



December 20, 2018

Steve Lanning, Board Chair
YouthBuild Public Charter School
3220 16th St NW
Washington, DC 20010

Dear Mr. Lanning:

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 YouthBuild Public Charter School between October 22 – 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 YouthBuild Public Charter School.

Sincerely,

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Jason Ellis, Principal

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: December 20, 2018

Campus Information

Campus Name: YouthBuild Public Charter School (YouthBuild PCS)

Ward: 1

Grade levels: Adult

Qualitative Site Review Information

Reason for Visit: School eligible to petition for 15-year Charter Renewal during 2019-20 school year

Two-week Window: October 22 – November 2, 2018

QSR Team Members: One DC PCSB staff member and three consultants including one English Learner (EL) and one special education (SPED) specialist

Number of Observations: 11 (including two special education pull-outs and a construction site observation not included in scoring)

Total Enrollment: 116

Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 25

English Language Learners Enrollment: 13

In-seat Attendance on Observation Days

Visit 1: October 23 – 54.0%

Visit 2: October 25 – 52.2%

Visit 3: October 29 – 54.4%

Visit 4: November 1 – 41.3%

Summary

YouthBuild PCS's mission is "to transform the lives of out-of-school youth in the District of Columbia by offering a bilingual educational option that combines an academic program with vocational training, employability skill-building, and community service - a program designed to prepare young people for college or the workplace while they work to create housing for the city's /low-income residents."

The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team observed classes at YouthBuild PCS taught in both Spanish and English, depending on the needs of the students. Many teachers explicitly referred to the overall goal of preparing students to pass the General Education Development (GED) test, which is the primary focus of the students' academic time. Attendance in academic classes was observably low, with rates spanning between 41.3% and 54.4% on observation days. Classes ranged from three to ten students, and many students did not return to YouthBuild PCS after lunch for advisory.

As part of the school's vocational program, students spend up to forty percent of their overall time at YouthBuild PCS on a construction work site or in vocational education classes. During the QSR, DC PCSB observed students building a community garden and outdoor learning space at Rita Bright Family and Youth Center. Students dug a French drain to redirect rainwater and built wooden plant beds for vegetables. All students were working independently and safely with a table saw. Two teachers oversaw the project, one speaking in English and one in Spanish.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendix I and II). The QSR team scored 74% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain, an increase from the 63% the school earned in this domain in its last QSR in 2016¹. The overall rapport among students and teachers was strong. With a few exceptions, students who attended school generally demonstrated that they wanted to be there by engaging with learning tasks as directed. Most observations were rated as proficient in this domain, although one observation earned an unsatisfactory score in every component. While this class was certainly an outlier, students showed a blatant disrespect by refusing to work. No student in this observation engaged with the learning task. Nevertheless, the domain average for Classroom Environment was 2.84, meaning the average teacher scored just below proficient, the second highest rating of the rubric.

The QSR team scored 63% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain, which is also up from the 58% the school earned in this domain in 2016. Again, most observations were proficient and the same class scored unsatisfactory in each component. In one component, *Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques*, scores varied widely. At least one observation was scored at each level of performance: unsatisfactory (1), basic (2), proficient (3), and distinguished (4). The domain average in the Instruction domain was 2.56, meaning the average teacher scored right between basic and proficient. While these scores are relatively strong, one must take into consideration when reviewing these scores that roughly half of the students attended on each observation day.

Governance

Mr. Steve Lanning chairs YouthBuild PCS. Two alumni sit on the board and a majority of board members are DC residents, as required by the School Reform Act². In May of

¹ <https://www.dcpsb.org/qualitative-site-review/youthbuild-qsr>

² <https://www.dcpsb.org/policy/school-reform-act>

2018, the YouthBuild PCS board amended its bylaws to require at least four regular meetings annually.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, YouthBuild PCS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Overall, the school's program implemented its stated accommodations and strategies for differentiation with fidelity. Due to the very small class sizes, SWD received one-on-one support in nearly every observation.

