. When several students in one observation were unsure of the answer, the teacher asked everyone to turn and talk to get everyone involved. Several teachers used encouraging language to set expectations such as, "We are capable of building on that" and "Be prepared to struggle, but we can do it."	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	55%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 36% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers conveyed high expectations for only some students. In several observations students who were off-task were not redirected to engage in learning and were allowed to remain off-task, often disrupting the learning environment. In one observation the classroom discussion was dominated by one student in particular. The teacher did not insist that other students participate in the discussion. In another observation students complied with the teacher's expectations for learning but did not indicate commitment or initiative for their work. For example, students who solved a problem on the board or worked directly with the teacher were focused on the task, but students not working directly with the teacher engaged in off-topic conversations or sat idle until the teacher worked directly with them.	Basic	36%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	9%
Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team scored 91% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. Most classrooms maintained effective routines and procedures. Many teachers had materials ready or easily accessible to students and in a few classrooms, students helped pass out and clean up as needed. Several teachers used class chants or a countdown as a way to indicate needing attention or transitions. Other teachers used visual cues such as timers or posted agendas to help keep the class running smoothly.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	91%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as basic in this component.	Basic	9%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 54% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation student behavior was entirely appropriate. All students adhered to the expectations for watching the video silently and participating in the ensuing discussions. The teachers in this observation actively circulated and monitored student behavior throughout the observation.	Distinguished	9%
	Student behavior was generally appropriate in the proficient observations and teachers monitored and responded to misbehaviors effectively. Teachers used strategies such as global reminders, proximity, and individual redirection to address misbehaviors. One teacher allowed a student to take a break on their own when the student indicated one was needed. In another observation the teachers monitored behavior by shouting out students that met expectations and responding quickly to those who did not. One teacher wrote notes to two students that read, "Thank you for paying attention today."	Proficient	45%
	The QSR team scored 27% of the observations as basic in this component. While some standards of conduct had been established, their implementation and teachers' reinforcement of the system were inconsistent. Some teachers wrote students' names on the board, but this was not consistent with who was misbehaving nor did it result in a change of behavior. In other observations teachers attempted to respond and redirect misbehaviors but students often ignored the requests or paused momentarily and then returned to off-task behaviors without any further response from teachers.	Basic	27%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations students challenged the teacher and any type of established standard of conduct. The environment in these observations was disorderly and not conducive to learning. In several observations, students talked off-task, passed notes to each other, and got out of their seats to walk around. Two students ran out into the hallway without permission during one observation. There was little to no monitoring of these examples of student behavior and teachers did not redirect.	Unsatisfactory	18%

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 49% 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 54% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation the teacher explained content clearly using metaphors and analogies to help students understand. The teacher also encouraged students to make connections between the content, related symbols, and their lives outside of school.	Distinguished	9%
	In the proficient observations several teachers clearly stated what students should do and how they could connect the current task with previous learning. In a few observations teachers asked students to read the agenda or objective and then asked other students to rephrase the task in their own words. A few teachers provided models for student work and clarified student misunderstanding when needed. Several teachers offered strategies students could use when solving problems and completing tasks.	Proficient	45%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated 27%% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers in these observations attempted to explain content clearly but these attempts were either purely procedural or needed significant clarification. In one observation the teacher situated the lesson within the context of his/her unit and attempted to involve student participation during the explanation of content, but some portions were difficult to follow. After students showed confusion, the teacher explained in a monologue the conclusions that they drew from the scene. It was unclear if all students understood how the teacher arrived at his/her thinking. In another observation the teacher posted the steps of the process for students to follow but there was no explanation or exploration of the task's content.	Basic	27%
	The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. The purpose and directions for these lessons were unclear. Students responded to the teacher's instructions with confusion by asking numerous questions or not participating. In one observation only one student attempted to answer the teacher's questions with rapid-fire incorrect responses. Eventually the teacher in this observation gave students the expected answer.	Unsatisfactory	18%

| Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques | The QSR team scored 60% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. In these observations teachers incorporated discussion techniques during the lesson, such as turn and talk, small group work, and asking students to agree/disagree with each other. In one observation, students worked in small groups to explore different questions. The teacher floated from group to group asking students to justify their thinking to each other. In another observation the teacher challenged students' thinking with follow-up questions and called on all students to participate. In another observation a group of students worked on a word problem on the board.

