DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

February 11, 2019

Christopher Cody, Board Chair
Hope Community Public Charter School – Lamond Campus
6200 Kansas Avenue NE
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Cody:

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 Hope Community Public Charter School – Lamond between November 26 and December 7, 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 Hope Community Public Charter School – Lamond.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Carolyn Davis, Executive Director and Diana Tharpe, Principal

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: February 11, 2019

Campus Information

Campus Name: Hope Community Public Charter School – Lamond Campus (Hope Community PCS – Lamond)
Ward: 3
Grade levels: Prekindergarten-3 (PK3) through fifth

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: November 26 – December 7, 2018
QSR Team Members: Two District of Columbia Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) staff and four consultants including an English Learner (EL) specialist and a special education (SPED) specialist
Number of Observations: 17
Total Enrollment: 288
Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 26
English Language Learners Enrollment: 39
In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:
Visit 1: November 26, 2018 – 93.3%
Visit 2: November 28, 2018 – 94.8%
Visit 3: November 29, 2018 – 94.8%
Visit 4: December 5, 2018 – 91.1%
Visit 4: December 6, 2018 – 94.4%

Summary

Hope Community PCS – Lamond's mission is "to positively shape the hearts and minds of our students by providing them with an academically rigorous, content rich curriculum and environment in which character is modeled and promoted, and a community in which to build trusting relationships with others."

Throughout the review period, observers noted that the school provided a trusting environment in which character was modeled and promoted. The QSR team scored 88% of observations as proficient or distinguished in the *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport* component. Students and teachers demonstrated mutual respect, saying "please" and "thank you." Teachers greeted students by name when they entered the building, giving high-fives and hugs. Students in lower grades shared materials without prompts. Teachers used table teams, stations, and friendly competition across classrooms to emphasize group responsibilities and

collaboration. Teachers also named positive demonstrations of character in students. Signs posted in various locations displayed what good character looked like in bathrooms, halls, the cafeteria, etc.

Academic rigor was mixed across classrooms. Most questions and discussion required only recall of facts or procedures, with 53% of observations scored as basic or below in the *Questioning and Discussion* component. Students completed rigorous, grade-appropriate work in some observations but not in all. For example, a third grade lesson focused on reading analog clocks (which is more aligned with Grade Two Common Core State Standards on Measurement and Data).

During the 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 65% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest rated component was *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport,* with 88% of observations scored as proficient or distinguished, as described above. The QSR team scored 54% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The highest rated component in this domain was *Communicating with Students* with 65% of observations scored as proficient. Teachers used rich, grade-appropriate language with students and clearly communicated lesson objectives. In the remaining components of Instruction, the QSR team scored 18% of observations as Unsatisfactory, though it should be noted that these were from the same three classrooms in *Using Questioning and Discussion* Techniques, *Engaging Students in Learning*, and *Using Assessment in Instruction*. The school scored similarly in both Classroom Environment and Instruction in 2014[1].

Governance

Christopher Cody chairs the Hope Community PCS Board of Trustees. The board's bylaws require the board to "hold at least one regular quarterly meeting," which the school has been compliant with for the past five years. The School Reform Act[2] requires all public charter school boards to be comprised of a majority DC residents and two representatives, which the school has also been compliant with for the past five years.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week window, Imagine Hope Community PCS - Lamond completed a questionnaire describing its model to serve students with disabilities (SWD). The

[1] https://www.dcpcsb.org/qualitative-site-review/2013-14-hope-community-lamond-qsr

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

school stated that it stands on the premise that its students with disabilities are as fundamentally competent as students without disabilities, and therefore students receive instruction in the school's least restrictive setting. The school explained that it currently offers specialized services through an inclusion model. Most students receive specialized instruction through push-in and pull-out services led by a SPED resource teacher. The school stated that when pushing into the general education classroom, teachers use the co-teaching model of One Teach, One Assist. Typically, the general education teacher delivers whole-class instruction and the SPED teacher assists students with their classwork and maintains behavior expectations. The school stated there is one dedicated aide that supports a student in the general education setting and during pull-out sessions. Students who require a more restrictive environment receive their instruction in a self-contained classroom led by a SPED teacher.

