DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

November 28, 2022

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

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 – Congress Heights 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 – Congress Heights from September 19 – 30, 2022. The team observed 75% 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 – Congress Heights' 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) – Congress Heights			
Year Opened	2003 – 04	**Ward**	8
Grades Served	PK3 – 3	**General Enrollment**	412[1]
Students with Disabilities Enrollment	60	**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 09/30/22		Visit 1. 09/20/22: 88.7% Visit 2. 09/26/22: 89.5% Visit 3. 09/27/22: 89.5% Visit 4. 09/28/22: 85.3% Visit 5. 09/29/22: 86.3%	

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 – Congress Heights. The QSR team included four DC PCSB employees and consultants, including one special education expert. The QSR team rated 79.7% of observations as proficient or distinguished in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 2a, "Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport," with 81.3% of observations rated "proficient" or

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

"distinguished." In most observations, teacher-student interactions were friendly, demonstrating care and warmth. The QSR team rated 73.3% of observations as "proficient" or "distinguished" in the Instruction domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 3d, "Using Assessment in Instruction," with 84.6% of observations rated "proficient." Across most observations, teachers regularly assessed student learning and provided individual students with feedback. Teachers also adjusted instruction as necessary.

See below for a breakdown of scores by component:

Domain	**Classroom Environment**				**Instruction**			
Component	**2A** Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	**2B** Establishing a Culture for Learning	**2C** Managing Classroom Procedures	**2D** Managing Student Behavior	**3A** Communicating with Students	**3B** Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	**3C** Engaging Students in Learning	**3D** Using Assessment in Instruction
Distinguished	18.8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Proficient	62.5%	75.0%	75.0%	87.5%	81.3%	53.3%	75.0%	84.6%
Basic	18.8%	25.0%	25.0%	12.5%	18.8%	46.7%	18.8%	15.4%
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6.3%	0%
Subdomain Average	**3.00**	**2.75**	**2.75**	**2.88**	**2.81**	**2.53**	**2.69**	**2.85**
Domain Average	**2.84**				**2.72**			
% Proficient or above	**80%**				**73%**			

(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 – Congress Heights 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 – Congress Heights provides specialized instruction through a combination of push-in, pull-out, and self-contained settings. DC PCSB observed specialized instruction in the self-contained setting. 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 three self-contained classrooms. In these observations, the special education teacher took sole responsibility for leading academic lessons. Other adults in the classroom supported students with transitions, redirections, and engagement. In one observation, students were split into two small groups, with one group focusing on English language arts (ELA) and the other math. In another observation, students focused solely on math content, specifically adding single-digit numbers. DC PCSB observed the following academic supports: visual and verbal prompts, de-escalating strategies, repeated directions, and the use of manipulatives.

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 79.7% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Classroom Environment domain.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	The QSR team rated **18.8%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observations, teacher-student interactions reflected genuine warmth and care. In these observations, teachers told students as they helped them with classwork, "I know sometimes you don't have people to help you, so we are going to get started now." In another observation, the teacher asked a student, "How is your mommy feeling?" Teachers also connected to students as individuals. In one observation, the teacher asked a student, "Did you like your blueberry oatmeal this morning?" and "Do you want to do a puzzle with me?" Teachers also fostered respectful environments by telling students to be respectful, give neighbors personal space, and greet one another. Across all distinguished observations, students demonstrated respect for their teacher and classmates.
	The QSR team rated **62.5%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, interactions between teachers and students and among students were uniformly respectful. Across the proficient observations, teachers used endearing terms like "sweetie" and "baby" when referring to students. In one observation, the teacher jokingly said to a student, "You're just saying anything now, aren't you?" in response to a student's intentionally silly answer. Teachers in the proficient observations were also observed creating respectful environments. In one observation, the teacher asked a student, "Did you apologize to them?" after the student accidently hit the back of another student's chair, and "You stepped on her finger; what

