DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

August 18, 2022

Donald Hense, Board Chair
Friendship Public Charter School – Armstrong Middle
111 O Street NW
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mr. Hense:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Review (QSR) visits 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 QSR because it is eligible for its 25-year charter review during school year 2022 – 23.

Qualitative Site Review Report
A QSR team conducted on-site reviews of Friendship Public Charter School-Armstrong Middle between March 7 – 18, 2022. The team's report is enclosed. You will find that it focuses primarily on classroom environment and instruction, as defined in the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching*. The report also includes our evaluation of the sample English language arts and math assignments we collected to assess grade-level alignment to college and career ready standards.

We appreciate the assistance your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the QSR at Friendship Public Charter School – Armstrong Middle.

Sincerely,

Rashida Young
Chief School Performance Officer

Qualitative Site Review Report

Date: August 18, 2022

Campus Information
Campus Name: Friendship Public Charter School (PCS) – Armstrong Middle
Ward: 5
Grade levels: Fourth through eighth

Qualitative Site Review Information
Reason for Visit: School eligible for twenty five-year Charter Review during school year 2022 – 23
Two-week Window: March 7 – 18, 2022
QSR Team Members: Two DC PCSB staff members and two consultants, including a special education (SPED) specialist and an English learner specialist
Number of Observations: 12
Total Enrollment: 234
Students with Disabilities Enrollment: 45
English Learners Enrollment: 15
In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:
Visit 1: March 10, 2022 – 96%
Visit 2: March 14, 2022 – 83.1%
Visit 3: March 16, 2022 – 78.2%
Visit 4: March 17, 2022 – 83.6%

Summary
Friendship PCS's mission is to:

> Provide a world-class education that motivates students to achieve high academic standards, enjoy learning, and develop as ethical, literate, well-rounded and self-sufficient citizens who contribute actively to their communities.

The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team observed evidence that Friendship PCS – Armstrong Middle is achieving the school's mission. The QSR team observed high academic standards across classrooms as teachers challenged student thinking. Students developed literacy skills by reading and analyzing rigorous and relevant fiction and non-fiction texts. Teachers motivated students through engaging learning tasks like planning a museum exhibit and solving math problems using pattern blocks. As described further in component 2a, "Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport," teachers developed ethical students by creating an environment of respect in classrooms. Students demonstrated self-sufficiency

through class discussions as they justified their responses and advocated for their positions.

During the two-week observation window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teachin*g to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendices I and II). The QSR team scored 92% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 2d, "Managing Student Behavior," with 92% of observations scored as distinguished or proficient. Student behavior was almost entirely appropriate in several observations as they listened attentively to instruction. Teachers used proximity to monitor behavior and preempted negative behaviors by telling students to raise their hands silently and track the teacher. The QSR team scored 77% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 3d, "Using Assessment in Instruction," with 91% of observations scored as distinguished or proficient. Teachers continuously assessed student understanding through verbal questioning about content, conferred with students about their reading, and reviewed individual student math work. Teachers provided immediate feedback, generally through questions that guided students to correct answers. A breakdown of the scores by component can be found below.[1]

Percent	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Basic	0%	8%	17%	8%	33%	25%	25%	9%
Proficient	100%	83%	83%	50%	50%	75%	58%	82%
Distinguished	0%	8%	0%	42%	17%	0%	17%	9%
Subdomain Average	**3.00**	**3.00**	**2.83**	**3.33**	**2.83**	**2.75**	**2.92**	**3.00**

	Domain 2	Domain 3
% Proficient or above	92%	77%
Domain Averages	**3.04**	**2.88**

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week observation window, Friendship PCS – Armstrong Middle completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities. According to the school, general education teachers and special education teachers

[1] Each component score is out of four. A breakdown of the critical attributes for each component can be found in Appendices I and II.

collaborate to provide the best learning environment for special education students. Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Overall, DC PCSB found the school implemented its stated SPED program with fidelity. Key trends from the SPED observations are summarized below.

