March 15, 2023

Ms. Catharine Bellinger, Board Chair
Mr. Chris Pencikowski, Executive Director
Lee Montessori Public Charter School – Brookland

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 Lee Montessori Public Charter School – Brookland for a Qualitative Site Review because your school is eligible for its 10-year charter review during school year 2023 – 24.

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Lee Montessori Public Charter School – Brookland from December 5 – 16, 2022, and again from January 9 – 13, 2023. 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 Lee Montessori Public Charter School – Brookland'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

Lee Montessori Public Charter School – Brookland (Lee Montessori PCS – Brookland)			
Year Opened	2014 – 15	**Ward**	5
Grades Served	Pre-kindergarten 3 (PK3) – 5	**General Enrollment**	283[1]
Students with Disabilities Enrollment	58	**English Learners Enrollment**	12
Mission Statement			
Lee Montessori Public Charter School's mission is to create a peaceful, multi-age learning environment for preschool and elementary aged children that fosters the physical, social, emotional, and academic growth and development of students and produces life-long learners using the materials and philosophy developed by Maria Montessori and furthered by the Association Montessori Internationale.			
Observation Window[2]		**In-Seat Attendance Rate on Observation Day(s)**	
12/05/22 through 12/16/22 1/9/23 through 1/13/23		Visit 1. 12/05/22: 91.9% Visit 2. 12/06/22: 93.3% Visit 3. 12/12/22: 91.5% Visit 4. 1/13/23: 94.5%	

Observation Summary

During the observation window, the QSR team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction at Lee Montessori PCS – Brookland. The QSR team included four DC PCSB employees and consultants, including one special education expert, one English learner expert, and one Montessori

[1] This enrollment figure is based on preliminary, unvalidated data as of October 5, 2022.
[2] The QSR team visited Lee Montessori PCS – Brookland during two observation windows because it did not complete all specialized instruction observations during its initial visits in December 2022.

expert. The QSR team scored 84.6% of observations as "distinguished" or "proficient" in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 2d, "Managing Student Behavior," with 84.6% of observations rated as "distinguished" or "proficient." Across observations, teachers circulated classrooms and when minor instances of misbehavior occurred teachers quickly and appropriately redirected students. The QSR team scored 88.6% of observations as "distinguished" or "proficient" in the Instruction domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 3c, "Engaging Students in Learning," with 92.3% of observations rated as "distinguished" or "proficient." Across classrooms, the materials and resources required intellectual engagement. Further, students had some choice in how they completed learning tasks as they got materials, completed learning tasks, and exchanged materials for other tasks.

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	7.7%	15.4%	23.1%	61.5%	0%	0%	38.5%	0%
Proficient	76.9%	76.9%	53.8%	23.1%	92.3%	66.7%	53.8%	91.7%
Basic	15.4%	7.7%	23.1%	15.4%	7.7%	33.3%	7.7%	8.3%
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Subdomain Average	**2.92**	**3.08**	**3.00**	**3.46**	**2.92**	**2.67**	**3.31**	**2.92**
Domain Average	**3.12**				**2.95**			
% Proficient or Above	**84.6%**				**88.6%**			

(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

Before the observation window, Lee Montessori PCS – Brookland completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities. According to the school, its specialized instruction through an inclusion model with push-in and pull-out services. Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Overall, DC PCSB found the school implemented its stated special education continuum with fidelity. Key trends from the special education observations are summarized below.

- **Pull-out Instruction:** In one observation, the special education (SPED) teacher serviced two students who were assigned a vocabulary development assessment task. The SPED teacher required the students to read and follow directions: "Use the brown crayon to circle any animal words." One student worked with the SPED teacher on reading fluency; the teacher read the passage aloud and the student repeated after the teacher. The teacher rewarded the students for their hard work, "Do you want Oreos or chocolate chip cookies?" A second SPED teacher worked with groups of students with disabilities (SWD) in a pull-out setting in the morning and the afternoon. In another observation, students were reminded, "We do our drills first, and then move into our reading content study." In some cases, as appropriate, dedicated aides monitored student requirements in the pull-out setting and were expected to review the learning activities when students returned to the general education classroom.

