DC
PUBLIC
CHARTER
SCHOOL
BOARD

March 15, 2023

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

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 – East End 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 – East End from December 5 – 16, 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 Lee Montessori Public Charter School – East End'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 (PCS) – East End			
Year Opened	2019 – 20	**Ward**	8
Grades Served	Pre-kindergarten 3 (PK3) – 2	**General Enrollment**	189[1]
Students with Disabilities Enrollment	24	**English Learners Enrollment**	0
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		**In-Seat Attendance Rate on Observation Day(s)**	
12/5/22 through 12/16/22		Visit 1. 12/07/22: 87.3% Visit 2. 12/14/22: 93.7% Visit 3. 12/16/22: 82.5%	

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 Lee Montessori PCS – East End. The QSR team included three DC PCSB employees and consultants, including one special education expert and one Montessori expert. The QSR team scored 75.0% of observations as "distinguished" or "proficient" in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 2d, "Managing Student Behavior," with 85.7% of observations rated as

---

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

"distinguished" or "proficient." Across observations, student behavior was almost entirely appropriate and expectations for behavior had been established. Further, when needed, teachers respectfully and effectively responded to misbehavior. The QSR team scored 80.0% of observations as "distinguished" or "proficient" in the Instruction domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 3d, "Using Assessment in Instruction," with 100% of observations rated as "proficient." Across classrooms, students understood how they would be assessed and their role in the assessment process. In addition, teachers provided timely and specific feedback that, at times, advanced learning.

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	28.6%	0%	28.6%	42.9%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Proficient	42.9%	71.4%	42.9%	42.9%	85.7%	0%	85.7%	100%
Basic	28.6%	28.6%	28.6%	0%	14.3%	100%	14.3%	0%
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	14.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Subdomain Average	**3.00**	**2.71**	**3.00**	**3.14**	**2.86**	**2.00**	**2.86**	**3.00**
Domain Average	**2.96**				**2.68**			
% Proficient or above	**75.0%**				**80.0%**			

(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 two-week observation window, Lee Montessori PCS – East End completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities. According to the school, it provides 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 (SPED) observations are summarized below.

- **Pull-out:** The pull-out setting was equipped with an array of Montessori and other specialized materials to assist students with conceptualizing both concrete and abstract representations. In one observation, students worked with the special educator on foundational skills, such as counting, number recognition, shapes, alphabet recognition, name writing, sound-letter association, and spelling consonant-vowel-consonant (CVC) words. Students used a variety of hands-on, sensorial materials. During the observation, students moved freely from table to carpet with boxes of Montessori materials and manipulatives to complete assigned academic tasks. The special educator maintained student binders updated daily with need-based practice work for the students while in the general education classroom.

- **Push-in:** DC PCSB reviewers did not observe the implementation of push-in services for students with disabilities in the general education classrooms.

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 75.0% 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 **28.6%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observations, interactions between the teacher and students were highly caring and respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and sensitivity. In one observation, the teacher made personalized connections with students to show civility and concern. For example, the teacher said, "Make sure that you're not looking over your glasses," and "You can take a break and drink your water." When a student started sneezing, the teacher said, "Bless you! You're having a sneeze attack!" In the distinguished observations, the net result of teacher-student interactions was that of connections with students as individuals. In one observation, the teacher laughed and joked with a student about the student's error making the short /u/ sound. The teacher teased, "Whaaaaat? You've got to be kidding!" The teacher and student then laughed together at the sound of /oo/.
	The QSR team rated **42.9%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, interactions between students and teachers (and among students) were highly respectful and kind. Across proficient observations, teachers spoke in gentle tones with students and offered encouragement if they struggled. In one observation, when a student got upset, the teacher took them by the hand and guided them over to their work reassuring them, "It's OK, I can help you. Come on, let's take a look." In another observation, when one student asked for the teacher's attention, the teacher said, "Just a minute, I'm helping [student 1]. Do you want to come and see what she's working on?"

