



March 6, 2018

Mr. Brandon Daniels, Board Chair  
City Arts + Prep Public Charter School  
705 Edgewood Street NW  
Washington, DC 20017

Dear Mr. Daniels,

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 2017-18 school year for the following reason:

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

### **Qualitative Site Review Report**

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of City Arts + Prep Public Charter School (City Arts + Prep PCS) between January 22, 2018 and February 9, 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 City Arts + Prep PCS.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Naomi DeVeaux".

Naomi DeVeaux  
Deputy Director

Enclosures:

cc: Ms. Lanette Dailey-Reese, Executive Director

## Qualitative Site Review Report

**Date:** March 6, 2018

### **Campus Information**

**Campus Name:** City Arts + Prep Public Charter School (City Arts + Prep PCS)

**Ward:** 5

**Grade levels:** PK3-8

### **Qualitative Site Review Information**

**Reason for visit:** 15-year Charter Renewal in school year 2018-19

**Two-week window:** January 22, 2018 – February 9, 2018

**QSR team members:** Two DC PCSB staff including one special education specialist and one English Learner specialist and three consultants

**Number of observations:** 27 (including two art observations not included in scoring)

**Total enrollment:** 487

**Students with Disabilities enrollment:** 43

**English Learner enrollment:** 27

**In-seat attendance on observation days:**

**Visit 1:** January 22, 2018 – 94.8%

**Visit 2:** January 30, 2018 – 93.8%

**Visit 3:** February 1, 2018 – 93.4%

**Visit 4:** February 8, 2018 – 94.6%

### **Summary**

City Arts + Prep PCS' mission is

To prepare students for success in high school and beyond by providing an academically rigorous learning environment enriched by a diverse performing arts program.

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). There was a wide range in the level of performance among classrooms at City Arts + Prep PCS. Some classrooms, primarily in the early elementary grades, were marked by observable instructional engagement and procedures. In others there was noticeable hostility between students and teachers, no clear procedures, and little to no observable instruction. Likewise, in some observations students were cognitively challenged in well-designed learning tasks. In others no learning occurred. The QSR team observed two arts classes aligned to the school's mission. In one observation all students were excited, engaged, and attentive. In the other, lack of respect, poor behavior management and an

absence of engaging instructional strategies hindered the ability of all students to engage with the lesson.

The QSR team scored just 48% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. This score is down from 59%, which the school earned in this domain during its last QSR in 2013. In most components of this domain, about half of observations were rated as proficient or distinguished. In the component of *Managing Student Behavior*, however, an alarming 35% of the observations were rated as unsatisfactory. "Unsatisfactory" is the lowest level in the Danielson Framework indicating that the classroom environment was chaotic, with no apparent standards of conduct. In several observations the teacher responses were disrespectful of student dignity.

The QSR team scored just 41% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain, which shows that no observable growth occurred in the past five years given that 40% of observations earned proficient or distinguished in this domain in 2013. In most observations students were not intellectually engaged and lessons required only minimal thinking, allowing students to be passive or merely compliant.

#### In School Suspension (ISS)

According to school leadership, when a student is referred to ISS, the behavior management team reviews the referral and contacts the parent/guardian before students are placed in ISS for a full day.

The QSR team observed In-School Suspension twice during the observation window. During the first visit there were no adults or students in the ISS room. During the second visit, a DC PCSB staff member heard students crying and yelling in ISS. The students had just been removed from their classroom and threatened with suspension for talking out of turn. The same DC PCSB staff member returned to ISS later in the day and two different students were in the room. A staff member was mediating a conflict between the students.

#### Governance

DC PCSB reviewed City Arts + Prep PCS' board meeting minutes from the November 15, 2017 meeting. A quorum was present. The board discussed potentially moving to a new facility in the coming years. The board voted to allow the Finance Committee to approve, review, and accept the budget. The governance committee shared that they are hoping to recruit three more board members. Finally, the leadership team shared that they are analyzing academic data weekly and are seeing progress in the middle school.

#### Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Observers scored only 27% of special education observations as proficient or distinguished in the Classroom Environment domain, and 38% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. Prior to the two-week window, City

Arts + Prep PCS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities. Reviewers observed co-taught general education classrooms and a resource room for evidence of the articulated program. Although the school stated its commitment to inclusive practices, there was limited evidence of co-planning and co-instruction between general and special educators. In resource and pull-out settings, students engaged inconsistently with their assignments. Overall, the school's special education program does not effectively provide students with disabilities with the specialized services they need to access the general education curriculum.

- In core ELA and math general education classes, special educators co-teach to support students with disabilities and those who are struggling. The school explained that reviewers would observe several types of co-teaching models, including One Teach/One Assist, Alternative, and Station models. In three co-taught observations, teachers only used the One Teach/One Assist model for the entire lesson. The special education teachers focused on working with a few students, while the general education teacher managed behavior, initiated routines, and led instruction. There was little evidence of shared responsibilities.
- The school explained that teachers collaborate to identify "anticipated misconceptions" during co-planning, and that special educators have content-based knowledge. In all three co-taught observations, co-teachers rarely communicated or interacted, indicating a lack of collaboration or parity. In one observation a teacher entered the room and asked students what they were doing. He/she proceeded to assign a book to a student that was more advanced than his/her reading level. The students expressed frustration at his/her inability to comprehend the text.
- To support students with disabilities, teachers provide a variety of accommodations and modifications, such as differentiated computer programs, preferential seating, repetition/clarification of instructions, extended time, read-aloud, calculators, differentiated assignments. Overall, few of these examples were found. In one classroom some students worked on differentiated assignments on iPads, but student intellectual engagement was limited. The teachers rarely redirected off-task students.
- Per the IEPs of students with disabilities, some students also require instruction outside of the general education setting in a resource room. While a resource room teacher stated each student's objective for the period, expectations for quality and effort varied between students. By the end of the period, some students had completed their work, whereas others had yet to begin.

### Specialized Instruction for English Learners (EL)

Prior to the two-week window, City Arts + Prep PCS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its English Learners. The school explained that it uses an English as a Second Language (ESL) pull-out model where students meet with the ESL teacher for specified amounts of time per week based on their needs. However, the school has not hired an EL teacher but rather has the special education teacher conduct the ESL lessons. Staff is unsure whether the teacher has any experience in EL. The school stated that their Language Acquisition program is also implemented through Spanish resources in the classroom, scaffolded assignments, and repeated directions. DC PCSB's EL specialist on the team looked for evidence of the school's described program and found that the school effectively implements its stated pull-out model, but EL resources within the inclusion classes are under-developed and inconsistently used.

- The EL specialist observed three pull-out sessions conducted by the SPED specialist. In each session the one-on-one student to teacher ratio provided direct opportunities for students to improve their pronunciation, spelling, and reading comprehension. Teachers used repetition, modeling, context clues, and questioning to guide instruction. Each of these observations were rated as proficient across components.
- The QSR team did not observe Spanish resources in any classrooms. However, several students in early elementary classrooms used the SmartyPants app on iPads. This program focuses on different skills related to reading (letter knowledge, phonemic awareness, phonics, phonetic words, and sight words) and is leveled based on the individual student's progress.
- Some, but not all teachers, used scaffolded questioning and repeated directions to engage students in classrooms discussions, but the QSR team did not see any scaffolded assignments.

## THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT<sup>1</sup>

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 48% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Classroom Environment domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each component's score.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 52% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component.</p> <p>In distinguished observations interactions between students and teachers were highly respectful. Students participated enthusiastically and took intellectual risks. Teachers referred to students as "friends" and students used phrases such as "come on brother" to encourage their peers. These teachers respected student dignity when implementing consequences, saying phrases such as, "Thank you for fixing your behavior. Sometimes we forget, and that's okay."</p> <p>In proficient observations talk between the teacher and students was polite and uniformly respectful. Students willingly helped one another in centers, and teachers frequently encouraged student efforts. One student said to an off-task peer, "Can you please build with us? We're going to need your help!"</p>	Distinguished	19%
		Proficient	33%