- **Push-in Instruction:** In one observation, a SPED teacher provided one-on-one instruction to two separate students within a general education classroom. The SPED teacher and SWD engaged in hands-on activities to practice spelling the student's name, sorting animal pictures, and representing number values according to place value. In another observation, also within a general education classroom, a SPED teacher provided one-on-one instruction to two separate students. Students answered comprehension questions from reading texts. After reading the story, one student was able to write a sentence to summarize the main idea of the story; the second student had to take several breaks and finally agreed to finish the story at another time.

Specialized Instruction for English Learners

Before the observation window, Lee Montessori PCS – Brookland completed a questionnaire about how it serves English learners (EL). According to the school, its EL program includes "instructional strategies that are in line with all best practices of teaching" and its "Language Acquisition Program is noticeable in every classroom with the implementation of individualized lessons." The school states that it provides push-in services inside the general education classroom as well as pull-out services when needed. Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. DC PCSB found the school implements its stated English learner program with fidelity. Key trends from the English learner observations are summarized below.

- **Language Skills:** The English learner teacher provided direct instruction on language skills, particularly reading and pronunciation. The teacher listened closely as students read grade-level sight words. When a student did not know how to read a specific word, the teacher pointed to each letter sound and had the student sound it out. Students also practiced manipulating letters within a word to create new words, such as "quite" and "quiet." Additionally, the teacher had students practice reading fluency by having students read a passage while timing their reading and keeping track of their error count.

- **Vocabulary:** Vocabulary development was also a focus point in the English learner observations. As students read various words, the teacher had them define each word and use the word in a sentence. When students were unclear on definitions, the teacher directed them to use a dictionary and to look up an image of the word on Google. In some instances, the teacher provided students with the word in Spanish to activate their background knowledge before discussing the definition.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[3]

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*.[4] The QSR team scored 84.6% 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 **7.7%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observation, interactions between the teacher and students and among students were highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and care. Students worked at centers and playfully laughed with one another, assisted one another in completing their work, and encouraged one another. Teachers kindly interacted with students giving out hugs and high fives. One student said to the teacher, "We should take a picture of all of us and put it in the face of the Santa. A nice picture of all the classmates together." There was no disrespectful behavior amongst students.
	The QSR team rated **76.9%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, interactions between teachers and students were friendly and demonstrated caring and respect. In one observation, the teacher thanked students as they gathered materials for small groups and greeted students with, "Is everybody good? Hi, how are you doing?" In another classroom, the teacher entered a classroom holding a student's hand saying, "Let's sit together over here." Another student asked, "Is it still breakfast time?" The teacher responded, "I'll see what we can do about a late breakfast." Across observations, students demonstrated respect for the teacher by following directions the first time asked, cleaning up materials and retrieving materials from their shelves. They demonstrated respect for one another by working together cooperatively to complete tasks like fitting blocks in a cube.

[3] The QSR team may observe teachers more than once by different review team members.
[4] 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 **15.4%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, the quality of interactions between teacher and students, or among students, was uneven, with occasional disrespect or insensitivity. In one observation, the teacher demonstrated insensitivity telling a student, "You didn't even come close," regarding completing a learning task. In another observation, many students had off-topic conversations and their interactions showed occasional disrespect or insensitivity. A student said to a group of peers: "I am more muscular than he is." Another student said: "[student name], it's true: you are skinny." Another student responded, "Yes, you are." The student targeted followed with, "Well, that's fat," and the other students laughed.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team rated **15.4%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observations, the classroom culture was a cognitively busy place. Students diligently and independently worked at all centers ensuring their work was completed to the best of their ability. Students also assisted one another in understanding the content. In one observation, students were working on using beads to multiply and one student shared that they were confused. Another student at the center said, "I'll help!" and worked with the student to clarify the learning task.
	The QSR team rated **76.9%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers had high expectations for both learning and hard work. For example, one teacher told students, "You've been working hard. Let's see how much progress we've made." In another observation, a student tried to return materials before finishing their learning task. The teacher asked, "Have you gone through all the words in the basket?" The teacher and student worked together to review the words the student had not completed. In the proficient classrooms, the classroom culture was a cognitively busy place where learning was valued, "Now we're going to do our reading and then you can work a puzzle." Across proficient observations, teachers celebrated student effort