DC PCSB observed four SPED settings: two pull-out lessons led by the SPED resource teacher (one of which had the dedicated aide), one push-in lesson led by the SPED resource teacher, and one self-contained classroom led by another SPED teacher. Overall, the school inconsistently implemented its stated model. SPED teachers used specialized materials and facilitation techniques to engage students in two of the four observations described below.

In the small group with the dedicated aide, the SPED teacher led a lesson with a mixture of four SPED and EL students. The students in this group needed significant language support, which the teacher excelled at providing. The lesson began with an interactive, movement-based greeting that allowed each student to practice orally by initiating and responding to questions. The group asked each other how they were, and the teacher modeled responses using more advanced vocabulary such as "hungry" and "tired". The teacher asked students to repeat full sentences after her. The dedicated aide also participated and offered praise and support to all students. The main lesson was on counting and ordering numbers to 30. First, the teacher placed number cards out of order on the board. Next, the teacher asked students to identify which number came next in the sequence, and then to put that number in the correct order using the pocket chart on the board. When students said the incorrect number sequence, the teacher did not correct the student right away but asked follow-up questions, such as, "What comes after ____?" The teacher invited the whole group to chorally count together until the student identified his or her own mistake. The teacher also infused the lesson objective into movement breaks. Midway through the observation, students got up to dance to a counting song and video that was projected on the board. At the end of the lesson, as students lined up to leave, each student was given five jumps on the mini trampoline, and the whole group chorally counted each student's jumps together.

In the second pull-out observation, the SPED teacher facilitated a lesson on order of operations for a small group. The teacher explained the order of operations as she wrote them on a poster, and referenced the acronym PEMDAS (Parenthesis, Exponents, Multiplication and Division, Addition and Subtraction) and the pneumonic device of “Please Excuse My Dear Aunt Sally.” While some students were engaged, one student called out of turn and sat with their head on the desk. The teacher gave the students a worksheet to complete independently, and the teacher looked over their shoulders as they worked. When one of the students solved the first problem incorrectly, the teacher re-explained the content in the same way it was introduced during the lesson and did not offer any manipulatives or an alternative explanation or accommodation, as described in the school’s questionnaire. Eventually, the student became visibly frustrated and chose to copy another peer’s answers after the teacher wrote several problems on the board for them to solve. When the frustrated student refused to show his or her work on the board, the teacher responded by saying, “This is the last thing you need to do before class. You're dragging this out because you want to act like you don't understand what I am saying.” The teacher eventually relented to completing the problems on the board for the group and told the frustrated student to simply copy the answer. As a result, it was unclear if the student ever fully grasped the content.

DC PCSB observed the SPED resource teacher push into a classroom. Due to the structure of this co-teaching style—One Teach, One Assist—the SPED teacher’s participation was limited, but whenever possible the SPED teacher helped to facilitate student thinking by interjecting with questions like, “What is another word for ‘problem’?” In an instance when a student had their head down on the table, the SPED teacher discreetly spoke to the student and was only minimally successful with helping the student re-engage in the lesson. While the student initially complied by sitting up and pulling out a textbook, he or she eventually returned to being off-task and disengaged. In this same observation, the general education teacher led the class in a lesson on drawing conclusions and making predictions from a text. The teacher emphasized real-world connections by asking, “Do you watch SVU [Special Victims Unit]? Law and order? A crime show or mystery? What is the job of the detectives? What do they need to use? Their knowledge and experience. And what else do they look at? How is that similar to us drawing conclusions when we read?” Multiple students raised their hands and shared in response to these questions. The SPED teacher assisted in the lesson by writing step-by-step instructions on the board for how to draw conclusions.

Finally, DC PCSB observed a self-contained classroom. Although there was evidence of established systems to meet the emotional and behavioral needs of students, their inconsistent implementation resulted in a loss of instructional time for some students. The teacher used two behavioral incentive systems, individual tickets and a

group point system, which were both used consistently and frequently during the lesson. As needed, students were allowed to take breaks on the couch or carpet area before resuming their participation in classroom activities. DC PCSB observed instances when this worked well, including when a student returned to the whole group without prompting after taking a break on the coach while the rest of the class worked on a math packet. Later in the class, another student was sent to the couch area to take a short break and the teacher called him back to join the lesson after five minutes. However, in another instance the teacher asked a student to go to the carpet to work on a math problem that he or she was struggling with. However, after ten minutes the teacher realized the student had not completed the problem. In response the teacher asked, "What's going on with you?" and bargained with the student by saying, "If you can finish that problem, you will earn 25 tickets. Then you can stop and take a break." The teacher failed to check back with the student and the student never completed the problem or had an opportunity to participate in the day's lesson. The school's questionnaire stated that observers would see evidence of teachers using models and manipulatives to support student learning, but students did not physically use manipulatives or draw models during the observation.