The teacher had each student solve the problem and explain their process in detail. After each student explained how they got their answer, the teacher told the class that both students were correct in how they answered the problem. The teacher then asked another student in the class to explain why both answers were correct. | Distinguished | 0% |
		Proficient	60%
	The QSR team rated 30% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations few questions were asked to promote student thinking. The majority of questions from teachers to students led students along a single path of inquiry where the teacher responded only to correct answers. In one observation the teachers attempted to ask questions to engage students but only a few students participated.	Basic	30%
	The QSR team scored 10% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. A few students dominated the discussion in one observation, with the teacher mediating the few questions posed and answers received. No one was asked to respond directly to each other's ideas or to explain their reasoning.	Unsatisfactory	10%

Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team scored 36% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation the students were asked to draw their own conclusions at the end of the lesson. The teacher stated, "You are writing a biography. You already wrote summaries and now you are taking the information from these summaries to write a full essay."	Distinguished	9%
	In the proficient observations, students were invited to explain their thinking and most students were engaged during the tasks. Lessons had a clear structure and provided sufficient time for students to engage. In one observation students watched a video and the teacher periodically paused it so students could discuss and ask clarifying questions. In another observation the teacher provided visual cues that supported student understanding. Students used these supports during independent practice.	Proficient	27%
	The QSR team rated 55% of observations as basic in this component. The learning tasks in these observations allowed students to be passive or compliant learners. In one observation students were asked to cut, color, and glue a square from a worksheet onto a piece of construction paper. In another observation teacher talk dominated the lesson. Even when questions were meant to engage students, there was little participation and the teacher responded or moved on instead.

Pacing in most of the basic observations was uneven. In one lesson several students waited passively for others to finish. No additional tasks or opportunities for learning were offered. In other observations, students not engaged directly with the teacher engaged in off-task talk and movement around the room. | Basic | 55% |
| | The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 9% |

Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team scored 45% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. Several teachers ensured students had clear criteria for their work and often provided students with an opportunity to self-assess or participate in peer-assessment and revision. In a few observations this occurred when students solved problems on the board in front of the class. The teacher prompted students at the board to explain their thinking to everyone and students were able to adjust their own answers accordingly. One teacher prompted the rest of the class to assess whether their peer's work was correct and to explain why.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	45%
	The QSR team rated 36% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers sometimes offered general feedback to students both individually and as a group. In one observation the teacher indicated when a group's response was incorrect, but did not prompt them further with questions, suggestions, or strategies to improve their work. In other observations teachers monitored and walked around the classroom but did not diagnose evidence of learning or adjust the lesson when needed. In one observation the teacher requested global indicators of student understanding. They asked questions to the whole group but gave minimal wait time for students to generate thoughtful answers.	Basic	36%
	The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations, there was little to no feedback or monitoring of student understanding by teachers. There were few to no opportunities for students to assess their own work either.	Unsatisfactory	18%

APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

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

APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION RUBRIC

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Communicating with Students	Teacher's oral and written communication contains errors or is unclear or inappropriate to students. Teacher's purpose in a lesson or unit is unclear to students. Teacher's explanation of the content is unclear or confusing or uses inappropriate language.	Teacher's oral and written communication contains no errors, but may not be completely appropriate or may require further explanations to avoid confusion. Teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose, with limited success. Teacher's explanation of the content is uneven; some is done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow.	Teacher communicates clearly and accurately to students both orally and in writing. Teacher's purpose for the lesson or unit is clear, including where it is 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	18%	9%	0%	18%	18%	10%	9%	18%
Basic	18%	36%	9%	27%	27%	30%	55%	36%
Proficient	64%	55%	91%	45%	45%	60%	27%	45%
Distinguished	0%	0%	0%	9%	9%	0%	9%	0%
Subdomain Average	2.45	2.45	2.91	2.45	2.45	2.50	2.36	2.27

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	66%	49%
Domain Averages	2.57	2.40