



November 9, 2017

Abigail Smith, Board Chair
E.L. Haynes PCS – Elementary
4501 Kansas Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Ms. Smith,

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 2016-17 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 E.L. Haynes Public Charter School – Elementary (E.L. Haynes PCS – Elementary) between September 25, 2017 – October 6, 2017. 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 E.L. Haynes PCS – Elementary.

Sincerely,



Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: Ms. Hilary Darilek, CEO

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: November 9, 2017

Campus Information

Campus Name: E.L Haynes PCS – Elementary

Ward: 4

Grade levels: Prekindergarten (PK3)-4

Qualitative Site Review (QSR) Information

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

Two-week window: September 25, 2017 – October 6, 2017

QSR team members: 2 DC PCSB staff members including 1 special education (SPED) specialist and English Learner (EL) specialist and 2 consultants

Number of observations: 16

Total enrollment: 348

Students with Disabilities enrollment: 50

English Language Learner enrollment: 131

In-seat attendance on the days the QSR team conducted observations:

Visit 1: September 25, 2017 – 95.4%

Visit 2: September 26, 2017 – 95.7%

Visit 3: October 3, 2017 – 97.4%

Visit 4: October 4, 2017 – 95.1%

Summary

E.L. Haynes Public Charter School's mission is:

Every E.L. Haynes student of every race, socioeconomic status and home language will reach high levels of academic achievement and be prepared to succeed at the college of his or her choice. Every E. L. Haynes student will be adept at mathematical reasoning, will use scientific methods effectively to frame and solve problems, and will develop the lifelong skills needed to be a successful individual, an active community member, and a responsible citizen.

E.L. Haynes PCS – Elementary is a diverse school within a PK-12 Local Education Agency (LEA) that currently serves 1,150 students at two campuses in the Columbia Heights and Petworth neighborhoods. During the Qualitative Site Review (QSR) observers noted a clear emphasis on teaching personal responsibility and citizenship. The school implements the practices and structures of Responsive Classroom and Developmental Designs, including the Circle of Power and Respect, Social Contract, and Morning Meeting. Students at the Elementary school were given frameworks and vocabulary to solve disagreements, assert themselves, and

practice empathy and self-control. While observers did not observe explicit use of the scientific method, students in science classes were engaged in comparing and contrasting and finding the cause and effect of scientific phenomenon. In some observations lessons connected math to the real world and students were prompted with open-ended questions to mathematically reason.

During the QSR two-week window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendix I). The QSR team scored 65% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain, down from 82% in the elementary campus' last QSR in 2013-14. The highest rated component was *Establishing a Culture of Respect and Rapport*, with 76% of observations rated as distinguished or proficient. Teacher and student interactions remained uniformly respectful during most observations. The lowest rated component was *Establishing a Culture of Learning*, with 54% of observations rated as distinguished or proficient.

The QSR team scored 65% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. This is down from 81% of observations in 2014. In two components 73% of teachers were distinguished or proficient: *Communicating with Students* and *Using Assessment in Instruction*. Most teachers consistently communicated the lesson purpose and procedures and students complied with directions, indicating that they understood what to do. In these observations teachers monitored progress of learning throughout the lesson. The lowest rated component was *Engaging Students in Learning*.

Governance

A DC PCSB staff member attended the E.L. Haynes PCS board meeting on September 21, 2017. A quorum was present. Before the meeting teachers and staff had the opportunity to meet with the board over dinner. The chair announced that meetings would be more focused on rich discussions per the LEA's year-long focus on feedback. The CEO gave updates on the new volleyball team, homecoming spirit week activities, high school team building trips, and the formation of SPED and EL parent advocate groups. The finance committee reported on enrollment and the budget, and the governance committee noted they are making an effort to recruit a parent representative from each campus. The academic committee detailed E.L. Haynes' progress toward internal goals and the 2016-17 Performance Management Framework. The observer noted that board members were exceptionally engaged in discussion around strategic issues.

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Observers scored 75% of special education observations as proficient or distinguished in the Classroom Environment domain, while 59% of special education observations scored proficient or distinguished in the Instruction

domain. Prior to the two-week window, E.L. Haynes PCS – Elementary completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities (SWD). Reviewers looked for evidence of the school’s articulated program. Overall, most – but not all – observations effectively supported the learning of SWD by providing high-quality co-planned instruction, clear explanations of content, and accommodations and modifications.