- To demonstrate that co-planning occurred, the school explained that the special education teacher would actively move around the room to check on student progress and lead instruction when necessary. Both the general educator and the special educator supported students in class by monitoring progress and providing support as needed.
- The school reported that they offer resources such as peer tutors, pull-out/push-in, manipulatives, and computers. Students were provided with scaffolded support in the co-teaching class and the pull-out session. In one observation students worked on identifying equivalent fractions using numbers and images using flashcards. For example, on one side of the card was the fraction $\frac{1}{3}$ and on the other side was a rectangle divided into three equal parts with one part shaded in. One student needed additional support, and the teacher worked one-on-one with him, providing more straightforward examples until the student was able to work independently. While DC PCSB did not observe peer tutors, many classrooms used computers with personalized learning programs.
- As a program that uses co-teaching, the school said reviewers would observe Alternative Teaching, Station Teaching, or One Teach, One Assist. The QSR team observed the One Teach, One Assist model in the general education classroom. The general educator facilitated the lesson, and the special educator assisted. Both teachers were engaged with students for the duration of the observation.
- To provide accommodations according to the IEPs of SWD, the school stated that reviewers may see extended learning time, calculators, graphic organizers, markup tools, audio support, preferential seating, breaks, clarification of directions, and multiple opportunities for students to show mastery. Students did have a choice in where they chose to sit when entering the classroom in all classes observed. The teacher allowed students to use their phones as a calculator if needed. Both the pull-out and push-in teachers worked with students to clarify directions and to explain problems differently (e.g., drawing a picture or helping students to make a connection) for those who needed additional support.

- To provide modifications according to the IEPs of SWD, the school wrote that an observer may see chunking of content, scaffolded lesson plans, modified computer-based lessons depending on skill level, guided notes, graphic organizers, and one-on-one support for students. In the pull-out session students were provided with one-on-one support and had the opportunity to think aloud with the teacher about how to solve a problem. Multiple observations used computer-based lesson plans based on the student's skill level.

Specialized Instruction for English Learners (EL)

Prior to the two-week window, YouthBuild PCS outlined its EL program. The school's instructional model is designed to help students establish English proficiency as quickly as possible. Students engage in whole-class learning activities, blended learning, small group projects, guided reading, writing, and read-alouds. The EL program is designed to meet student needs based on their individual EL levels. Support spans a continuum from in-class co-teaching support, pull-out groups, and one-on-one instruction, all within the English as a Second Language (ESL) class.

During the two-week window, the EL specialist observed best practices to help students establish English proficiency in the ESL class. In particular, the teacher ensured that all students frequently spoke throughout the class. In one observation students learned how to discuss goals, challenges, and solutions by previewing a text with picture supports, predicting what would happen in the story, making a chart of challenges and solutions, and reading the story using highlighters and pencils to take notes. In another observation students learned how to talk about money. Students warmed up by writing numbers in word form as the teacher called them out. Students later previewed a text with picture supports, reviewed bill values, and discussed how to get the same amount using different bills. In both observations students had frequent opportunities to speak English and the teacher ensured that all students participated in the discussion.

Overall, the ESL teacher met students at their individual EL levels in the whole-class setting. Students used various resources to support their learning objectives including picture supports for text, charts, individual vocabulary lists, and word walls. In demanding that each student participate in the discussion, the teacher differentiated the lessons by providing more time to respond, summarizing the text, directing students to clues in the pictures, and rephrasing questions. The teacher constantly encouraged students by frequently saying, "Nice work!". S/he insisted that students speak English at all times, responding to students' questions in Spanish with "I don't speak Spanish- only English!" The ESL teacher provided frequent assessment, asking students to write responses on individual whiteboards and

giving them a thumbs up or a thumbs down, asking students comprehension questions, and reviewing written work.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT³

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 74% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Classroom Environment domain. As mentioned above, each day about half of the enrolled students attended school, making class sizes small and selective in that only students who wanted to attend school were present. This is important context when reviewing the results. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|---|--|--------------------|-----|
| Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport | <p>The QSR team scored a high 88% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations there were high levels of respect and civility observed among students and teachers. Teachers encouraged students to help each other, and the majority of students willingly participated in the tasks.</p> | Distinguished | 25% |
| | <p>In the distinguished observations interactions between students and with the teacher were warm, considerate, and personal. One teacher demonstrated an understanding of students' lives outside of school. A student entered late and offered an explanation. The teacher responded, "I understand. Thank you for coming to school even when it's hard." Another teacher responded to students' incorrect responses in a way that respected their dignity: s/he provided additional time, picture prompts, and summaries. Students were highly respectful and kind to one another. One student showed a peer a picture prompt to help her answer the teacher's questions. The helping student was visibly excited when her friend got the answer correct.</p> | Proficient | 63% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored no observations as basic in this component.</p> | Basic | 0% |