Specialized Instruction for English Learners (ELs)

Prior to the two-week window, Hope Community PCS - Lamond outlined its model of instruction for ELs. The school explained that the "EL teacher works with classroom teachers to incorporate best practices for language acquisition instructional courses with EL students" (note that the school did not name specific strategies). Overall, the EL teachers taught lessons to support student language acquisition using primary language support, visual aids, and other strategies detailed below. During a half day of observations, the EL specialist observed the following instructional strategies in the EL program in two pull-out sessions and one whole group push-in session.

> Observation One: During the first pull-out session with four ELs, the EL specialist observed modeling and visual aids (pictures and hand motions) as the class learned about the letter F and numbers 1-5. The EL teacher had written out a song about ladybugs, drawing five ladybugs and using different colors for certain consonants. She gave students opportunities to talk to each other at the beginning of the class as a warm-up, modeling questions like "How are you? What did you have for dinner?" She provided scaffolding for one student, asking him a question both in English and in Spanish, letting him answer in Spanish but repeated back his response in English. After singing the ladybug song while pointing to the words, she counted the five ladybugs slowly with students as they held up their fingers, 1-5. They practiced identifying the letter F by going to the board, circling the F, and saying the associated word. At the end of the class,

students made their own ladybugs and described them to their classmates. Students had opportunities to talk to each other throughout the lesson, with the EL teacher's support, as she probed them with questions or gave them additional vocabulary to enable them to communicate with classmates.

Observation Two: In a push-in session, the EL teacher co-taught with the general education teacher. They used strategies beneficial to ELs and non-ELs including repetition, word banks and visual aids, pre-teaching text, and activating background knowledge. At the beginning of the class, both teachers repeated directions clearly, ensuring students understood the learning task. As a warm-up, students used a word bank written on the board to fill in blanks in sentences. The EL teacher reminded students of the "i before e" rhyme to spell correctly. Both the general education teacher and the EL teacher pre-taught a text, asking students to predict what it was about based on pictures and text features. The EL teacher activated background knowledge by asking students to discuss what they knew about ranches and the American West. She also used a visual aid in the form of an anchor chart about drawing conclusions to help students do so about the story they read.

Observation Three: The EL teacher used visual aids in a pull-out phonics lesson with two ELs with BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills). She set up a board with letter cards, using different colors for consonants and vowels. The teacher made different words with the letters, showing students how to create various sounds when they struggled with pronunciation. The EL teacher assessed students' phonics skills as she read words from flash cards and had students make the word with their own personal magnetic board and letter tiles. The teacher used hand motions, objects in the classroom, and Spanish translations to show students the meaning of words where necessary. Lastly, she worked with one student making sentences with words on flash cards as the other worked on a phonics program on the computer.

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 65% 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 88% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In distinguished observations classroom interactions were warm and caring. Teachers promoted a caring environment by encouraging students to praise each other, saying in one observation "Give yourself a clap, pat yourself on the back, and tell a friend that they did well this morning." In proficient observations teachers respectfully redirected negative behaviors by saying a student's name, asking students how to share, and encouraging students to "check in" with one another about their feelings. Students showed respect for each other by apologizing when they hurt classmates, offering to help each other, and cooperating while sharing.	Distinguished	29%
		Proficient	59%
	The QSR team scored 12% of the observations as basic in this component. Classroom interactions reflected occasional disrespect when students refused to engage with lessons, despite teachers' attempts to refocus them. Teachers failed to address disrespectful behavior in a couple of classrooms (unkind words to classmates), though most other interactions were respectful.	Basic	12%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