- To demonstrate that co-planning has occurred with special education teachers, the school explained that both teachers would be actively engaged in each section of the lesson, circulating the room, checking for understanding, and addressing misconceptions. Evidence of co-planning was found in all classrooms with special and general education teachers, and its implementation mostly supported the learning of SWD. In one classroom three teachers circulated during centers, asking students questions, and monitored their learning. In another observation teachers clearly co-planned because all students engaged with texts that were on the same subject but differentiated by Lexile level. Although both teachers in another setting led math mini-lessons on expanded form, the special education teacher’s explanation of content was imprecise and confusing to students.
- The school reported that they provide resources such as assistive technology, occupational therapy tools, highlighters, and anchor charts to support the learning of SWD. Teachers provided students with access to many additional resources. Teachers used the programs Illuminate and Mastery Connect to monitor the learning of SWD. In one classroom the special education teacher provided a number chart during a math assessment. In a resource room some students worked on grammar exercises on the computer program iReady, while other students engaged with an anchor chart to identify how the main character’s feelings changed throughout the story.
- The school explained that reviewers would observe several types of co-teaching models, including One Teach/One Assist, Alternative, Team, and Station models, during a lesson. Teachers decide how they will best deliver content and plan the co-teaching model accordingly. The reviewers observed a variety of co-teaching models in action. In multiple settings teachers used the Alternative model. The general education teacher led most of the class in a mini-lesson or monitoring partner reading, while the special education teacher provided small group instruction re-teaching a skill or using a lower Lexile-leveled text. In early childhood classrooms teachers utilized Station co-teaching during math and ELA centers.
- To provide accommodations according to the IEPs of SWD, the school stated that reviewers might see: preferential seating, calculators, noise buffer

headphones, extended time, Kindles for read-aloud text, graphic organizers, small group instruction, and para-educator support. The school program effectively provided accommodations to SWD, and across many settings, teachers successfully used small group instruction and graphic organizers. In a co-taught math classroom, the special education took three students for small group testing. S/he posted key vocabulary and visuals, read the problems aloud to the students, and provided them with number charts.

- To provide modifications according to the IEPs of SWD, the school wrote that reviewers might see: modified assignments, note-taking assistance, and alternative testing formats and grading. Teachers may provide executive functioning support by helping students organize materials. The observers saw many examples of meaningful modifications. In one co-taught classroom all teachers circulated through centers to check for understanding, and the special education teacher monitored learning by giving a modified assessment. By flashing word and picture cards, s/he evaluated if pre-selected students knew which pictures represented which word and how they knew. Many teachers provided executive functioning support by encouraging students to regulate their emotions through deep belly breaths, the reset chair, and behavioral self-reflections.

Specialized Instruction for English Learners

E.L. Haynes PCS – Elementary serves 131 English Learner (EL) students, more than one-third of the student body. Prior to the two-week window, E.L. Haynes PCS – Elementary School completed a questionnaire about how it serves EL students. The school wrote that it utilizes a content-based English acquisition model, and reviewers looked for evidence of its implementation. Overall, the school EL program attempts to integrate general education content and language teaching aims; however, the quality of instruction does not consistently engage students in learning.

- The school stated that students receive most EL services in inclusive settings taught in English. EL teachers may push into the general education classroom or provide small-group pull-out instruction. Reviewers observed only English-based teaching and saw push-in small group instruction, pull-out small group instruction, and a co-taught lesson in which the EL teacher lead instruction using the One Teach, One Assist model. All observations included opportunities for students to engage with content-based and language-based objectives and activities. Nonetheless, teachers made some content or language-based errors. An EL teacher incorrectly explained unit form, and another made some minor writing errors (e.g., not capitalizing a proper noun, separating a compound word).
- To meet the academic needs of EL students, the school reported that

teachers scaffold and differentiate the general education curriculum, “with emphasis placed on the development of the four language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.” In a pull-out setting the students engaged with a text that they read prior the general education classroom. The teacher scaffolded learning by having students complete a graphic organizer, but student engagement consisted largely of recording low-level facts from the text. In an inclusive math classroom, the EL teacher led a small group in skill review, while the general education teacher worked with others on a similar, yet more advanced task. However, the small group lesson required minimal thinking, and there was considerable “downtime.” In an inclusive classroom students practiced speaking and listening using content-based language to describe the similarities and differences between two animals, then students wrote independently on a Venn diagram exit ticket. Although the teachers circulated to answer questions and monitor learning, these activities only engaged some students intellectually. Many students talked during independent work despite the teachers’ directions to have “level 0” voices.

- The school explained that EL students have access to resources, such as translated or modified texts, graphic organizers, sentence stems, bilingual dictionaries, and illustrated vocabulary. Although reviewers did not observe the use of translated or modified texts, Smart Boards, or bilingual dictionaries, all observed settings incorporated graphic organizers or other visual supports. A teacher in a pull-out class drew pictures next to the vocabulary words students used to complete their graphic organizers. In a co-taught setting students wrote the differences between two animals using a Venn diagram. Both assignments were a mix of those requiring thinking and those requiring recall.