---

[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 **28.6%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, interactions among students were mostly positive, with occasional disrespect between students. In one observation, a student threw a hard plastic pencil case at another student's face. In this same observation, two students hit the teacher when being redirected. In another observation, one student approached two others who were working together. When the first student asked to work with them, one of the students loudly responded, "No!" A few moments later, a similar incident occurred between other students, with one saying, "Go away! That's [our] work!" The teacher did not intervene.
	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 **71.4%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers conveyed the importance of the content and held high standards for all students. In one observation, the teacher encouraged a student to write more in their journal when they mentioned being finished. The teacher also motioned for the student to select another work set if they desired. In another observation, the teacher said to a student who hesitated with a sewing project, "You have to at least try." Later, that same student did a dance to celebrate having accomplished the stitch she was afraid to try before. Students expended effort and showed a desire to learn. In one observation, when a student asked, "Can we read a book today?" The teacher responded, "Yes, we're going to read a book today. I'm glad you want to read a book."
	The QSR team rated **28.6%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, the teachers' energy for the work was neutral. In one observation, one student who struggled with some math work received comments of encouragement tinged with frustration such as, "You added yesterday so we know you can do it—just get it over with." In basic observations, teachers conveyed high expectations for some but not all students. In one observation, the teacher circulated only a small section of the

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	classroom, while much of the room went unmonitored. Students in this area sat idle, wandered the room, and used the materials inappropriately (e.g., opened and swung on door of the mini fridge).
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team rated **28.6%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observations, classroom routines and procedures were well-established and functioned smoothly. In each observation, students chose their own work and transitioned in-between activities without any additional prompting from the teacher. Across observations, students knew where to gather materials and where to put them away. In one observation, the teacher used a chime to get students' attention; all students immediately stopped their work and paid attention.
	The QSR team rated **42.9%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, routines functioned smoothly, and students were productively engaged in small group or independent work. In one observation, when students wanted to switch activities, they cleaned up what they were working on, put it away, and retrieved the materials for the next activity. Across observations, teachers issued reminders which, at times, students promptly heeded. In one observation, the teacher guided students through the sequence of steps to use Boom Cards, a gamified student-centered learning tool: "You remembered your password," "Click the right number to answer," "You get to select three games." Further, after students returned from pull-out sessions, SPED teachers checked their students' binders for practice exercises they would complete in the general education classroom.
	The QSR team rated **28.6%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, some instructional time was lost due to inefficient routines and procedures. During one observation, the teacher attempted to direct students to the carpet by ringing a chime. Initially, only a few students transitioned to the carpet and most of the class had to be redirected several times before whole group instruction

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	began. In another observation, the teacher paused their work with one group of students to remind another group how to manage the blocks, and later to remind a student how to roll up a yoga mat.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
2d. Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team rated **42.9%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observations, student behavior was entirely appropriate. Across observations, it was evident that behavior standards had been established and students complied with expectations. In the distinguished observations, teachers subtly monitored behavior by remaining attentive to students as they worked, encouraging them, and helping them find another activity when students completed one.
	The QSR team rated **42.9%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers frequently monitored student behavior, and rules and expectations had been established. In one observation, the teacher's response to student misbehavior was mostly effective, although they had to remind students more than once to treat classroom materials respectfully. On the second reminder for one group, the teacher approached them and said, "If we can't put those cylinders away properly, they won't be out on the shelf for you to use tomorrow." In the proficient observations, student behavior was generally appropriate. In one observation, students worked quietly, using number rods, writing in journals, and matching moveable alphabet letters with images. Students who worked with peers shared materials, used kind words such as "thank you," and complimented their peers when they completed learning tasks.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **basic** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **14.3%** of observations as **unsatisfactory** 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.

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 80.0% 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 **85.7%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers' explanation of content and procedures were clear and invited student participation and thinking. In one observation, the teacher articulated the learning sequence for students: "Yesterday, remember we started with Magic E. Today, we will read some words with magic e." The teacher also said, "Now that we can count our numbers, let's write them," and, "Now, you're going to practice your Magic C letters." In another observation, the teacher approached students working at the container station, asking them, "Do you know what these materials are for?" The teacher went on to explain and model the purpose of the containers. Students then engaged in using them, indicating they understood what to do.
	The QSR team rated **14.3%** 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.
3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques[5]	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **proficient** in this component.