[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
	should you say?" In the proficient observations, teachers respectfully responded to disrespectful behavior among students. In one observation, the teacher said, "It's her turn to pick, so let's respect her choice," when classmates were unhappy at their peer's chosen class activity.
	The QSR team rated **18.8%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, the quality of interactions between teachers and students were uneven with occasional insensitivity. The teacher in one observation used a harsh tone as they told students, "Be quiet! Just be quiet!" In another observation, when students had incorrect responses, the teacher told them, "I'm very disappointed" and "Guys, I just showed you." In another observation when a student asked to use the bathroom, the teacher said, "Go ahead. You always seem to have to go to the bathroom when I'm giving instructions."
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **75.0%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers demonstrated a high regard for student abilities. In one observation, the teacher told the class, "This is so easy for you!" as they made the math problem more challenging. In another observation, the teachers squealed in delight as students got answers correct. Teachers in the proficient observations also expected strong student effort. In one observation, the teacher said, "We must all do our very best" and "You're going to have to do math…we are here to help you…let me see you learn." Teachers insisted on precise use of language as they politely corrected a student's pronunciation of a vocabulary word. In the proficient observations, classrooms were cognitively busy with students beginning their work immediately upon receiving it.
	The QSR team rated **25.0%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers conveyed high expectations only for some students. In one observation, the teacher consistently called on the same student to answer questions.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	Students in the basic observations indicated they were looking for an easy path to completing work as they waited for the teacher to come around before starting their learning task. In the basic observations, teachers focused on task completion rather than quality. In one observation the teacher told students, "We have two more left and then we'll be done."
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **75.0%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, there was little loss of instructional time due to effective classroom routines and procedures. Teachers gave students jobs like sweeping, handing out materials and washing desks. In the proficient observations, students followed established classroom routines with minimal guidance. In one observation, students independently spaced themselves out on the carpet for read aloud. They also independently transitioned to their centers. Teachers effectively used countdowns and chants such as, "If you can hear me, clap once," to refocus students. Across the proficient observations, students smoothly transitioned between large- and small-group activities.
	The QSR team rated **25.0%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers lost instructional time due to only partially effective classroom routines and procedures. In one observation, students continuously interrupted the teacher's small groups to ask for support with their independent work. In another observation, the teacher spent several minutes completing attendance, which ultimately caused students to begin engaging in off-task behavior. In another observation, students disengaged as soon as the teacher left their table.
	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 **87.5%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, student behavior was generally appropriate. Students took turns sharing during

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	circle time and tracked their teachers as they gave directions. In the proficient observations, teachers effectively responded to misbehavior. In one observation, students immediately lowered their voice when the teacher said, “Settle down, settle down, level one.” Teachers in these observations continuously monitored student behavior. In one observation, the teacher quietly removed a book from a student who was reading during direct instruction. The student then quickly reengaged, giving their full attention to the teacher for the remainder of the lesson.
	The QSR team rated **12.5%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers attempted to monitor behavior with uneven results. In one observation, students used math manipulatives as toys, despite the teacher’s frequent redirection. A teacher in another observation had to ask students four times to lower their voices before the students complied. In another observation, a student had to be removed from the classroom after multiple voice-level reminders.
	The QSR team rated **none** of observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school's performance in the Instruction domain during the unannounced visits. The rating categories—"distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory"—come from the *Framework for Teaching*.[4] The QSR team scored 73.3% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Instruction 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 **81.3%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers clearly stated the instructional purpose. Across observations, teachers stated learning objectives such as identifying the narrator, distinguishing between points-of-view, and number bonds related to the number 10. Across observations, teachers also modeled the learning tasks, showing students how to solve for missing parts of a number bond, and answer questions in complete sentences. Teachers in the proficient observations also reviewed necessary vocabulary. In one observation, the teacher previewed and defined words students would encounter in an upcoming text. Teachers also invited student intellectual engagement during lessons. In one observation, the teacher intentionally solved a math problem incorrectly for the class to critique.
	The QSR team rated **18.8%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In one basic observation, the teacher made a minor content error as they reviewed the days of the week. In this same observation, the teacher's explanation of content consisted of a monologue as she counted along the days of the week in the calendar with only one student out of seven participating. In another basic observation, the teacher had to clarify the learning task multiple times for students to complete it. In this observation, students engaged in off-task behavior, while repeatedly asking the teacher, "What are we doing?" and "How do you do this?"
	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.

[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 **53.3%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers used open-ended questions that invited students to think and offer multiple possible answers. Teachers asked students to spot differences between two similar pictures, identify number pairs that make up the number ten, offer definitions of the word *interesting*, and give clues telling the reader a book is fantasy. Teachers built on student responses, asking students to elaborate on their fears and add to their observations. One teacher said, "That argument isn't strong enough," prompting students to give a more detailed explanation. Across the proficient observations, teachers employed a range of strategies to ensure a variety of student voice.
	The QSR team rated **46.7%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers framed some questions designed to promote student thinking, but many had a single correct answer. In one observation, the teacher primarily asked questions to which the answer was readily available such as, "How can I move these numbers around to create a different equation with the same operation?" The teacher repeated the question throughout the observation. In the proficient observations, teachers made limited attempts to engage students in discussion and only called on students who initially raised their hand.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
3c. Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **75.0%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, students were highly engaged throughout the lesson. Students enthusiastically sang songs, made observations about their read-aloud, and played in centers with minimal teacher intervention. Materials and resources supported learning goals and required intellectual engagement. In one observation, students read a text as they differentiated between first- and third-person point-of-view. In another observation, students used number lines and manipulatives to demonstrate how they arrived at a math solution. Students also demonstrated intellectual engagement through strong