---

<sup>1</sup> Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 19% of the observations as basic in this component. Interactions between students and teachers were uneven in these observations, with occasional disrespect. One teacher got into an argument with students saying, "You can stick with that answer and it'll be wrong, or you can get with the group and jump on the bandwagon. Ok, we're done." This teacher yelled at a student who attempted to leave the classroom. The student protested each time, insisting that s/he needed water. The same teacher talked respectfully to another student, saying, "I understand you're not feeling well, but I need you to try your best."</p> <p>In another observation the teacher attempted to connect with a student by relating the text to a topic that interested the student. However, the student's reactions (e.g., refusing to engage with the work, ignoring the teacher) indicated these attempts were not successful.</p> <p>In other observations the teacher's response to disrespectful behavior was inconsistent. One student told the teacher that group members were bullying him. The teacher quickly moved the student and facilitated an apology, yet other instances of student infractions went unaddressed.</p>	Basic	19%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations teachers were disrespectful and student body language indicated feelings of hurt and discomfort. One student struggled to answer a question in front of the class, and the teacher said, "Well, you should come to school more often." Sounding hurt, the student said s/he was at the doctor's office the day before the teacher said the reason did not matter. Students laughed at their peer and the teacher did not respond.</p> <p>In another observation the teacher repeatedly threatened to "rip up" student work. Another teacher threatened to "scream and holler" at students and characterized him/herself as "one against thirty," in apparent opposition to the students.</p> <p>In one particularly unsettling observation the teacher suspended students on the spot, saying, "I'm allowed to suspend twenty students this year, who is next?" Students who were put out of the classroom were crying in ISS immediately after, indicating that they were hurt.</p>	Unsatisfactory	29%