---

[4] For details, see the framework's "Instruction Observation Rubric," available in Appendix II.
[5] The QSR team conducted seven observations at Lee Montessori PCS – East End but did not have sufficient evidence rate to component 3b, "Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques" for five of the seven observations.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	The QSR team rated **100%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers asked few questions. When they did ask questions, they low-level and required single correct answers responses. Examples include: "Where is the word car?" and "Where do you find a star?" Although a few questions were designed to encourage thinking (e.g., "What does the rhombus look like?"), teachers did not attempt to engage students in discussion.
	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 **85.7%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, most students were engaged in meaningful, open-ended learning tasks that allowed for higher-order thinking. In one observation, students worked on writing journals, made snacks using kitchen utensils, matched letters to objects, and washed dishes. In the proficient observations, learning tasks and activities were designed to challenge student thinking, invited students to make their thinking visible. In one observation, a few students worked with place value tiles, choosing their own three-digit numbers to represent; some students were also ready to add or subtract after that. Across observations, the pacing and groupings were open-ended and based on student choice. Most students paced and grouped themselves in a productive manner.
	The QSR team rated **14.3%** 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 **100%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, the students understood how their assessments would be

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	evaluated and their role in carrying out the assessment tasks. In one observation, the teacher stated, "We're going to have to work on that d/d/ sound." Students used Boom Cards with a built-in self-assessment feature, "When you hear 'Oops,' we must try it again." Teachers provided students with timely and specific feedback throughout the learning process. Teachers also elicited evidence of student understanding. For example, in one observation, the teacher asked a student, "What is this number? … And how can we represent that number using these place value tiles?" Later, in the same observation, the teacher noticed the student had reversed the ones and thousands places' and the teacher corrected the student.
	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 English language arts (ELA) and math assignments Lee Montessori PCS – East End 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.[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]

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 – East End 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.[8]

Of the five ELA samples submitted, all five assignments received an overall rating of "sufficient." These assignments engaged students at the appropriate depth of the foundational skill or language standard addressed. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level(s)	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	K	The task required students to practice their foundational skills by matching picture cards	Sufficient	The task engaged students at the appropriate depth of the foundational skill addressed.

---

[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.

[8] 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
		with phonetic (CVC) words with their corresponding labels. Students used a control chart to check their work.		
Sample 2	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 3	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 4	K	Students practiced descriptive adjectives using a group of objects and investigating relationships between them. Students placed the symbols for adjective, noun, and article above the proper word in the phrase.	Sufficient	The task engaged students at the appropriate depth of the language standards addressed.
Sample 5	1 – 3	Using a grammar box, students selected cards to make a sentence, act out the sentence, and symbolize each word.	Sufficient	The task engaged students at the appropriate depth of the language standards addressed.

Of the five math samples submitted, three 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 included an opportunity to engage with at least one critical math practice, but not at the level of depth required by the standard. One assignment received an overall rating of "no opportunity." This assignment was not aligned to a grade-level standard. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	K	Students counted the appropriate number of spindles in the 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 connect the content to the real-world, but not in a meaningful way.
Sample 2	K	Students worked with a chain of 1,000 golden beads composed of 100 bars of 10. Students practiced taking out the chain and counting the beads one-by-one and then by 10s.	Sufficient	The task reached the full depth of the targeted standards and mathematical practice. The task allowed students to connect the content to the real-world, but not in a meaningful way.
Sample 3	1 – 2	Students wrote their own division problem or used one of the pre-printed division problems from the classroom with a single digit divisor. Students used stamps to represent the numbers using their understanding of place value and exchanged tiles to represent the division problem.	Sufficient	The task reached the full depth of the targeted standards and mathematical practice. The task allowed students to connect the content to the real-world, but not in a meaningful way.
Sample 4	1 – 2	Students engaged with the checkboard to begin learning the concept of long multiplication. This task was the initial learning of the board and showed students how to review the hierarchical categories,	Minimal	The task aligned to grade-level standards but did not allow students to reach the full depth of the standard.

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
		tiles for the multipliers, and the tiles for the multiplicands.		
Sample 5	1	Students worked with a box of sticks to understand the concept of parallel, convergent, and divergent lines. Students used the sticks to create various shapes. Students then labeled the lines they created.	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[9]

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.

[9] 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.

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.

[10] 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.

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.