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	participation in class discussions about point-of-view, genre, and math strategy. Across the proficient observations, when appropriate, teachers scaffolded instruction to support engagement.
	The QSR team rated **18.8%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, learning tasks required only minimal thinking. In one observation, students completed a worksheet containing rote, fill-in-the-blank math problems. In the basic observations, student engagement was passive. In one observation, only two out of five student groups completed their work, while others engaged in off-task behavior. In the basic observations, the lesson pacing did not provide students the time needed to engage intellectually. In one observation, when students quickly finished their work, the teacher encouraged them to "take a two-minute nap."
	The QSR team rated **6.0%** 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 **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **84.6%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers used assessment regularly during instruction, resulting in accurate, specific feedback. Teachers circulated classrooms examining student work and providing one-on-one feedback. In one observation, the teacher asked students individual questions related to their work such as, "So what is your addition equation to represent this?" In another observation, the teacher provided individual scaffolds for students who had difficulty solving a problem. In the proficient observations, teachers adjusted instruction as necessary. In one observation, the teacher asked students if they needed an additional example before completing work independently.
	The QSR team rated **15.4%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers provided general feedback that was not focused on improvement of student work. In one observation, the teacher gave global feedback such as, "Good

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	work" and "Nice job, class." In another observation, the teacher said, "Give me a thumbs up if you think you've got this." In the basic observations, teachers did not adjust lessons when students demonstrated confusion. In one observation, multiple students verbally stated their confusion, but the teacher did not offer any clarification.
	The QSR team rated **none** of 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 – Congress Heights students received. 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.[5]

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.[6]

Of the five ELA samples submitted, two assignments received an overall rating of "sufficient." These assignments were based on high-quality texts, required students to use what they learned in the text, and reached the full depth of the standards. Three assignments received an overall rating of "no opportunity." These assignments were either not based on a grade-appropriate text or only loosely based on a grade-appropriate text. Additionally, these assignments did not reach the full depth of the targeted standards. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	K	Students listened to the story, *Jack and the Hungry Giant*, paying attention to events at the beginning and middle of the story. After listening, students drew and told what happened at the beginning and middle of the story.	Sufficient	This assignment is based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. It reached the full depth of the targeted standards and allowed students to use their personal voice.

[5] 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.
[6] For details, see a breakdown of each rating in Appendix III.

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 2	1	Students drew and labeled symbols from the story, *The Contest*. They then wrote an opinion piece on their favorite symbol.	Sufficient	This assignment is based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. It reached the full depth of the targeted standards, and allowed students to use their personal voice.
Sample 3	1	Students created maps of Washington, DC and identified each ward with a different color and label. They also created map keys.	No Opportunity	This assignment is only loosely based on a text and does not reach the targeted depth of the standard.
Sample 4	2	Students discussed the language of poetry, chose a topic focused on the weather and used a word bank to write their own poem about weather.	No Opportunity	This assignment is only loosely based on a text and does not reach the targeted depth of the standard. While the task provides students an opportunity to use their personal voice, it does not do so at the appropriate level of depth.
Sample 5	3	Students used the Idea Support Map to respond to the following writing prompt: "Should schools have a welcome program for new students?" Students stated their opinions with reasoning and examples to support their responses.	No Opportunity	This assignment is not based on a text and does not reach the targeted depth of the standard.

Of the five math samples submitted, two assignments received an overall rating of "sufficient." These assignments focused on grade-level content, met the depth of the targeted standards, and connected academic content to real-world experiences. Three assignments received an overall rating of "minimal." These assignments were aligned to grade-level standards, but the tasks' questions did not reach the intended levels of depth. Additionally, the assignments did not provide an opportunity for students to connect academics to real-world experiences. None of the assignments contained word problems or real-life application. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	K	Students read addition number stories and created drawings and number equations to represent the number stories.	Sufficient	This assignment focused on grade-level content, met the depth of the targeted standards, and connected academic content to real-world experiences.
Sample 2	K	Students colored in circles and created number equations to demonstrate two different ways to make the number ten.	Minimal	This assignment was aligned to grade-level standards, but it did not reach the intended level of depth of the mathematical practice. Further, it did not provide an opportunity for students to relate the content to real-world experiences.
Sample 3	1	Students read a scenario and identified the essential information. Students then drew a picture, created a number bond, composed two number sentences, and wrote a statement to explain their thinking.	Sufficient	This assignment focused on grade-level content, met the depth of the targeted standards, and connected academic content to real-world experiences.
Sample 4	2	Students represented subtraction with and without the decomposition when there was a three-digit minuend.	Minimal	This assignment was aligned to grade-level standards, but it did not reach the intended level of depth of the mathematical practice. Further, it did not provide an opportunity for students to relate the content to real-world experiences.
Sample 5	3	Students skip-counted as a group, then practiced multiplication factors by adding the unknown (product). Students determined the area of a figure by	Minimal	This assignment was aligned to grade-level standards, but the task's questions did not reach the intended levels of depth. The task did not provide an opportunity for students

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
		decomposing the figure into two smaller rectangles using the distributive property.		to relate the content to real-world experiences.

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC[7]

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.

[7] 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[8]

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.

[8] 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.

APPENDIX III: ASSIGNMENT REVIEW CRITERIA[9]

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.

[9] *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.