- **Resources:** To support the learning of students with disabilities, the school reported that they offer resources such as adaptive computer-based programs as well as dedicated aides. Students with disabilities also have access to Chromebooks or iPads. In the QSR team's observations, there were at least two dedicated aides in each of the observed class settings. Two of the observations took place in resource rooms with multiple SPED teachers, dedicated aides and support staff. In one math lesson, the teacher handed out calculators to students as they worked to solve a math word problem.

- **Co-Teaching Models:** The school said it uses six co-teaching models: One Teach, One Assist; One Teach, One Observe; Station Teaching; Parallel Teaching; Alternative Teaching; and Team Teaching. The school stated that its ideal model is Parallel Teaching. In all three observations, the teachers used Parallel Teaching. In two resource room observations, the lead SPED teacher alternated between working with students individually and circulating throughout the room. The other SPED teachers did the same as the dedicated aides, working directly with students to support their learning. All teachers addressed the whole group throughout the lesson, in addition to giving individual feedback to students and small groups.

- **Accommodations:** The school stated that students would receive extended time, frequent breaks, repeated directions, small groups and one-on-one support by aides or teachers. The QSR team observed implementation of all the listed accommodations. Multiple dedicated aides served students with disabilities in all three SPED observations. The SPED teachers in each classroom allowed for three to seven minutes breaks throughout the class. Teachers repeated activity directions and checked for student understanding throughout the lesson. In one class, the teacher asked, "X, do you need more time? Tell me and we can come back to you in a few minutes when you are done. You don't need to rush."

- **Modifications:** The school wrote the QSR team could expect to see teachers soliciting verbal rather than paper responses; students using illustration to show understanding of math concepts; group tasks; modeling; and scaffolding to support students with disabilities. The QSR team observed the school implementing the stated modifications. Students worked one-on-one

with teachers or in small groups to complete assignments. In one resource room observation, the lead SPED teacher modeled appropriate spacing between words to a student as they worked to complete a writing prompt. In a resource room math observation, the teacher asked the students to draw the problem before they worked to solve it.

Specialized Instruction for English Learners

Prior to the two-week observation window, Friendship PCS – Armstrong Middle completed a questionnaire about how it serves its English learners. According to the school, Friendship PCS – Armstrong Middle relies on a "content-based integrated approach" to English learner (EL) instruction, wherein "all instruction is given in English," and students receive services "in small groups, as well as individually when necessary." The school stated, "English learners in content-based ESL classes naturally and incidentally acquire English and its structure because they comprehend the language expressed in content-related concepts." The school explained that English language development, "takes place in a structured, non-threatening environment in which students feel comfortable taking risks." Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Overall, DC PCSB found the school implemented the following aspects of its EL program with fidelity in the one session observed.

- **Trusting Environment:** DC PCSB observed strong rapport between students and both the EL teacher and general education teacher. For example, most students raised their hands to share responses or thoughts during the lesson. The EL teacher actively encouraged and praised participation from all students, but especially those who raised their hands less often than others. All students seemed comfortable sharing, either out loud with the class or quietly through a one-on-one discussion with a circulating teacher. Students did not appear discouraged or embarrassed when they gave an incorrect response, and usually wanted to try again.

- **Minimize Language Barriers:** The school explained that DC PCSB observers would see "both ESL and general education teachers work to reduce language-based barriers in academic subjects and improve English learners' comprehension and word reading ability in integrated classrooms." Generally, DC PCSB observed the EL teacher and general education teacher work together to support English language development through content instruction. For example, during a lesson where students were learning about the American Revolution through a literary text, teachers asked students to read aloud, listen to their peers read aloud, read to themselves, and write responses based on the reading. When students struggled or had a question,

the EL teacher circulated the classroom and provided one-on-one support while the general education teacher led the lesson.

Aspects of the school's articulated English language acquisition model that DC PCSB did not observe include small group instruction and specialized, supplemental curricular offerings (e.g., Learning A-Z ELL Edition and the Amira reading program).

