November 28, 2022

Mr. Aaron Lentner, Interim Board Chair
Dr. Joe Smith, Chief Executive Officer
Eagle Academy Public Charter School – Capitol Riverfront

Dear School Leaders:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. DC PCSB identified Eagle Academy Public Charter School – Capitol Riverfront for a Qualitative Site Review because your school is eligible for its 20-year charter review during school year 2022 – 23.

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Eagle Academy Public Charter School – Capitol Riverfront from September 19 – 30, 2022. The team observed 75.0% of the campus's core content classes. Observers evaluated classroom environment and instruction, as defined in the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching*. Additionally, the team reviewed Eagle Academy Public Charter School – Capitol Riverfront's sample English language arts and math assignments to determine whether the assignments align with grade-appropriate standards. See the team's findings in the enclosed Qualitative Site Review report.

Sincerely,

Rashida Young
Chief School Performance Officer

Qualitative Site Review (QSR) Report

Eagle Academy Public Charter School (Eagle PCS) – Capitol Riverfront			
Year Opened	2003 – 04	**Ward**	6
Grades Served	PK3 – 3	**General Enrollment**	115[1]
Students with Disabilities Enrollment	26	**English Learners Enrollment**	0
Mission Statement			
Eagle PCS's mission is to build the foundation for a promising future for all students in a rich, robust learning environment that fosters creativity and problem-solving abilities, emphasizing cognitive, social, and emotional growth by engaging children as active learners in an inclusive learning environment.			
Observation Window		**In-Seat Attendance Rate on Observation Day(s)**	
09/19/22 through 09/20/22		Visit 1. 09/19/22: 85.7% Visit 2. 09/26/22: 88.1% Visit 3. 09/27/22: 89.7%	

Observation Summary

During the two-week observation window, the QSR team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction at Eagle PCS – Capitol Riverfront. The QSR team included three consultants, including one special education expert. The QSR team rated 66.7% of observations as "distinguished" or "proficient" in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 2a, "Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport," with 88.9% of observations rated as "distinguished" or "proficient." Across classrooms, most teacher-student interactions demonstrated care and respect. Teachers and students used polite language toward one another, and teachers demonstrated care for students as they comforted

---

[1] This enrollment figure is based on preliminary, unvalidated data as of October 5, 2022.

them and told them, "I'm here to help." The QSR team rated 77.8% of observations as "distinguished" or "proficient" in the <u>Instruction</u> domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 3d, "Using Assessment in Instruction," with 100% of observations rated as "distinguished" or "proficient." Across all observations, teachers regularly elicited evidence of student learning through various methods.

See below for a breakdown of scores by component:

Domain	Classroom Environment				Instruction			
	2A	**2B**	**2C**	**2D**	**3A**	**3B**	**3C**	**3D**
Component	Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Establishing a Culture for Learning	Managing Classroom Procedures	Managing Student Behavior	Communicating with Students	Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	Engaging Students in Learning	Using Assessment in Instruction
Distinguished	11.1%	0%	11.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11.1%
Proficient	77.8%	66.7%	44.4%	55.6%	66.7%	66.7%	77.8%	88.9%
Basic	11.1%	33.3%	44.4%	44.4%	33.3%	22.2%	11.1%	0%
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11.1%	11.1%	0%
Subdomain Average	3.00	2.67	2.67	2.56	2.67	2.56	2.67	3.11
Domain Average	2.72				2.75			
% Proficient or Above	**66.7%**				**77.8%**			

(Each component score is out of four. See Appendices I and II for a detailed description of each level of performance.)

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities
Prior to the two-week observation window, Eagle PCS – Capitol Riverfront 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, Eagle PCS – Capitol Riverfront provides specialized instruction through a combination of push-in, pull-out, and self-contained settings. DC PCSB observed specialized instruction in the self-contained and pull-out settings. Overall, DC PCSB found the school implemented its stated special education continuum with fidelity. Key trends from the special education observations are summarized below.

- **Self-Contained**: DC PCSB observed one self-contained class that supported early childhood students with significant developmental needs. The student-to-adult ratio was three-to-two. Both adults shared responsibility for supporting students with transitions and academics. DC PCSB observed the following academic supports: verbal prompts, proximity, oral assessments, visual and verbal prompts, movement breaks, and repeated directions.