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	and accomplishments with praise and words of encouragement such as, “High five, [student name]! You did great!” and “You are very smart and have a good memory.” In proficient observations, the classroom was cognitively busy. Most students worked productively throughout the class period, fitting blocks into cubes, cutting, threading bells, and making snowflakes. The teacher expected student effort, quietly monitoring what students were doing and telling them to go get materials when they were idle.
	The QSR team rated **7.7%** of observations as **basic** in this component. This represents one observation and qualitative evidence will not be included in the report. DC PCSB only reports qualitative evidence for a single observation when the performance is rated distinguished or proficient.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team rated **23.1%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observations, students ensured that their time was used productively with minimal prompting by the teacher. Across distinguished observations, students worked at different centers, and all students remained on task for the duration of the observation. Students also independently moved around the room to check in with teachers and retrieve additional materials when needed. As a result of efficient routines, instructional time was maximized. Students took full control of the management of instructional groups and materials. In one observation, when one student told another student that they wanted to use the materials in the other’s possession, the students worked out how to share with no intervention needed from the teacher.
	The QSR team rated **53.8%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, students were productively engaged with little loss of instructional time. In one observation, learning activities were monitored and timed to ensure efficient use of the instructional period. Montessori materials were neatly stored in wooden boxes on shelves and returned to their rightful places by students after use. In another observation, the teacher reminded a student, “Now we're going to put them

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	back in their place." Across the proficient classrooms, routines for distribution and collection of materials and supplies were efficient. Students raised hands to answer questions in small groups with limited prompting. They retrieved materials as requested by the teacher. Students followed established routines for going to the bathroom and getting materials to complete learning tasks. Students not working directly with the teacher retrieved and returned materials as desired.
	The QSR team rated **23.1%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers lost some instructional time due to only partially effective classroom routines. Students at tables were only partially engaged, joking around and socializing rather than focusing on their work. Students interrupted the teacher throughout the entire lesson to show their work or ask a question about materials. Students engaged in learning tasks with regular prompting. Across basic observations, students not working directly with the teacher were only partially engaged. In one classroom after a read-aloud, students transitioned to independent work. Several groups of students had off-topic conversations or did not engage with tasks until the teachers approached them.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
2d. Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team rated **61.5%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observations, student behavior was entirely appropriate. Students followed all teacher directions and respectfully interacted with one another. They shared appropriately when they wanted to use the same materials. The teacher fostered positive behavior by reminding students, "So, remember if you ever have a question or comment, you're going to raise your hand and you're going to listen. Side conversations are going to cease." Teachers subtly monitored student behavior. Across distinguished classrooms, teachers silently circulated classrooms and when minor instances of misbehavior occurred teachers quickly redirected students. Further, students respectfully intervened with classmates to ensure

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	compliance with standards of conduct. In one observation, a student said to others, "Y'all just have to be quiet and do your work."
	The QSR team rated **23.1%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, student behavior was generally appropriate. Teachers' responses to minor misbehavior were consistent, appropriate, and effective. In one observation, the teacher reminded students in small groups, "When we are in the lesson, we have to sit for the entire time." When the teacher noticed a student who was chatting about non-academic content, they asked, "Why are we talking about [student name]?" The student quickly returned to work. In another observation, students worked independently on individual activities, while the teacher circulated the classroom. The teacher said to a student that was having a conversation with another student, "You have to focus." The student returned to work.
	The QSR team rated **15.4%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, standards of conduct appeared to have been established but their implementation was inconsistent. Students generally engaged in learning tasks, though many students walked around the classroom, sat idle, or socialized at desks. The teacher tried to intervene with uneven results, reminding the same students several times to get to their work. In one classroom, while students worked independently, two students ran from one side to the other side of the classroom while loudly screaming that someone ripped off part of the timeline that was on the floor. One teacher ignored the behavior while another teacher slowly walked to the timeline and said, "It's not a big deal," and continued to talk to a group of students.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the 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*.[5] The QSR team scored 88.6% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" in 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 **92.3%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, students engaged with the learning tasks, indicating they understood what to do. In one classroom, students worked on individual tasks. On the board, the teacher displayed a list of activities with students' names next to each activity. The board also included an instruction: "Find your unfinished work paper and use that to do the work! Please put the finished work in your binder!" Students completed the activities on their tables or the carpet. While some students worked in pairs, most worked independently. Across the proficient observations, teachers' explanations of content invited student participation. In one observation, the teacher modeled the process to be followed in a small group. The teacher showed students a grid of numbers and verbalized their thinking as they skip-counted by threes and colored the numbers. Students then successfully completed the learning task on their own as the teacher watched.
	The QSR team rated **7.7%** of observations as **basic** in this component. This represents one observation and qualitative evidence will not be included in the report. DC PCSB only reports qualitative evidence for a single observation when the performance is rated distinguished or proficient.
	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.