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[2]

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 92% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Classroom Environment domain. Please see Appendix I for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	The QSR team rated 100% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, teacher-student interactions were caring and demonstrated genuine respect. In one observation, the teacher apologized for mispronouncing a student's name. Across observations, teachers greeted students upon entry, asked how they were, and referred to them by name. In these observations, teachers connected with students individually about their lives outside of school. In one observation, the teacher inquired about a student's past injury. Students in these observations, were polite to each other and often thanked their classmates for sharing or helping them solve a problem.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	100%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as basic in this component.	Basic	0%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
	The QSR team rated 91% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the	Distinguished	8%

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

Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Establishing a Culture for Learning	distinguished observation, the teacher communicated a genuine passion for the content. The teacher said things like, “You guys, this is so juicy!” and, “Oh, I am seeing these connections and it is making me so happy. Listen up!" In the proficient observations, teachers communicated that with hard work, all students could be successful. In one observation, the teacher said, “It is really hard, but you can do this,” and “You are all capable; just give each other time to get through it.” Across observations, teachers held high expectations for students as they insisted on students’ precise use of language, saying, “Be specific.” Teachers showed high regard for student abilities, explaining, “I want to hear what you think; there is no right or wrong answer,” “They got this! This is what I’m talking about! I like what I'm seeing!” and, “You got this. Take your time and you can get this."	Proficient	83%
	The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component. This represents one observation and qualitative evidence will not be included in the report.	Basic	8%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team rated 83% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, classroom routines functioned smoothly. Teachers used countdowns and timers to signal transitions. Students followed established routines. Across classrooms, students entered classrooms and immediately began the warm-up. Students and teachers efficiently managed materials. In one observation, students quickly complied with the teacher’s call to “make sure your calculators are on your desk,” so they could collect them. In another observation, the teacher distributed and collected laptops from students with little prompting. Teachers successfully facilitated the lesson during small group and independent work by giving students group roles and circulating the classroom to check student work and provide support as needed.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	83%

Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated 17% of the observations as basic in this component. In these observations, classroom routines functioned unevenly. In one observation, students lost instructional time as many were unsuccessful at finding a partner as the teacher counted down from 30. In another basic observation, students working independently and in small groups were only partially engaged. Some engaged in off-topic conversations or horseplay. The teacher attempted to refocus students by saying, “Clap once if you can hear me,” but had to do so several times before all students complied.	Basic	17%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team rated 92% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations, student behavior was almost entirely appropriate. Students listened during instruction, raised their hands patiently to speak, and immediately worked on assigned tasks. Teaches effectively managed minor instances of off-task behavior. Teachers addressed behavior subtly using proximity to stop students from talking during independent work. Teachers prompted positive behavior, telling students, “I know you’re ready to listen because your eyes are on me,” and, “I want to see a silent hand.” In proficient observations, student behavior was generally appropriate, and teachers addressed minor instances of off-task behavior effectively. Teachers said things like, “I notice a lot of us are talking, which is good, but not all of us are talking about our story.” In another observation, students quickly quieted down as the teacher explained, “I want us to listen to our classmates as they give us some evidence." Teachers reminded students of the expectations by calling on students with raised hands and calling out students complying with directions, saying, “I see X doing what she's supposed to, I see Y doing a good job. I see you, Z."	Distinguished	42%
		Proficient	50%
	The QSR team rated less than 10% of the observations as basic in this component. This represents one observation and qualitative evidence will not be included in the report.	Basic	8%

Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated 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 77% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Instruction domain. Please see Appendix II for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

<table>
<tr><th>Instruction</th><th>Evidence</th><th colspan="2">School Wide Rating</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Communicating with Students</td><td rowspan="2">The QSR team rated 67% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations, teachers invited students to explain content, saying, "X, plot [the points] for us and tell us how you knew where to plot each number." Students demonstrated understanding of the presentation, correctly using precise academic language. Teachers in the distinguished observations used rich, imaginative language connected to student experience when teaching vocabulary.