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT¹

¹ Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

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	<p>The QSR team scored 76% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations teacher-student interactions were uniformly polite and respectful. In one distinguished observation students took initiative to recognize their peers’ efforts by asking the teacher, “Can we give [student] a ‘whoosh’ for that answer?” Other students reminded one another, “If you don’t get a turn this time, you’ll get a turn next time!” In another distinguished observation students asked clarifying questions about an upcoming field trip. The teacher’s responses consistently demonstrated care and respect for student concerns.</p>	Distinguished	13%
	<p>In proficient observations students patiently took turns and encouraged one another with phrases such as “Way to be positive!” Teachers modeled respectful language and conflict resolution. One teacher said, “We thank people so they know we appreciate them.” Another facilitated a conversation between two students to teach manners: “It looks like you want to share. Say, ‘Can I have a turn please?’ Thanks for being a kind friend.”</p>	Proficient	63%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 25% of the observations as basic in this component. Student and teachers in these observations exhibited uneven levels of respect. Teachers spoke sternly to students multiple times during observations and numerous students used unkind words with each other during partner work. One teacher occasionally showed exasperation when students asked questions.</p>	Basic	25%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<p>Establishing a Culture for Learning</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 54% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In these observations teachers conveyed high expectations for all students and worked to maximize instructional time. When one student returned from the "take-a-break station" the teacher reviewed key vocabulary and testing expectations with him just as s/he had done with the rest of the group. One co-teacher working independently with a struggling student said, "Don't give up. We have 15 minutes left and we don't waste time in this class."</p> <p>When teachers gave instructions, they asked students to think about <i>why</i> each task was important. Teachers insisted on the precise use of language and supported student efforts by posting and referencing definitions and visuals of key vocabulary. When a student said, "I think the main thing is..." the teacher corrected him and said,</p>	Distinguished	7%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>"The central message is..." Several teachers explicitly valued risk-taking by using equity sticks and saying "Raise your hand! Be brave!" A few teachers used a call-and-response routine in which student responded, "Challenge, challenge, bring it on!"</p> <p>In the distinguished observation the teacher demonstrated genuine passion for the subject, exclaiming, "This is my favorite part!" while conducting a read-aloud. The teacher danced with students during transitions and reminded students that "trick words help us read better and write faster."</p>	Proficient	47%
	<p>The QSR team scored 47% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations the instructional activities conveyed only modest expectations for students to participate actively in their learning. Although many students raised their hands to share responses, turn-and-talk conversations quickly became off-topic. One teacher encouraged students to "tap out" tricky words but did not wait for students to do so before giving answers. Another teacher did not effectively use wait time and quickly told students where to find the answers in their text.</p> <p>In some observations teachers demonstrated neutral energy for the work and were primarily concerned with completing the task rather than the quality or purpose of the work. One teacher said, "We need to get these done so we can post them in the hallways."</p>	Basic	47%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team scored 69% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. There was little to no loss of instructional time due to effective classroom routines and procedures in these observations. During transitions students followed teacher cues the first time, knew how to check in and out of centers independently, and followed directions for managing materials. Students knew where to sit on the carpet and used universal signals to ask for a pencil and use the restroom. Multiple teachers called on previously-assigned "table captains" to get bins of supplies for their groups before beginning a task.	Distinguished	13%
	In distinguished observations students took the initiative to use their time productively. In one observation a student who finished breakfast early asked, "Can I go and make sure there are no coats on the ground?" In both observations students had responsibility for completing classroom jobs; they did so smoothly and independently.	Proficient	56%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 31% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations classroom routines functioned unevenly. Teachers used pre-established signals for getting students' attention ahead of transitions (e.g., "Back to me in 3...2...1") but some students failed to respond appropriately and teachers had to repeat the routines multiple times. In a couple of observations students were directed to "mix and mingle" to find a partner. They proceeded to wander around searching for partners. The process was loud and chaotic, and both teachers had to restart the procedure after clarifying directions.</p>	Basic	31%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Student Behavior	<p>The QSR team scored 63% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. Student behavior was consistently appropriate in these observations. Teachers proactively used positive reinforcement to encourage appropriate behavior: "I see [student] is working silently.... [student] is focused...Good level 3 voices." Teachers also used non-verbal communication (e.g., eye contact or a hand pointing to a new</p>	Distinguished	13%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>seat) to address behavior and students immediately corrected themselves. One teacher corrected student behavior through group reflection by saying, "I want to give you all a little bit of feedback about that process. I saw lots of friends putting in their papers nicely, but some waited too long. Please use urgency."</p> <p>In distinguished observations students intervened with classmates. One student said to her reading partner, "It seems like you are leaning into my space on purpose. Please stop so I can focus." In another observation a student said to his peer, "Remember you aren't supposed to copy her work."</p>	Proficient	50%