[5] 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 Techniques[6]	The QSR team rated **66.7%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers posed questions to promote student thinking and understanding. In one observation, as the teacher began a lesson on triangles, they asked the students, "What do we notice about these triangles?" Students offered different observations, comparing sides and angle lengths. During a small group related to water in different containers, the teacher asked, "What do we notice about these shapes?" Discussions about triangles and the shape water takes in different vessels allowed students to talk to one another without the teacher's mediation. In the proficient observations, many questions were open-ended and allowed for multiple possible answers. For example, teachers asked: "What is this story about?" and "Can you think of a sentence that describes what you just said?" The teacher gave students adequate time to compose their thoughts.
	The QSR team rated **33.3%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers did not ask students questions that promoted reasoning. Across basic observations, questions mostly required single-answer responses such as "What's the title of this story?" and "Are your letters the right size?" Further, teachers did not require students to explain their thinking or encourage them to engage in discussion.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
3c. Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team rated **38.5%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observations, virtually all students were intellectually engaged in the lesson. In one classroom, students played in centers and worked independently as well as with the teacher. All students were engaged in a center and moved efficiently from center to center when they are done with the activities. Further, students were observed quietly talking themselves through challenging problems and different ways of solving. Students said, "Hmm,

[6] The QSR team conducted thirteen observations at Lee Montessori PCS – Brookland but did not have sufficient evidence rate to component 3b, "Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques" for seven of the thirteen observations.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	I can do 16 + 16" and "I think I'm going to try it a different way this time." Across the distinguished observations, students had extensive choice in which tasks they completed.
	The QSR team rated **53.8%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, learning tasks and activities are designed to challenge student thinking, inviting students to make their thinking visible. When given the choice to spell nonsense words with letters, one student spelled the nonsense word, "backson," and pronounced it correctly. In another proficient classroom, Students wrote a silly sentence, "I saw a rabbit and a racoon run over a rainbow." Across the proficient observations, the materials and resources required intellectual engagement, as appropriate. In one observation, all students raised their hands to volunteer to read their original sentences. In another observation, students in small groups noticed patterns as they color-coded numbers on a grid by skip-counting. In another small group, they worked through division problems using hands-on materials ("racks and tubes").
	The QSR team rated **7.7%** of observations as **basic** in this component. This represents one observation and qualitative evidence will not be included in the report. DC PCSB only reports qualitative evidence for a single observation when the performance is rated distinguished or proficient.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **91.7%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, students appeared aware of how they would be assessed. Students in these observations followed numerous assessment routines: beginning each class session with math drills, sounding out words with long vowel sounds, decoding words that followed the consonant-vowel-consonant (CVC) pattern, tracing and rewriting to improve handwriting skills. Throughout proficient classrooms, feedback included specific and timely guidance. While most instruction was student-driven, teachers circulated the classroom checking in with students when appropriate. When

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	checking in with one student the teacher asked, “Are you sure this is five squares here? Can you double check?” The student then counted again and was able to fix the error. In proficient observations, teachers elicited evidence of individual student understanding for small groups of students. For example, in one classroom, the teacher asked students to make observations about triangles, explained the different types of triangles, then asked each student to identify the types. In another classroom, after a lesson on tree roots, the teacher asked students to draw a picture of tree roots that showed what their purpose was.
	The QSR team rated **8.3%** of observations as **basic** in this component. This represents one observation and qualitative evidence will not be included in the report.
	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 English language arts (ELA) and math assignments Lee Montessori PCS – Brookland 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.[7]

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.[8]