In the proficient observations, teachers clearly communicated the instructional purpose. In one observation the teacher stated, "The purpose is we can see these [grammatical elements] in other people's writing and apply it to our own." The teacher later told students they would be looking for claims and evidence in an article. Teachers used vocabulary suitable to the lesson and age of students, referring to terms like 'Loyalist,' 'Patriot,' 'Redcoat' and 'blacksmith.' Teachers invited student participation and thinking in explanations of content, telling them to, "Think about what you're underlining in this [word] problem…" and later asked students to share their approaches. Students in these observations engaged with the learning task, indicating they understood what to do. In one observation, after the teacher explained the learning task, students immediately began independently reading and annotating the text.</td><td>Distinguished</td><td>17%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Proficient</td><td>50%</td></tr>
</table>

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated 33% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, teachers had to clarify the learning task so students could complete it. In one observation, after attempting to explain the directions to students multiple times, the teacher had to regroup the entire class for a mini lesson. In another observation, the teacher's explanation of content was hard to follow as the class worked through a word problem. In this observation, both adults in the room had to discuss the problem to ensure their solution was correct before students completed it. In another observation, the teacher's explanations of content were purely procedural and as a result limited student participation.	Basic	33%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques	The QSR team rated 75% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers posed open-ended questions designed to promote student thinking, like, "What claim is the author making in this article?" and, "What are the disadvantages with using photos versus video?" Teachers asked students to justify their responses and find text evidence to support their conclusions. Teachers often invited students to respond directly to one another. One teacher said, "Do you want to build on what X just said?" In another observation, students participated in a robust, unmediated discussion about a text as they offered different interpretations of a quote. Across classrooms, teachers used effective wait time and a range of strategies to give students a voice, like cold-calling, partner work, and small group work.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	75%
	The QSR team rated 25% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, teachers framed some questions to promote student thinking, but only a few students were involved. Teachers often attempted to engage students in academic instructions, but many students remained silent, resulting in teachers answering their own questions. In some observations, questions had predetermined answers with few opportunities for students to explain their rationale.	Basic	25%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team rated 75% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations, virtually all students were intellectually engaged in the lesson. Students participated in whole group discussions and small group problem solving. Students in these observations, were highly engaged as they participated in an academic discussion. In another observation, students in small groups helped each other solve algebraic word problems. The teacher suitably scaffolded, prompting students with questions like, "Which equation are you going to solve first? What are you going to solve for?" In the proficient observations, most students were engaged in work that demanded higher-level thinking. Across observations, students wrote and peer-edited short stories, identified authors' claims in informational texts, and plotted temperatures on a number line of their own creation. In these observations, teachers used a mix of groupings appropriate to the lesson objectives, including whole group, small group, and turn-and-talks. Materials supported learning goals as students used pattern blocks to explore multiplying fractions.	Distinguished	17%
		Proficient	58%
	The QSR team rated 25% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, while some learning tasks required critical thinking, many required only recall. Students showed their work as they completed math problems and answered questions with predetermined answers like, "What does "double" mean? How many more times is that?" Students in these observations passively engaged with the content, and lessons focused primarily on facts or procedures. Students had no choice in how they completed learning tasks.	Basic	25%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
		Distinguished	9%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team rated 91% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation, the teacher continuously monitored student understanding. The teacher circulated the classroom and reviewed individual student work while students read and annotated a text. The teacher later conferenced individually with students about what was happening in the text and what they annotated, providing differentiated feedback to address student misunderstanding. In the proficient observations, teachers regularly elicited evidence of individual student and small group understanding. Teachers asked questions like, “Can someone tell me what it means for two inequalities to be proportional?” During small group work, teachers asked, “So what did you say?” then offered feedback to guide students to the correct answer. Teachers invited students to assess their own work or peer-asses and make improvements, telling them, “Check with your partner. Does your [story]…establish character, setting, and situation?” and, “Be sure to check your work first before you put your exit ticket down.” In one observation, the teacher asked students to compare their work to exemplars and correct their own papers as the class reviewed answers to multiple choice questions. Teachers offered feedback in the form of questions as they guided students to correct responses, telling students, “Here, look at this part. Is that what it said in the passage?"	Proficient	82%
	The QSR team rated less than 10% of observations as basic in this component. This represents one observation and qualitative evidence will not be included in the report.	Basic	9%
	The QSR team rated 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 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.

Work Sample Review

DC PCSB reviewed ten student work samples in addition to conducting classroom observations. Friendship PCS – Armstrong Middle submitted five English language arts (ELA) samples and five math samples covering a range of grade levels and assignment types. The QSR team evaluated the work samples based on grade-level alignment to college and career ready standards, including Common Core.[3] The team reviewed each work sample in the areas of content, practice, and relevance.[4]

The goal of the review is to answer three essential questions:

1. Does this assignment align with the expectations defined by grade-level standards, including a high-quality text and text-based questions?
2. Does the assignment provide meaningful practice opportunities for this content area and grade-level?
3. Overall, does the assignment give students an authentic opportunity to connect academic standards to real-world issues and/or context?