- **Pull-Out**: DC PCSB observed one English language arts (ELA) pull-out session. The student-to-adult ratio was two-to-two. During this observation, students worked on a guided reading lesson. The special education teacher led the lesson. During the activity, the teacher alternated between reading aloud to the students and having students read aloud to their peers. The teacher encouraged students to participate. DC PCSB observed the following academic supports: repeated directions, verbal and visual cues, and the use of a word bank.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[2]

This table summarizes the school's performance in the Classroom Environment domain during the unannounced visits. The rating categories— "distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory"—come from the *Framework for Teaching*.[3] The QSR team scored 67% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" in the Classroom Environment domain.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	The QSR team rated **11.1%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observation, classroom interactions between the teacher and students were highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth, caring, and sensitivity to students as individuals. Teachers greeted students with, "Good morning," and called them by name. Teachers in this observation showed care by asking students if they were okay, wiping their noses, and straightening out their clothes.
	The QSR team rated **77.8%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teacher-student interactions were friendly and demonstrated general care and respect. Teachers praised students with, "Good job," "Very good," and, "You guys are fantastic!" Teachers thanked students for participating and comforted them by saying, "You'll get a turn," and, "If you need help, I'm here to help." In one observation, a student's parent brought in treats for the class and the teacher said, "Let's make sure to say thank you." In the proficient observations, teachers also responded to minor instances of disrespectful behavior. In one observation, one student interrupted another, and the teacher said, "No, I want Student X to reply so you need to wait until I call on you to share."
	The QSR team rated **11.1%** of observations as **basic** in this component. This represents one observation. DC PCSB only reports qualitative evidence for a single observation when the performance is rated distinguished or proficient.

---

[2] The QSR team may observe teachers more than once by different review team members.
[3] For details, see the framework's "Classroom Environment Observation Rubric," available in Appendix I.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team rated **66.7%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, classroom interactions supported learning and hard work. Teachers expected strong student effort by providing students with multiple opportunities to respond to questions and telling students, "Say it like you know it!" and, "No one is going to remain unnoticed in my class." Teachers in the proficient observations also demonstrated a high regard for student abilities. In one observation, the teacher said to students, "I know you can do this; you just have to try!" In the proficient observations, teachers also recognized student effort by giving students specific praise.
	The QSR team rated **33.3%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers conveyed high expectations for only some students. For example, teachers called only on a select group of students to answer questions. They also demonstrated low energy for the work, focusing on task completion rather than quality. In one observation, when students asked questions about a task, the teacher rushed them to finish their work so they could move on rather than answering their questions.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team rated **11.1%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observation, students demonstrated understanding of routines and took initiative to establish them. In one observation, a student who was assigned the job of "assistant teacher" led their classmates through routines for transitioning.
	The QSR team rated **44.4%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, routines functioned smoothly. Across observations, teachers used verbal cues and chants to refocus students. One verbal cue was, "Macaroni and cheese, freeze!" In the proficient observations, students were productively engaged during small-group and independent work. In one observation, students in centers

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	played in a kitchen in the dramatic play area, read books, built with blocks, played with Play-doh and connected manipulatives. In this same observation, students were able to independently find another activity when their preferred activity was full. Across all proficient observations, teachers maximized instructional time through efficient classroom routines and procedures.
	The QSR team rated **44.4%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, students not working directly with the teacher were only partially engaged. In one observation, students who were working independently sat idle or walked around the classroom. In the basic observations, instructional time was lost due to ineffective classroom routines and procedures. In one observation, 13 students waited for five minutes with no instructional activity as the teacher assisted other students with logging on to iPads. In another observation, when students were talking and kicking their chairs during a transition, the teacher had students practice standing up and pushing in their chairs for several minutes.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
2d. Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **55.6%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers' responses to misbehavior were effective. In one observation, when a student was drawing rather than reading, the teacher walked over and quietly redirected them. The student then re-engaged in reading. In another observation, a student played with a toy but stopped when the teacher tapped on their desk. In the proficient observations, teachers consistently monitored student behavior by circulating the classroom and observing students. Across all proficient observations, student behavior was generally appropriate.
	The QSR team rated **44.4%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers attempted to maintain order in the classroom, but with uneven success. In one observation, despite the teacher's directions to stand behind desks and