	<p>The QSR team scored 38% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers attempted to maintain order in the classroom by referring to classroom rules, but with uneven success. Teachers used a variety of strategies to redirect behavior including positive reinforcement of good behavior – "shout out to friends whose bodies look self-controlled" – and modeling desired behavior – "look at me, I am ignoring distractions and focusing on what needs to get done." However students frequently talked over the teacher and at least one or two groups were off-task during small-group work.</p>	Basic	38%
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	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 65% 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	
<p>Communicating with Students</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 73% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In these observations students engaged with their work and did not need additional clarification on the assignment beyond that given by the teacher initially. Teachers articulated the purpose of each lesson and used descriptive language to convey content.</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>In one observation a student asked a partner a clarifying question and a peer answered with no additional teacher intervention needed. In these observations teachers invited student input when explaining content and used visuals and supports (e.g., math definitions and pictures, graphic organizers, Venn diagrams) to enhance the explanation of content. Teachers not only stated directions for the activities but often modeled the process students should use.</p>	Proficient	73%
	<p>The QSR team rated 20% of the observations as basic in this component. The teacher’s explanation of content was mostly procedural in these observations. On several occasions the teacher directed students to look back at "the rules." In some observations teacher's explanation of content contained minor errors or oversimplifications; some portions were clear while others were difficult to follow.</p>	Basic	20%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	8%
Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques	The QSR team scored 62% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. Teachers in these observations used open-ended questions to promote student thinking. In one observation the teacher asked guiding questions such as, "How do our senses help us learn?" Another asked, "Do you know <i>why</i> ? Can you explain your thinking?"	Distinguished	0%
	Teachers involved most/all students in the discussion, calling on those who did not initially volunteer to answer. One teacher attempted to create genuine discussion and elicit multiple perspectives: "Do you want to build on that? I see friends disagreeing who may want to challenge your thinking."	Proficient	62%
	The QSR team rated 31% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers asked few questions of students and few participated in the discussion. In some observations questions were largely procedural: "Why is it important to write neatly?" and "What supplies will be helpful to collect for this task?" In another observation the teacher asked summary questions: "What is the setting? What is the conflict?" but students simply read the answers off the board.	Basic	31%
	The QSR team scored less than 10% of observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	8%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Engaging Students in Learning	<p>The QSR team rated 50% of the observations as proficient in this component and none as distinguished. In these observations students remained intellectually engaged in the lesson. In several classes students checked themselves in and out of centers, working both independently and in groups with a variety of resources appropriate for the task.</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>In one observation students worked in pairs to determine cause and effect based on an informational text. Some groups had differentiated books on the same subject, indicating groupings were meaningfully pre-determined. Co-teachers effectively supported students by conducting mini-lessons for groups of students during independent work time.</p>	Proficient	50%
	<p>The QSR team rated 50% of the observations as basic in this component. Assignments only engaged some students intellectually in these observations. In a few instances the pacing of the lesson was slow and students who finished the task early talked in their tables while others did not complete the work at all. Some tasks required thinking but not all students were engaged.</p> <p>In one observation students had little or nothing on their papers until the teacher reviewed the solution. In one observation the task was to copy a poster from the front of the room. In most groups one student copied words and the other drew pictures. In another observation the teacher read text off of a worksheet and asked students to call out the answer chorally. Students then paused and filled in the answers on their worksheets.</p>	Basic	50%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
Using Assessment in Instruction	<p>The QSR team rated 73% of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. Teachers regularly used assessment during instruction through progress monitoring. Teachers often circulated among small groups to offer feedback: "Can you find another detail that supports the central message?"</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>Teachers monitored understanding in a variety of ways, such as listening to turn-and-talks, calling on students to share out, and checking in with individual students during the exit ticket. Some teachers had students engage in self and peer assessment by having students post their completed work. Students then discussed if they agreed/disagreed with their peers and asked questions of one another. One teacher projected exemplary student work to show students the key indicators of quality work that made up the assessment criteria.</p>	Proficient	73%
	<p>The QSR team rated 27% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers monitored the progress of the class as a whole but elicited no diagnostic information. In one observation the teacher asked which strategies students used to solve the word problem but ultimately demonstrated the steps without student input. Students wrote down the correct answer, but it was unclear if they knew how to solve it by themselves.</p> <p>Some feedback consisted of vague evaluative statements without an orientation toward future progress. Teachers said, "Good job," "Correct," and "Does anyone need help?"</p>	Basic	27%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team scored none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION 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 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 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	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	8%	0%	0%
Basic	25%	47%	31%	38%	20%	31%	50%	27%
Proficient	63%	47%	56%	50%	73%	62%	50%	73%
Distinguished	13%	7%	13%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Component Average	2.88	2.60	2.81	2.75	2.67	2.54	2.50	2.73

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% of Proficient or above	65%	65%
Domain Averages	2.76	2.61