



August 18, 2022

Nicole Solomon Mitchell, Board Chair  
Statesmen College Preparatory Academy for Boys Public Charter School  
4600 Livingston Rd SE, #313  
Washington, DC 20032

Dear Ms. Solomon Mitchell:

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 five-year charter review during school year 2022 – 23.

**Qualitative Site Review Report**

A QSR team conducted on-site reviews of Statesmen College Preparatory Academy for Boys Public Charter School from April 18 – 29, 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 Statesmen College Preparatory Academy for Boys Public Charter School.

Sincerely,

Rashida Young  
Chief School Performance Officer

## Qualitative Site Review Report

**Date:** August 18, 2022

### **Campus Information**

**Campus Name:** Statesmen College Preparatory Academy for Boys Public Charter School (Statesmen PCS)

**Ward:** 8

**Grade levels:** Fourth through Seventh

### **Qualitative Site Review Information**

**Reason for Visit:** School eligible for five-year charter review during school year 2022 – 23

**Two-week Window:** April 18 – 29, 2022

**QSR Team Members:** Two DC PCSB staff members and one consultant who served as the special education (SPED) specialist

**Number of Observations:** 10

**Total Enrollment:** 163

**Students with Disabilities Enrollment:** 61

**English Learners Enrollment:** 0

**In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:**

**Visit 1:** April 21, 2022 – 89.9%

**Visit 2:** April 22, 2022 – 88.0%

**Visit 3:** April 27, 2022 – 93.8%

### **Summary**

Statesmen PCS's mission is to:

Create a boy-friendly pedagogy-informed academic environment within which young men are equipped with the academic skills, social competencies, and personal development necessary to navigate life challenges, attend and complete the college of their choice, and return to become the premier agents of social change within and for the communities they serve.

The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team observed some evidence that Statesmen PCS is achieving its mission. In most classrooms, students and teachers had positive relationships. Teachers focused heavily on personal development, often encouraging students to persist by making personal connections with students' lives outside of school. Most students engaged learning tasks. Materials and resources were readily available, allowing all students to access the content. Across classrooms, teachers exclusively asked recall questions with single correct answers, resulting in limited the academic conversations.

During the two-week observation window, the team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendices I and II). The QSR team scored 83% of observations as “distinguished” or “proficient” in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 2d, “Managing Student Behavior,” with 90% of observations rated as “proficient.” Across classrooms, student behavior was generally appropriate, and students followed established routines and procedures. Teachers handled minor instances of student misbehavior swiftly and respectfully. The QSR team scored 68% of observations as “distinguished” or “proficient” in the Instruction domain. The highest performing components in this domain were 3a, “Communicating with Students,” 3b, “Engaging Students in Learning,” and 3d, “Using Assessment in Instruction,” with 75% of observations rated as “proficient.” Across classrooms, most teachers explained content clearly, maintained student engagement, and checked for individual evidence of student understanding. A breakdown of the scores by component can be found below.<sup>1</sup>

Percent	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	3c	3d
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Basic</b>	20%	20%	20%	10%	25%	50%	25%	25%
<b>Proficient</b>	80%	80%	80%	90%	75%	50%	75%	75%
<b>Distinguished</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Subdomain Average</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.75</b>

	<b>Domain 2</b>	<b>Domain 3</b>
<b>% Proficient or above</b>	83%	68%
<b>Domain Averages</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>2.69</b>

### **Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities**

Prior to the two-week observation window, Statesmen PCS completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities. Reviewers looked for evidence of the school’s articulated program. According to the school, Statesmen PCS provides specialized instruction using a co-taught classroom model. DC PCSB observed specialized instruction in four general education, co-taught classrooms. Three of the classrooms used the “One Teach, One Assist” co-teaching model. One of the classrooms used an alternative teaching model. Overall, DC PCSB found the school implemented its stated program with fidelity. Key trends from the SPED observations are summarized below.

---

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

- **One Teach, One Assist:** In three observations, the general education teacher led whole-group instruction, while the special educator circulated the room, supporting individual students. DC PCSB observed the following accommodations: clarification/repetition of directions, providing students with wait-time to provide verbal responses to questions, ongoing checks for understanding, and preferential seating/close proximity (i.e., sitting near the teacher) that supported immediate feedback and redirection.
- **Alternative Teaching Model:** The classroom was supported by one special educator and two other adults (a general education teacher and an instructional aide). In this observation, the special educator implemented an alternative teaching model, providing modified instruction to a small group of students. Throughout the observation, the special educator modified the pace of instruction for the small group. DC PCSB observed the following accommodations: restating directions, preferential seating/close proximity that supported immediate feedback, modeling tasks.

## CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

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 83% 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 80% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, interactions between teachers and students and among students were respectful and reflected genuine warmth and caring. In one observation, the teacher gently put their arm around a student's shoulder. The teacher asked, "What's the matter?" and "What's up man?" The student explained what was happening, and immediately calmed down after being comforted by the teacher. In another observation, the teacher respected and encouraged students' efforts. The teacher said, "Please show the person that is reading the utmost respect." The teacher continued by encouraging the class to cheer for their peers. The teacher said, "That was so good, can we all say good job Student X?"	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	80%
	In the basic observations, interactions between teachers and students were uneven with occasional instances of disrespect. In one observation, the teacher loudly redirected students who were off-task. After several attempts, students continued to talk, and the teacher became visibly frustrated. The teacher responded by saying, "Are y'all serious?" and "Sit down now." In another observation, a student attempted to leave the room. The teacher stopped the student by placing their hand on the student's chest. The student stomped back to their seat before sitting down.	Basic	20%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
		Distinguished	0%

Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	The QSR team rated 80% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers held high expectations for most students. In one observation, the teacher said to a student, "You are so smart. You can do anything," after encouraging a student to persist in completing a problem they were having difficulty with. Across observations, students expended good effort to complete high-quality work. In one observation, as the teacher chose responses to display on the projector, many students showed pride in their completed work by yelling with excitement, "Choose mine! Can you read mine?"	Proficient	80%
	The QSR team rated 20% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, few students exhibited commitment to complete work on their own. In one observation, many students engaged in off-task behaviors instead of taking notes as instructed. The teacher asked, "Did everyone write that down?" Most students replied by saying, "No" to which the teacher replied, "OK, so get it down." However, many students continued to disengage instead of taking notes. In both observations, students not working directly with the teacher were off-task and required several reminders before beginning or continuing their work.	Basic	20%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	The QSR team rated 80% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, classroom routines and procedures functioned smoothly. In one observation, students read an academic text together. The teacher quickly distributed books and the students immediately opened them and started following along with no loss of instructional time. In another observation, the teacher used a timer to transition students between activities. In this observation, when the timer sounded at the end of an activity, the students immediately and independently transitioned to the next activity.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	80%

Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team rated 20% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, some instructional time was lost due to inefficient routines and procedures. In one observation, the teacher counted down from ten, asking students to put their laptops away. Many students did not comply. The teacher repeated the transition several times, resulting in loss of instructional time. During one attempt, the teacher said, “I’m waiting for 100%. One more time. I am still hearing voices—why?” Many students continued to talk. In another observation, the teacher said, “When I say ‘go,’ we are going to take our laptops, plug them back in on the chargers, and go back to our seats.” As they transitioned, many students engaged in off-task behavior and required to several redirections leading to loss in instructional time.</p>	Basic	20%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Student Behavior	<p>The QSR team rated 90% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, student behavior was generally appropriate. The teacher responded to minor instances of student misbehavior swiftly and respectfully. In one observation, a student left their seat without permission. The teacher replied, “Hold on—is there a reason why you are out of your seat?” The student immediately returned to their seat. In another observation, two students began talking during independent work time. The teacher told them to separate themselves and they did so immediately. The teacher thanked both students for complying.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	90%
	<p>The QSR team scored 10% of observations as basic in this component. This represents one observation and qualitative evidence will not be included in the report.</p>	Basic	10%
	<p>The QSR team rated 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 68% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Instruction domain. Please see Appendix II for a breakdown of each subdomain score.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Communicating with Students</b>	The QSR team rated 75% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers clearly communicated what students would be learning. In one observation, the teacher said, "Today we are going to spend most of our time drafting a literary analysis paragraph." In another observation, the teacher modeled expectations for students. The teacher said, "Here's what you're going to do," before modeling for students how to represent a number using graphing paper. Across observations, teachers used content-specific vocabulary to explain concepts. Teachers often required students to repeat directions back to them to ensure that they understood.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	75%
	The QSR team rated 25% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, teachers provided little explanation about what students would be learning. As a result, teachers often had to repeat instructions several times before students understood. In one observation, the teacher said, "I am going to review what we did yesterday to catch everyone up." The teacher followed up with a 30-minute review in which they haphazardly went back and forth between learning objectives resulting in student confusion and disengagement.	Basic	25%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
		Distinguished	0%



Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques	<p>The QSR team rated 50% of observations proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers posed open-ended questions, inviting student thinking. In one observation, the teacher asked, "What have we been discussing?" to which the student responded, "The central idea and the topic." The teacher continued by asking, "Why have we been discussing the topic?" The student then engaged in several back-and-forth exchanges with the teacher. After the exchange, the teacher instructed the student to find a partner to discuss the topic to compare their answers. Across classrooms, teachers encouraged students to participate in classroom discussions by asking them to share if they agreed or disagreed with a peer's response or if they had anything to add. This result in several robust academic conversations.</p>	Proficient	50%
	<p>The QSR team rated 50% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, teachers posed some questions designed to promote student thinking, but many had a single correct answer. In one observation the teacher said, "Who can tell me what a Histogram is?" A student responded, and the teacher then said, "Now someone who wasn't here yesterday say it back to me." Several students responded by simply repeating the definition back to the teacher. In another observation, the teacher reviewed shapes and repeatedly asked the same question, "How many lines of symmetry does this shape have?" When some students initially answered incorrectly, the teacher responded by simply answering their own question. In another observation the teacher asked students to respond to a prompt. Most students simply responded "yes" or "no." The teacher did not ask them to provide additional context.</p>	Basic	50%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
		Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Engaging Students in Learning	<p>The QSR team rated 75% of observations proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, most students intellectually engaged with the learning tasks. In one observation, the teacher instructed students to work with a partner to discuss a text they read. Students were required to use evidence from the text in their responses. The teacher encouraged students to stay engaged in their discussion groups by offering conversation starters. For example, the teacher said, "What is the effect of the quote on the reader? I want you to go ahead and talk with your neighbor." Most students actively engaged in their groups. In another observation, the teacher also used small discussion groups to maintain student engagement. The teacher asked students to define unknown words. For example, the teacher said, "Turn and talk to your neighbor about what 'basking' means in the context that it was used in the text."</p>	Proficient	75%
	<p>In the basic observations, only some students intellectually engaged with the learning tasks. In one observation, students completed a recall activity on a learning app that required only passive engagement. Students completed this activity for the majority of the lesson. In another observation, most students engaged in off-task behavior and disengaged for the majority of the observation. The teacher only briefly attempted to reengage them before continuing with the lesson.</p>	Basic	25%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
		Distinguished	0%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Using Assessment in Instruction	<p>The QSR team rated 75% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers monitored student understanding through various methods. In one observation, the teacher polled the class saying, "Someone with a silent hand tell us what you think the topic is for this passage" and "Someone recap for us what we learned?" Several students had the opportunity to respond. When one student had difficulty, the teacher asked a peer to help them. Before asking the student again, the teacher said, "Student X, I'm doubling back to you because I said I was going to come back you." The student was able to successfully respond to the prompt. In another observation, the teacher used questioning to gauge student understanding of a text. The teacher asked, "What kind of language or descriptions are being used to describe the setting thus far?" and said, "Let me hear some good language." Multiple students responded using academic vocabulary related to the content.</p>	Proficient	75%
	<p>The QSR team rated 25% observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, the teacher monitored student understanding through a single method. In one observation, the teacher said, "Thumbs up if you understand the problem so far." While many students gave a thumbs up or thumbs down, the teacher did not require them to explain their responses. Further, this was the only way the teacher checked for student understanding. In the basic observations, feedback to students was vague and not focused on future improvement. In one observation, when a student incorrectly answered a question, the teacher said, "I would draw it like this," but did not explain why. In another observation, the teacher corrected a student's work rather than helping them identify why it was incorrect.</p>	Basic	25%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%

## 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.

### Work Sample Review

DC PCSB reviewed ten student work samples in addition to classroom observations. Statesmen PCS 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.<sup>2</sup> The team reviewed each work sample in the areas of content, practice, and relevance.<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>4</sup>

	<b>Content</b>	<b>Practice</b>	<b>Relevance</b>
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, and gave students the chance to use their voice to connect to real-world issues.

---

<sup>2</sup> See here for more information on the shifts in the college and career ready standards:

<https://achievethecore.org/category/419/the-shifts>.

<sup>3</sup> 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/Ca2F71NXld>. The review tools are based on The New Teacher Project’s report: *The Opportunity Myth*, available here:

<https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org/>.

<sup>4</sup> The overall assignment rating scale can be found here:

[https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/NteqkVdqCO/Overall\\_Assignment\\_Rating\\_Scale.pdf](https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/NteqkVdqCO/Overall_Assignment_Rating_Scale.pdf)

Three assignments received an overall rating of “minimal.” These assignments either partially aligned to the grade-level standard or were not based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. Some evidence is captured below:

- Fourth grade students read a non-fiction passage and responded to prompts based on the reading. While this assignment required students to use evidence from the text in their responses, it was not based on a qualitatively complex grade-appropriate text.
- Sixth grade students made meaning of a theme in a text. This assignment was based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text and allowed students the opportunity to use their personal voice.

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

	<b>Content</b>	<b>Practice</b>	<b>Relevance</b>
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 reached the appropriate depth of the grade-level standard and allowed students the opportunity to connect academic content to the real world in a meaningful way. Two assignments received an overall rating of “minimal.” These assignments mostly aligned to the targeted grade-level standard; however, they either did not give students the opportunity to engage in a critical math practice or connect academic content to the real world in a meaningful way. Some evidence is captured below:

- Fifth grade students located items on a coordinate plane before identifying an ordered pair. This assignment did not reach the full depth of the targeted

grade-level standard and did not allow students the opportunity to connect academic content to the real-world in a meaningful way.

- Seventh grade students applied their understanding of ratios to compute percentages. This assignment reached the depth of the targeted grade-level standard. This assignment contained word problems that allowed students to connect academic content to the real-world in a meaningful way.