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

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|--|---|--------------------|-----|
| | <p>The QSR team scored 13% of observations (which is one observation) as unsatisfactory in this component. In this observation students did not listen to their peers' responses and some laughed at those who mispronounced words or gave incorrect answers. Most students were on their phones off-task during the entire class period. Students talked back to the teacher and refused to follow directions. One student loudly sang a song containing explicit words while the teacher read aloud.</p> | Unsatisfactory | 13% |
| Establishing a Culture for Learning | <p>The QSR team scored 63% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations students were busy and teachers ensured that students were on-task at all times. Students showed effort by staying on task, reading closely, and answering the teacher's questions. In one observation the teacher structured the lesson materials in a way that ensured students completed high-quality work. Rather than having just the text, students looked at accompanying pictures, used highlighters to annotate, and referred back to vocabulary sheets. Another teacher used proximity to ensure students remained on-task. The teacher walked around the room, looked at student work, asked prompting questions, and redirected students to the text. The teacher insisted that students write in complete sentences. In the distinguished observation the teacher stopped everything upon realizing students needed help understanding the difference between "does" and "doesn't." The teacher conducted a mini-lesson and students were able to move forward with the task.</p> | Distinguished | 13% |
| | | Proficient | 50% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored 25% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations a few students in each room were disengaged from the group discussion and the teacher did not call on them or insist on their participation. In one observation a student looked out the window and ate for the duration of the class, without redirection from the teacher.</p> | Basic | 25% |

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|-----|
| | The QSR team scored 13%, or one observation, as unsatisfactory in this component. All students in this observation had their heads down, stared into space, drew, and/or refused to participate. Students talked back to the teacher and used profanity when the teacher urged students to engage with the text. | Unsatisfactory | 13% |
| Managing Classroom Procedures | The QSR team scored 85% of observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. In these observations instructional time was maximized due to effective classroom procedures and sufficient materials. Several teachers had labeled folders so students could retrieve materials upon entry and immediately start working. Another teacher supplied buckets of materials at each table, so all students had ample writing utensils and manipulatives. | Distinguished | 14% |
| | | Proficient | 71% |
| | The QSR team scored 14% of observations as basic in this component. In this observation the teacher was unable to locate the materials promptly. The lesson required measurement, but there were only two tape measures for the entire class, delaying productivity as students waited for a turn. | Basic | 14% |
| | The QSR team scored no observations as unsatisfactory in this component. | Unsatisfactory | 0% |
| Managing Student Behavior | The QSR team scored 63% of observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. In distinguished observations students generally were on-task and corrected one another's minor misbehavior. Proficient observations required some teacher intervention. When a student used an inappropriate word, the teacher just said: "language, try another word." The student apologized and the incident was resolved. In another observation some students listened to music while they completed independent work on laptops. The teacher asked the students to keep the volume low and the students were able to work productively. | Distinguished | 25% |
| | | Proficient | 38% |

| The Classroom Environment | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| | <p>The QSR team scored 25% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations the teacher inconsistently responded to minor student infractions. In one observation a few students disengaged by scrolling through their phones, and the teacher could not successfully re-engage them in instruction. In another observation some students repeatedly talked over one another, and the teacher was unable to enforce the standards of conduct consistently.</p> | Basic | 25% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored 13% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In this observation students had their heads down, drew, and refused to participate. Students talked back to the teacher, frequently saying "I'm not trying to read today."</p> | Unsatisfactory | 13% |

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 63% 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 76% of observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. In the distinguished observation the teacher explained how the lesson objective connected to the broader curriculum. The teacher used real-life examples and students offered multiple strategies and approaches to engage with the tasks. In proficient observations teachers clearly explained the instructional purpose of the lesson and modeled how to complete tasks. | Distinguished | 13% |
| | | Proficient | 63% |
| | The QSR team rated no observations as basic in this component. | Basic | 0% |
| | Two observations were scored unsatisfactory in this component. In one lesson the instructional purpose was vague. The teacher made several content errors, at one point referring to a numerator as a denominator. Students were visibly confused and resorted to guessing. In the other observation, the teacher attempted to lead a discussion about a news article, but no students participated. Students scrolled through their phones and loudly listened to music. | Unsatisfactory | 25% |