TNTP's ELA Assignment Review Protocol is not designed to evaluate foundational skills tasks, narrative writing tasks, or tasks based on kindergarten (K) – 5 language standards. Under the Montessori model, primary classrooms focus on foundational skills and language standards. As such, the ELA tasks Lee Montessori PCS – Brookland assigned its K – 3 students are based on foundational skills and language standards. TNTP applied a modified version of its ELA Assignment Review Protocol when it evaluated the campus's ELA assignments.[9]

Of the five ELA samples submitted, four assignments received an overall rating of "sufficient." These assignments engaged students at the appropriate depth of the targeted foundational skill or language standard. One assignment received an overall rating of "minimal." This assignment engaged students at the appropriate depth of the foundational skill addressed, but it did not provide opportunity for students to engage in using what they learned from a text in a grade-appropriate way. Evidence is captured below:

[7] 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.
[8] For details, see a breakdown of each rating in Appendix III.
[9] Specifically, TNTP did not evaluate these assignments in the practice and relevance domains. For details about these domains, see Appendix III.

Assignment	Grade Level(s)	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	PK3 –K	Students worked with a moveable alphabet box. They practiced with all 26 lowercase letters to form words on a work rug. Students identified shapes that go with the alphabet sounds.	Sufficient	The task engaged students at the appropriate depth of the foundational skill addressed.
Sample 2	K	Students practiced sounding out the words of objects they found in an object box. The students were required to match the appropriate object to the word using their understanding of letters.	Sufficient	The task engaged students at the appropriate depth of the foundational skill addressed.
Sample 3	1 – 3	Students worked in pairs to complete activities from a grammar box. Using prepared sentences in the box, students made each sentence with prepared cards, acted out the sentence, and symbolized each word.	Sufficient	The task engaged students at the appropriate depth of the language standards addressed.
Sample 4	1 – 3	Students created their own sentences including subject, predicates, and direct objects.	Sufficient	The task engaged students at the appropriate depth of the language standards addressed.
Sample 5	4 – 6	Students produced an adaptation of the play *Romeo and Juliet*. Students worked together to have various roles throughout the program. Students compiled short biographies of their classmates and collaborated on the publication and printing of the program.	Minimal	The assignment was aligned to a grade-appropriate text but did not contain questions that reach the depth of the standard. Further, the task did not require students to use what they learned from the text or defend their thinking about the content.

Of the five math samples submitted, two assignments received an overall rating of "sufficient." These assignments were aligned to grade-level standards and reached the depth of the standards. One assignment received an overall rating of "minimal." This assignment was aligned to grade-level standards, but the tasks' questions did not reach the intended levels of depth. Two assignments received an overall rating of "no opportunity." These assignments were not aligned to a grade-level standard. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level(s)	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	K	Students counted the appropriate number of spindles in a box and placed them into the corresponding compartment. The task reinforced that a number represents the quantity of separate objects.	Sufficient	The task reached the full depth of the targeted standards and mathematical practice. The task allowed students to engage with manipulatives but did not give them the opportunity to apply the mathematics to a real-world situation.
Sample 2	4 – 5	The task engaged students in practicing their understanding of all four operations in the decimal system. In the specific example shown, a student practiced subtracting a decimal problem.	Sufficient	The task reached the full depth of the targeted standards and mathematical practice. The task allowed students to engage with manipulatives but did not allow students to apply math in a meaningful way.
Sample 3	1	Students worked in groups to engage with manipulatives as they formed different closed and open figures. Students discussed with the guide the types of shapes they were making and determined the name of the shapes by their attributes.	Minimal	The task aligned to grade-level standards but did not allow students to reach the full depth of the standard.
Sample 4	K	Students engaged with a box with 10 compartments. They selected a number they want to multiply and started laying out the matching bead bars according to what they're being multiplied by.	No Opportunity	This assignment was not aligned to a grade-appropriate standard. The task aligned with 3rd grade standards without sufficient evidence that students had mastered grade-level standards. The task allowed students to

Assignment	Grade Level(s)	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
				engage with a real-world application (bead bars), but not at the appropriate depth of the standard.
Sample 5	3	Students used manipulatives (Racks and Tubes) to completed basic to complex division problems.	No Opportunity	This assignment was not aligned to a grade-appropriate standard. The task incorporates above grade-level standards without sufficient evidence that students had mastered grade-level standards.

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC[10]

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.

[10] 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[11]

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.

[11] 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[12]

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.

[12] *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.