The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 53% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component, making this the highest rated component of the review.</p> <p>In these observations teachers held high expectations for all students, often by insisting on precise language and student effort. In one observation students were not allowed to leave the carpet until the letters on the paper matched the sounds of their chosen words. The teacher said, "No, go back. This is important. Try that word again." Another teacher said, "Say the picture's name so you can figure it out. You can do this yourself. I'm not going to tell you, but I will help you."</p> <p>In a distinguished observation, center time was focused and cognitively busy for all students. Students successfully engaged in five different centers while the teacher carefully monitored and reinforced high expectations: "Remember we are making patterns in exploration station. Student X, explain to your friends how you made a pattern with the red and green blocks." In another observation the teacher used interactive chants that reinforced a positive learning culture. The teacher encouraged students who were eager to participate by saying, "I see hands popping up like popcorn!"</p>	Distinguished	10%
		Proficient	43%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of the observations as basic in this component. In some observations teachers held high expectations for some, but not all students. In three observations a subset of the class did not pick up their pencils to attempt the assignment at all. The teacher unsuccessfully attempted to intervene, but the students did not begin the assignment in the thirty-minute observation.</p> <p>In other observations the teacher and students were more concerned with work completion than student understanding. Many students engaged in off-task behaviors and demonstrated a desire to find an easy path for work completion. The teacher did not insist on precise language nor was there any encouragement for all students to re-engage in the work. In one observation students were told to highlight key details in the text. Some students highlighted the entire passage, while others did not highlight at all, indicating that students did not understand how to find a key detail.</p>	Basic	29%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 19% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In one observation, no learning took place. For forty minutes, a class of over twenty-five students sat idly while a few students completed an online survey. The teacher stood at the front of the classroom and threatened to suspend students. Some students who talked were sent to ISS, while others continued talking, playing, and sleeping without redirection.</p> <p>In another observation students were given a work packet, but the students yelled over the teacher while s/he attempted to give directions. Only three students attempted to complete the assignment. Others threw objects, fought, and talked. In another observation less than five out of twenty students consistently engaged in their station activities during the observation as the expectations for quality and completion were unclear.</p>	Unsatisfactory	19%
Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>The QSR team scored 48% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component.</p> <p>In distinguished observations students moved quickly and efficiently through a series of transitions and activities with no loss of learning time. Teachers used age appropriate techniques that engaged students positively. At stations, students redirected one another to transition appropriately.</p> <p>In proficient observations classroom routines functioned smoothly with minimal loss of instruction time. Teachers used call-and-response, hand claps, and countdowns to cue students. In some observations the instructional aides distributed and collected necessary supplies to increase efficiency.</p>	Distinguished	11%
		Proficient	37%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 26% of the observations as basic in this component. Transitions resulted in extended loss of learning time. Instructions and routines were unclear, and many students did not have basic supplies such as pencils or paper.</p> <p>During one observation students had difficulty finding materials in a disorganized classroom. Students did not return materials where they should have and the teacher did not have clear systems in place to support effective routines and procedures. In two observations the bathroom procedure was unclear. Students expressed frustration when some, but not all students, were allowed to leave. Students who were not working directly with the teacher in small groups were only partially engaged during these observations.</p>	Basic	26%
	<p>The QSR team scored 26% of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Transitions were chaotic, with significant time lost between activities. Students talked with one another and played with materials while waiting for directions.</p> <p>In some observations, students did not have the materials they needed. One student yelled out, "Does anybody have loose leaf?" Thankfully, one student brought enough paper from home for everyone to begin the assignment. In another observation students threw their lab materials at one another.</p>	Unsatisfactory	26%
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 40% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. In distinguished observations the teacher subtly monitored behavior, using proximity and non-verbal cues as preventative action. Student behavior was entirely appropriate.</p>	Distinguished	15%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>In proficient observations student behavior was generally appropriate and teachers had systems to effectively respond when needed. Classroom rules were implemented, and several teachers used positive verbal reinforcements such as "I love the way Student X is following directions". In one observations students actively helped each other when a peer was upset during center time. In another the teacher simply said, "Please stop," and students immediately fixed their behavior.</p>	Proficient	25%
	<p>The QSR team scored 25% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers attempted to maintain order in this observations with uneven success or with an inconsistent approach. Some teachers used ClassDoJo, a communication app to track student behavior. Some teacher said, that's a "level" each time a student talked out of turn, but this consequence did not deter students from continuing to talk.</p>	Basic	25%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 35% of the observations as unsatisfactory, making this the lowest rated component in the review. In these observations student misbehavior was either not monitored or inappropriately addressed.</p> <p>In one observation the teacher suspended students without explanation. One student got permission to leave the room for the bathroom, but said, "I know you're not going to let me back in!" The teacher responded, "No, probably not."</p> <p>In another observation student the teacher did not notice or respond to the following: two students put gum on the bookshelf, another crawled on the ground, two marked each other with glue sticks, two danced out of their seats, and one student cried. In another observation students disrupted the classroom by eating, banging on books, kicking the table, refusing to work, and leaving the room without permission. The teacher's response was ineffective.</p> <p>In another observation the teacher responded to misbehavior in a manner that did not respect the student's dignity, saying, "I'm gonna ask you to step out and not come back."</p>	Unsatisfactory	35%

## INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school's performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 41% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Instruction domain. Please see Appendix III for a breakdown of each component's score.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Communicating with Students</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 43% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component.</p> <p>Teachers clearly explained what students would be learning, gave clear directions for lesson activities, and checked for student understanding before releasing students to work independently.</p> <p>In several observations teachers connected the whole group lesson on the carpet to each center activity. In two observations the teacher read a folktale about dreams as a whole group. In centers, students wrote their own folktale, made dream catchers, and worked on patterns while the lead teacher worked one-on-one with small groups on spelling and writing.</p> <p>In all proficient observations students followed directions quickly and successfully.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	43%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 33% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations teacher directions and explanations were confusing and/or unclear. Directions had to be repeated several times and teachers made minor content errors during the modeling and explanation.</p> <p>In multiple classrooms students were told to copy directions and examples; there were few if any opportunities for students to participate. In one observation students were told to copy terms out of a textbook without any explanation of the lesson purpose.</p>	Basic	33%
	<p>The QSR team scored 24% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations students did not understand the lesson and the teachers made little effort to explain. In one observation the teacher read a long Shakespeare excerpt and did not take any questions or comments from students before assigning them to define all of the challenging words. Visibly bewildered, only a few students picked up their pencils to attempt the assignment. In one class, the teacher used imprecise, informal vocabulary that was inappropriate for the age of the students. When explaining a multiplication problem, the teacher said of the first factor, "I don't know what they call it - I'm just going to call it the top number."</p> <p>In another observation, no instruction occurred. The students said, "What are we supposed to be doing?" The teacher attempted to manage behavior and did not teach at all. In another observation the teacher attempted to explain the lesson directions but students loudly talked over the teacher and there was no further attempt at instruction. Students were given a worksheet and few attempted to complete it.</p>	Unsatisfactory	24%



Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques</b>	The QSR team scored 42% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component.	Distinguished	0%
	Teachers asked open ended questions such as, "What's going on in this picture?" and "How can we figure out how many square units will fit into the top row?" Teacher called on students with and without their hands raised to share their thinking. At times, students built off one another's responses.	Proficient	42%
	The QSR team scored 37% of the observations as basic in this component. Some teachers attempted to create discussions by inviting students to respond to one another with uneven success; only a few students volunteered answers. In a few observations students did not know how to respond so teachers answered their own questions without giving students sufficient time to think on their own.	Basic	37%
	The QSR team scored 21% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. Teachers asked few, if any, questions. One teacher refused to answer questions, saying, "I just explained it. I'm not going to repeat myself." Another teacher reviewed all of the math problems by doing them on the board without asking students to explain their thinking or talk to one another.	Unsatisfactory	21%
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 38% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in this component, making this the lowest rated component in the review.</p> <p>In the distinguished observation every student was cognitively engaged in differentiated activities that</p>	Distinguished	5%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	aligned to the larger lesson purpose. In proficient observations pacing was appropriate and students expressed eagerness to participate. Several of the proficient observations included small group and/or center work.	Proficient	33%
	The QSR team scored 33% of the observations as basic in this component. In several observations few students were intellectually engaged with the lesson. In one observation the teacher extended work time for a few students but didn't provide the other students with anything to do while they waited. In another observation most students were off-task or had their heads down on their desks. The teacher did not redirect or motivate the students, and there were no consequences for students who refused to participate	Basic	33%
	<p>The QSR team scored 29% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p> <p>In these observations few students attempted to complete assignments and many students indicated a lack of clarity about why they had to do the assignment. In one particularly unsatisfactory observation, only three out of twenty-four students had any assignment to work on for forty minutes.</p>	Unsatisfactory	29%
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	<p>The QSR team scored 43% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in this component.</p> <p>In proficient observations teachers used cold calls, thumps up/down, and circulation during partner and independent work to monitor student learning. These teachers gave specific feedback to improve</p>	Distinguished	5%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>students understanding (e.g., "For what operations does the order matter?") In two observations teachers asked students to give feedback to one another.</p> <p>In the distinguished observation the teacher used formative assessment extensively to support student understanding. The teacher adjusted the lesson in real time based on individual student responses. The teacher also insisted on precise punctuation. The teacher said, "thhhh - stick your tongue out. That's a good th."</p>	Proficient	38%
	<p>The QSR team scored 33% of the observations as basic in this component. In several observations assessment criteria were unclear and the teacher gave little to no feedback to students. One teacher noted that she wanted to see good work because it was going on the wall, but there was no discussion of what quality looked like for the assignment. Most teachers in these observations only monitored for behavior and did not evaluate student learning.</p>	Basic	33%
	<p>The QSR team scored 24% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component. In these observations teachers did not provide feedback or modeling, even when it was clear that many students were confused.</p>	Unsatisfactory	24%

## APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

The Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>	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.
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	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.
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	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.
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	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
<b>Communicating with Students</b>	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.
<b>Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</b>	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.
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	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.
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	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
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	29%	19%	26%	35%	24%	21%	29%	24%
<b>Basic</b>	19%	29%	26%	25%	33%	37%	33%	33%
<b>Proficient</b>	33%	43%	37%	25%	43%	42%	33%	38%
<b>Distinguished</b>	19%	10%	11%	15%	0%	0%	5%	5%
<b>Subdomain Average</b>	2.43	2.43	2.32	2.20	2.19	2.21	2.14	2.24

	Domain 2	Domain 3
<b>% of Proficient or above</b>	48%	41%
<b>Domain Averages</b>	2.34	2.20