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	quiet down, students continued moving and yelling. In another observation, students initially responded to teacher redirections, but quickly returned to off-task behavior. In another observation, after the teacher set voice level expectations, multiple students continued to engage in conversations with their peers during a read-aloud.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school's performance in the <u>Instruction</u> domain during the unannounced visits. The rating categories—"distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory"—come from the *Framework for Teaching*.[4] The QSR team scored 77.8% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" in the <u>Instruction</u> domain.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
3a. Communicating with Students	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **66.7%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers' content explanations were clear and invited student participation and thinking. In one observation, when working on making predictions, the teacher asked students to share their predictions and the reasoning for their prediction. In another observation, the teacher called on different students to support with the steps needed to solve a math problem. In the proficient observations, teachers also modeled the process to be followed in learning tasks. In one observation, the teacher modeled identifying specific vowel sounds before having students do so on their own. Across all the proficient observations, teachers clearly stated the objectives prior to beginning a lesson.
	The QSR team rated **33.3%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers' content explanations did not invite students' intellectual engagement. In one observation, the teacher walked students through how to complete a worksheet while students watched. The teacher did not call on students to participate or assist in completion. Once the teacher completed the example, students finished the worksheet on their own. In the basic observations, teachers needed to clarify learning tasks before students could complete them. In one observation, when the teacher explained breaking apart a number, students said, "I don't understand." Students remained confused after the teacher's clarification.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.

---

[4] For details, see the framework's "Instruction Observation Rubric," available in Appendix II.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Technique	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **66.7%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers used open-ended questions that invited students to think and offer multiple answers. In one observation, students were asked to predict what a story was about and to connect their own experiences to events in the story. In another observation the teacher asked, "When he says his stomach is full of butterflies, what does that mean?" In response to this question, multiple students raised their hands to share their thoughts. In the proficient observations, teachers also prompted students to expand on their verbal responses. In one observation, when a student shared that he liked a car, the teacher prompted the student to build on their response by saying, "Thanks for sharing, but *why* do you like it? Can you explain some more?" Teachers in the proficient observations used multiple discussion strategies to ensure student participation.
	The QSR team rated **22.2%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers called on many students, but only a small number participated. In one observation, the teacher posed many questions, but several went unanswered. In this same observation, the teacher attempted to cold call on students; however, most students still did not participate. In another observation, many of the teacher's questions had a single correct answer. In this observation, the teacher asked questions such as, "What letter is this?" and "Is it uppercase or lowercase?"
	The QSR team rated **11.1%** of observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component. This represents one observation. DC PCSB only reports qualitative evidence for a single observation when the performance is rated distinguished or proficient.
3c. Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **77.8%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, most students were intellectually engaged in the lesson. Students in the proficient observations demonstrated engagement as they responded

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	to whole group questions, actively participated in centers, and quickly began their work upon receiving directions. In the proficient observations, materials and resources supported learning goals. In one observation, students used foam cutouts to make letters, interacted with SmartBoards in learning activities, and used manipulatives in math. Across all proficient observations, the pacing of lessons provided students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.
	The QSR team rated **11.1%** of observations as **basic** in this component. This represents one observation. DC PCSB only reports qualitative evidence for a single observation when the performance is rated distinguished or proficient.
	The QSR team rated **11.1%** of observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component. This represents one observation. DC PCSB only reports qualitative evidence for a single observation when the performance is rated distinguished or proficient.
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team rated **11.1%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observation, the teacher constantly "took the pulse" of the class using a variety of questions to diagnose evidence of understanding. In this observation, the teacher adjusted the lesson to assist individual students.
	The QSR team rated **88.9%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, feedback included specific and timely guidance for groups of students. Across all proficient observations, teachers circulated the classroom, while reviewing and commenting on student work. Teachers also used various strategies to elicit individual student understanding. In one observation, students were required to color code specific letters to show letter recognition. In another observation, the teacher cold called on students who had difficulty with specific letter sounds to sound out and read certain words.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **basic** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.