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

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team scored 59% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. Students consistently expended effort to learn, getting right to work after the teachers' prompts, answering questions enthusiastically, paying attention for the entire lesson, and helping classmates get to the right spot in a reading. Teachers frequently praised students saying, "I love it", "Give yourselves a hand!", and "Snap snap!" Teachers had high expectations for all students, persisting to help students arrive at the correct answer and encouraging students to "answer in [their] own words" rather than copy from a text. Students took pride in their work, smiling proudly after getting an answer correct.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	59%
	The QSR team scored 41% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers' energy for the work was neutral with no comments suggesting the importance of the work. Teachers conveyed high expectations for groups of students that appeared to be working diligently but not for those less focused. In one observation the teacher reinforced expectations with students in her small group while the rest of the class was off-task, wandering around and socializing. In another observation some students put forth effort to complete high-quality work, asking classmates to explain math problems while others in the same classroom ignored the assignment entirely.	Basic	41%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team scored 53% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In distinguished observations students demonstrated strong understanding of routines by transitioning seamlessly in response to subtle cues like timers and single-word prompts, losing no instructional time. In proficient observations, routines functioned smoothly as students collected and distributed materials, and transitioned without reminders, putting away materials and moving from whole-group to stations or vice-versa without incident. Teachers used transition time effectively, setting up new materials as students moved to their desks and collected books. Teachers maximized instructional time by preparing materials ahead of time.	Distinguished	6%
		Proficient	47%
	The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as basic in this component. Procedures for transitions had been established but their operation was challenging. Teachers attempted to use timers and countdowns to transition activities but lost additional instructional time as students needed help locating materials. Students in some observations were unsure of routines for getting materials, transitioning, and going to the bathroom; they interrupted teachers frequently to explain. In another observation logging into computers took five to ten minutes, and some students used the wrong program (playing video games) until the teacher collected the computers.	Basic	29%
	The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Teachers lost instructional time due to inefficient or nonexistent classroom routines. Teachers attempted to use cues like “1,2,3, all eyes on me” and the song, “It’s Time for Story Time,” but only half of the students followed expectations. Transitions at stations were not based on established routines and led to overcrowding with little intervention from the teacher.	Unsatisfactory	18%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team scored 59% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Student behavior was entirely appropriate in distinguished observations. One teacher preempted behavior challenges by holding a student's hand during transitions. In minor instances of off-task behavior, teachers used gentle phrases such as "no thank you" and calling a student by name to ask them to repeat expectations. In proficient observations teachers effectively managed misbehavior saying, "What's a nice way to resolve this?", "Focus, ok?" and "Am I in the right class with all this calling out?" or simply stating a student's name. Teachers frequently monitored behavior by circulating the room, reminding students to keep their heads up and open their books. A teacher in one observation provided silent feedback when observing off-task behavior by moving a clothespin with a student's name to one of four laminated signs labeled "Awesome," "Just right," "Warning," and "Uh oh!"	Distinguished	18%
		Proficient	41%
	The QSR team scored 41% of the observations as basic in this component. Students maintained standards of conduct inconsistently. Teachers had to repeat directions several times and give multiple reminders about noise levels. Teachers' response to misbehavior was inconsistent, requiring some students to stay silent while failing to comment on other students' loud voices or off-task behavior. Teachers sometimes threatened consequences but failed to give them when negative behaviors persisted.	Basic	41%
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