DC PCSB used the criteria below to assign an overall rating to each ELA assignment.[5]

	Content	Practice	Relevance
Sufficient	The assignment is based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text and contains questions that reach the depth of the grade-level standards.	The assignment both integrates standards and requires students to use what they learned from the text.	The assignment builds grade-appropriate knowledge, gives students a chance to use their voice and/or connects to real-world issues.
Minimal	The assignment is based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text but does not contain questions that reach the depth of the standard.	Either the assignment does not integrate standards, or it does not require students to use what they learn from the text.	The assignment builds grade-appropriate knowledge but does not give students a chance to use their voice and does not connect to real-world issues.
No Opportunity	The assignment is not based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text.	The assignment does not integrate standards and does not require students to use what they learn from the text.	The assignment does not build grade-appropriate knowledge, does not give students a chance to use their voice and does not connect to real-world issues.

Of the five ELA samples submitted, two assignments received an overall rating of "sufficient." These assignments were based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text,

[3] See here for more information on the shifts in the college and career ready standards: https://achievethecore.org/category/419/the-shifts.
[4] Reviewers used this tool for ELA work samples: https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/Ss1Ffy9Ab7. Reviewers used this tool for Math work samples: https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/Ca2F7lNXld. The review tools are based on The New Teacher Project's report: *The Opportunity Myth, available here:* https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org/.
[5] The overall assignment rating scale can be found here: https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/NteqkVdqCQ/Overall_Assignment_Rating_Scale.pdf_

reached the depth of the grade-level standard, and required students to use evidence from the text in their responses. Three assignments received an overall rating of "minimal." These assignments were based on a grade-appropriate text, but they did not require students to cite evidence from the text. Some evidence is captured below:

- Sixth grade students completed a chart to show their understanding of key events that helped advance the plot in a story. This assignment reached the depth of the targeted grade-level standard and required students to use what they learned from the text.

- Fourth grade students read an informational text and completed a graphic organizer to brainstorm ideas before starting their own writing. This assignment was not based on one or more texts, and it did not reach the full depth of the targeted standard.

DC PCSB used the criteria below to assign an overall rating to each math assignment.

	Content	Practice	Relevance
Sufficient	All the questions on the assignment reach the depth of the targeted grade-level standard(s).	The assignment includes an opportunity to engage with at least one mathematical practice at the appropriate level of depth.	The assignment connects academic content to real-world experiences and allows students to apply math to the real world in a meaningful way. It may also include novel problems.
Minimal	More than half (but not all) of the questions on the assignment reach the depth of the targeted grade-level standard(s).	The assignment includes an opportunity to engage with at least one critical math practice, but not at the level of depth required by the standard.	The assignment connects academic content to real-world experiences, but the problems do not allow students to apply math to the real world in a meaningful way.
No Opportunity	Less than half of the questions on the assignment reach the depth of the targeted grade-level standard.	The assignment provides no opportunity to engage with critical mathematical practices while working on grade-level content.	The assignment does not connect academic content to real-world experiences.

Of the five math samples submitted, three assignments received an overall rating of "sufficient." These assignments were based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text and all questions reached the depth of the grade-level standard. One assignment received an overall rating of "minimal." This assignment was based on a below grade-level text, and it did not require students to engage with a grade-level standard at the appropriate depth. One assignment received an overall rating of "no

opportunity." This assignment was not aligned to the appropriate grade-level standard or critical math practices. Some evidence is captured below:

- Fourth grade students solved a word problem using a strategy of their choice. This assignment reached the depth of the targeted grade-level standard, aligned to one or more critical math practices, and allowed student to apply mathematical concepts to the real world in a meaningful way.

- Eighth grade students wrote equations from a table and compared the unit rate to a given equation. This assignment only partially aligned to the grade-level standard, and more than half of the questions assigned did not reach the full depth of the target grade-level standard.