Assignment Review

DC PCSB staff and The New Teacher Project (TNTP) consultants reviewed sample ELA and math assignments Eagle PCS – Capitol Riverfront students received.[5] The campus submitted five ELA samples and five math samples covering a range of grade levels and assignment types. Evaluators used TNTP's *Assignment Review Protocol* to assess whether the assignments:

1. aligned with the expectations defined by grade-level standards,
2. provided students with meaningful practice opportunities, and
3. gave students an opportunity to connect academic standards to real-world issues.[6]

Upon review, evaluators rated each assignment as "sufficient," "minimal," or "no opportunity," describing the opportunity students had to meaningfully engage in worthwhile grade-level content.[7]

All five ELA assignments received an overall rating of "minimal." Although these assignments were based on a grade-appropriate, high-quality text, students did not have a chance to use their personal voice and make connections from the text to real-world experiences. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	Kindergarten (K)	Responding to the book *Ish*, students drew a picture and wrote a sentence about doing something they love.	Minimal	The assignment was based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. It reached the depth of the targeted standard. However, it did not give students an opportunity to use their personal voice.
Sample 2	1	Students read *The Black Rabbit* and worked independently to retell the story in order using a graphic organizer.	Minimal	The assignment was based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. It reached the depth of the standards. However, it did

---

[5] Eagle PCS's QSR was originally scheduled to take place during SY 21 – 22 but had to be rescheduled due to various factors including COVID-19. As a result, the work samples reviewed are from SY 21 – 22.

[6] See the ELA Assignment Review Protocol here: https://bit.ly/3eSEXQe. See the Math Assignment Review Protocol here: https://bit.ly/3UavzHI. These evaluation tools are based on TNTP's study, *The Opportunity Myth*, available here: https://bit.ly/2Dv7yId.

[7] For details, see a breakdown of each rating in Appendix III.

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
				not give students a chance to use their personal voice.
Sample 3	2	Students discussed the text features of the book, *The Growth of a Sunflower*, and how those text features helped them understand the text. Students then independently completed a graphic organizer identifying different text features.	Minimal	The assignment was based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. It reached the depth of the targeted standard. However, it did not give students an opportunity to use their personal voice.
Sample 5	2	After reading *When the Moon is Full*, students created a writing piece using rhyming and sensory words, along with correct spelling, capitalization, and punctuation.	Minimal	The assignment was based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. It contained questions that reached the depth of the grade-level standards. However, students were not required to use what they learned in the text, and they did not have an opportunity to use their personal voice.
Sample 5	3	After reading and discussing the story *T.J. the Siberian Tiger Cub*, students had to fill in the graphic organizer with the main idea and three supporting details.	Minimal	The assignment was based on a high-quality text. It reached the depth of the targeted standards. However, students did not have the opportunity to use their personal voice.

Of the five math samples submitted, two assignments received an overall rating of "sufficient." These assignments were aligned to a grade-level standard, reached the full depth of the targeted standard and mathematical practice, and included word problems that related to real-world experiences. Three assignments received an overall rating of "minimal." In these assignments, students were able to engage in the targeted standard and mathematical practice at the appropriate level of depth. However, these tasks consisted primarily of rote algebraic equations. As a result,

students were not provided with the opportunity to relate the academic content to real-world experiences. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	K	Students used number bonds to solve one-digit subtraction equations.	Sufficient	The assignment reached the depth of the targeted grade-level standards and mathematical practice, while also connecting academic content to real-world experiences
Sample 2	3	Students constructed a visual representation of an equation to solve a given word problem.	Sufficient	The assignment reached the depth of the targeted grade-level standards and mathematical practice, while also connecting academic content to real-world experiences.
Sample 3	1	Students compared the length of two pencils.	Minimal	While the assignment did not reach the intended level of depth of the standard, students were able to connect academic content to real-world experiences.
Sample 4	2	Students solved subtraction equations within 1000 by decomposing numbers using place value strategies. Students also explained their understanding and strategy.	Minimal	Students engaged in mathematical standards at the appropriate level of depth. However, the assignment did not connect content to real-world experiences.
Sample 5	3	Students found the area of given rectangles using multiplication.	Minimal	Students engaged in mathematical standards at the appropriate level of depth. However, the assignment did not connect content to real-world experiences.

Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
2a. 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.
2b. 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.

---

[8] Danielson, Charlotte. *The Framework for Teaching: Evaluation Instrument*. Princeton, NJ: Danielson Group, 2013.

Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
2c. 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.
2d. 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[9]

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
3a. 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.
3b. 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.
3c. 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.

[9] Danielson, Charlotte. *The Framework for Teaching: Evaluation Instrument*. Princeton, NJ: Danielson Group, 2013.

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
3d. 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.

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

ELA			
Rating	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.

---

[10] *The Student Experience Toolkit.* New York, NY: The New Teacher Project, 2018.

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

Math			
Rating	**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.