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 54% 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 65% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. Teachers clearly communicated the instructional purpose to students and referred to it throughout lessons as students learned action verbs, how to draw conclusions, and practiced letter sounds. Teachers' explanations were clear and connected to student experiences; one teacher gave real-life examples of the word "nutrients" and asked students to share their background knowledge reading a text. Students participated in explanations of content by telling teachers the next steps in solving math problems. Teachers scaffolded instruction by repeating content slowly, guiding a student's hand as they counted, drawing pictures to represent "first, second, and third," and showing students how to produce certain letter sounds with their mouths. Teachers used rich, grade and content appropriate vocabulary in English Language Arts (setting, characters, narrator, inference, prior knowledge) and math (standard algorithm, expanded algorithm, rounding).	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	65%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated 35% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers' explanations of content were limited. In one observation the teacher focused more on behavior, telling students not to touch the materials in front of them, rather than finishing the explanation of using descriptive words. In another observation students struggled to continue a pattern using manipulatives so the teacher completed the pattern for them without providing strategies to do so. Teachers failed to provide instructions for what to do at centers, leaving students confused about using materials like gears and spindles.	Basic	35%
	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 47% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. Teachers created opportunities for discussion among students, using pair-and-shares and group collaboration. Teachers built on student responses, telling students what they liked and asking others to add to their responses. They ensured all students were involved in class discussion, calling on students who did not initially volunteer to answer questions. Teachers asked a mix of low and high level questions, like asking students to describe what they were grateful for in preparation for a writing activity and asking them to predict and infer during a story.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	47%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated 35% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers led students down a single path of inquiry, as in math classes where teachers asked students the next steps in problem solving without opportunities for students to explain thinking. Teachers' attempted to get students to respond directly to one another with limited success. Teachers directed students to "help your classmate" and "turn and talk" about your math solution, but students continued to direct their responses to the teacher.	Basic	35%
	The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Questioning was rapid-fire with single correct answers and no opportunities for further discussion. Students identified parts of a book by answering in recitation style and told the teacher what they created with tiles and blocks without further probing by the teacher or discussion with classmates.	Unsatisfactory	18%
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. Students intellectually engaged in lessons, craning their necks during a read-aloud and saying "Ahhh man!" when the teacher said they would read the rest later. Students also said, "This is fun!" and "I got it!", and participated enthusiastically in identifying letters on a chart. Learning tasks had multiple correct responses or approaches. For example, one teacher asked for three responses to each question to get students to evaluate possibilities (rather than focus on one right answer) and asked students to use multiple approaches to answer math problems. Pacing was appropriate and kept students engaged as when a teacher used extra time to play a math puzzle and cut one activity short to move to another when she realized students were ready to move on to the harder task.	Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	Classrooms had a mix of groupings as students solved math problems as teams, played math games while other students worked independently at computers, and worked in a small group with the teacher on a writing activity while others read, drew, or worked on computers.	Proficient	47%
	The QSR team rated 35% of the observations as basic in this component. Some students were intellectually engaged in lessons while others were not. Teachers focused only on their small groups without ensuring all students were working productively, and some students did not engage in learning tasks at all. Learning tasks required a mix of thinking and recall as students made sentences using predetermined verbs and made inferences based on a story later in the lesson, and told the teacher steps of a procedure in a math class.	Basic	35%
	The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Learning tasks required only recall as students identified opposites on a page that they had previously discussed, without opportunities to generate their own ideas. Teachers asked students to answer questions in unison though many stayed silent. In another observation students wandered around stations without actually engaging in them.	Unsatisfactory	18%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team scored 59% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. Teachers regularly used assessment as they asked students to answer questions about “First, second, third” and reviewed sentences students made with flash cards. Teachers assessed students individually by asking them to read their responses to writing prompts, say sight words, and discuss their craft with the group. Teachers adjusted instruction to address student misunderstandings as they helped students count slower to arrive at a correct answer, modeled the learning task, and referred students to visual aids around the classroom. They invited students to assess their own work and classmates’ work by asking them to read their responses and consider if any words were missing and give a “thumbs up” or “thumbs down” in response to a classmate’s math solution. Teachers ensured that students who did not volunteer responded to questions by cold calling and using popsicle sticks with student names on them.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	59%
	The QSR team rated 24% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers monitored understanding through one method, asking students questions as a whole-group and relying on volunteers to answer. Assessment was haphazard as teachers asked few students to respond to questions without ensuring all students understood the presentation. Teachers relied on students to voluntarily indicate understanding, saying “Got it, make sense? We good?” and “Who doesn’t understand what I just did?” Students had limited opportunities for self- or peer-assessment.	Basic	24%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored 18% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Feedback was global with no explanations that could be used for future improvement. Teachers simply indicated whether an answer was right or wrong and did not ask students to evaluate their own work or classmates' work at any time.	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

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: BREAKDOWN OF EACH COMPONENT

Percent of:	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	18%	0%	0%	18%	18%	18%
Basic	12%	41%	29%	41%	35%	35%	35%	24%
Proficient	59%	59%	47%	41%	65%	47%	47%	59%
Distinguished	29%	0%	6%	18%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Subdomain Average	3.18	2.59	2.41	2.76	2.65	2.29	2.29	2.41

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	65%	54%
Domain Averages	2.74	2.41