| Instruction | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|---|---|--------------------|-----|
| Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques | <p>The QSR team scored 63% of observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. In the distinguished observations, the teachers asked students to justify and explain their thinking. In both distinguished observations, students generated questions and built on each other’s ideas. In one observation the teacher posed a rich question and stepped aside as students debated and used evidence from the text to support their claims. The teacher extended the conversation and ensured all voices were heard by asking follow-up questions. In proficient observations questioning was teacher-led but the majority of students participated. Teachers used wait-time when students struggled to answer. Instead of skipping students, the teachers used picture clues and prompts so all students could participate in discussion, even those who initially hesitated.</p> | Distinguished | 25% |
| | | Proficient | 38% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored 25% of observations as basic in this component. In one observation the teacher engaged with individual students, and there was no dialogue among students. In one-on-one conversations, the teacher did not address student misconceptions. Students guessed or gave an answer they assumed the teacher wanted to hear. In the other observation the discussion was dominated by two students. The teacher attempted to include others but was unsuccessful.</p> | Basic | 25% |

| Instruction | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|-----|
| | <p>The QSR team scored one observation as unsatisfactory in this component. In this observation there was no expectation for all students to engage actively. Even though the teacher told students to pay attention, they were permitted to listen to music on headphones during a whole class discussion and scroll through their phones rather than participate. When the teacher unexpectedly called on a student, he responded, "Ugh. Why did you call on me?" When the teacher asked students to read, they responded, "I don't know how to read," and the teacher passed over them. Throughout the observation students did not engage in the learning tasks for more than a few minutes.</p> | Unsatisfactory | 13% |
| Engaging Students in Learning | <p>The QSR team scored 50% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished, making this the lowest scored component in the rubric. The learning tasks in these observations required students to engage intellectually. In one observation students read an article about a current event and debated whether the outcome was fair. In another observation students explored a math concept that had been scaffolded by the teacher. The pacing of these lessons allowed students time to ponder and discuss the content. Multiple student perspectives were considered and unpacked.</p> | Distinguished | 0% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored 28% of observations as basic in this component. In one observation, the pacing was uneven. Students copied notes from the board, and some were left with idle time as they waited for their peers to complete the task. In another observation, only some students intellectually engaged with the lesson. Others were off-task and the teacher did little to invite them into the learning.</p> | Basic | 38% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored one observation as unsatisfactory in this component. In this observation no students were productively engaged in learning.</p> | Unsatisfactory | 13% |
| | | Proficient | 50% |

| Instruction | Evidence | School Wide Rating | |
|--|---|--------------------|-----|
| Using Assessment in Instruction | <p>The QSR team scored 63% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations assessment was frequent throughout the lessons. In proficient observations teachers monitored student understanding through a combination of whole group questioning and individual follow-up conversations. When students struggled to understand an idea, the teacher explained it again and used a visual model to aid student understanding. One teacher adjusted the lesson in instances where students struggled, writing additional vocabulary and prompts on the board and encouraging students to look at the pictures for the answer.</p> <p>One teacher assessed each student individually during the warm-up as they wrote answers on individual whiteboards. The teacher kept tally marks on the board next to each student's name as a reminder of who to follow-up with for extra support.</p> | Distinguished | 0% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored 25% of observations as basic in this component. In these observations teachers attempted to provide feedback to students, but it was either vague or minimally effective. For example, in one observation the teacher only worked one-on-one with students on their laptops. The teacher offered suggestions but students remained confused about how to do the task. Another teacher said to a student who needed help, "Well, this is what you're working on," and walked away.</p> | Basic | 25% |
| | <p>The QSR team scored one observations as unsatisfactory in this component. All feedback was geared toward behavior management in this observation.</p> | 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 II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC

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

APPENDIX III: SCORE BREAKDOWN BY COMPONENT

| Percent of: | 2a | 2b | 2c | 2d | 3a | 3b | 3c | 3d |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Unsatisfactory | 13% | 13% | 0% | 13% | 25% | 13% | 13% | 13% |
| Basic | 0% | 25% | 14% | 25% | 0% | 25% | 38% | 25% |
| Proficient | 63% | 50% | 71% | 38% | 63% | 38% | 50% | 63% |
| Distinguished | 25% | 13% | 14% | 25% | 13% | 25% | 0% | 0% |
| Subdomain Average | 3.00 | 2.63 | 3.00 | 2.75 | 2.63 | 2.75 | 2.38 | 2.50 |

| | Domain 2 | Domain 3 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| % of Proficient or above | 74% | 63% |
| Domain Averages | 2.84 | 2.56 |