DC
PUBLIC
CHARTER
SCHOOL
BOARD

June 6, 2023

Ms. Aswathi Zachariah, Board Chair
Ms. Aurora Steinle, Interim Executive Director
Two Rivers Public Charter School – Young Middle School

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 Two Rivers Public Charter School – Young Middle School for a Qualitative Site Review because your school is eligible for its 20-year charter review during school year 2023 – 24.

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Two Rivers Public Charter School – Young Middle School from March 6 – 24, 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 Two Rivers Public Charter School – Young Middle School'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,

Melodi Sampson
Interim Chief School Performance Officer

Qualitative Site Review (QSR) Report

Two Rivers Public Charter School – Young Middle School (Two Rivers PCS – Young MS)			
Year Opened	2020 – 21	**Ward**	5
Grades Served	6 – 8	**General Enrollment**	257[1]
Students with Disabilities Enrollment	57	**English Learners Enrollment**	10
Mission Statement			
To nurture a diverse group of students to become lifelong, active participants in their own education, develop a sense of self and community, and become responsible and compassionate members of society.			
Observation Window		**In-Seat Attendance Rate on Observation Day(s)**	
03/06/23 through 03/24/23[2]		Visit 1. 03/14/23: 94.1% Visit 2. 03/16/23: 89.4% Visit 3. 03/17/23: 91.0%	

Observation Summary

During the observation window, the QSR team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction at Two Rivers PCS – Young MS. The QSR team included four DC PCSB employees and consultants, including one special education expert and one English learner expert. Overall, the QSR team rated 48.2% of observations as "proficient" in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 2a, "Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport," with 64.3% of observations rated as "proficient." Across the proficient observations, interactions between teachers and students and amongst students were uniformly respectful. The QSR team rated 48.9% of observations as "proficient" in the Instruction

---

[1] This enrollment figure is based on preliminary, unvalidated data as of February 17, 2023.
[2] The typical QSR observation window lasts two weeks. The QSR team visited Two Rivers PCS – Young MS over a three-week period because it could not complete all specialized instruction observations during a two-week period.

domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 3a, "Communicating with Students," with 50.0% of observations rated as "proficient." Across the proficient observations, teachers clearly explained academic content and described specific strategies students might use when working. Further, when appropriate, some teachers also modeled the process to be followed in a task.

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	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Proficient	64.3%	42.9%	50.0%	35.7%	50.0%	28.6%	50.0%	60.0%
Basic	35.7%	57.1%	50.0%	57.1%	50.0%	71.4%	42.9%	10.0%
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	7.1%	0%	0%	7.1%	30.0%
Subdomain Average	**2.64**	**2.43**	**2.50**	**2.29**	**2.50**	**2.29**	**2.43**	**2.30**
Domain Average	**2.46**				**2.38**			
% Proficient or above	**48.2%**				**48.9%**			

(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, Two Rivers PCS – Young MS completed a questionnaire about how it serves students with disabilities. According to the questionnaire, the school places students with disabilities in the general education classroom and delivers special education services via push-in or pull-out. DC PCSB observed specialized instruction in the push-in setting. Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Overall, DC PCSB found the school implements its stated special education continuum with fidelity. Key trends from the special education observations are summarized below.

- **Push-in/Co-teaching:** In each observation, the general education teacher and special education teacher shared responsibility for facilitating instruction. In all observations, educators used a One teach, One assist model. In one observation, the general education teacher led instruction, while the special education teacher provided direct support to students. In another observation, both teachers supported students with completing missing or incomplete assignments. Each teacher sat with a small group of students, prompting them through their individual assignments. In another observation, the general education teacher led all instruction while the special education teacher monitored student behavior and answered students' questions regarding the assignment.

Specialized Instruction for English Language Learners
Before the observation window, Two Rivers PCS – Young MS completed a questionnaire about how it serves English learners. According to the school, "English learner teachers push into the classrooms during [English language arts] or skills blocks. Additionally, some students receive instruction outside of the general education classroom individually or in small groups." DC PCSB was unable to observe the stated English learner model due to English Language Learners 2.0 (ACCESS) testing during the first two weeks of the observation window. In response, DC PCSB staff extended the QSR window until March 24, 2023. However, upon completing ACCESS testing, Two Rivers PCS – Young MS staff informed DC PCSB staff that it did not have a current English learner teacher schedule due to master schedule shifts; consequently, English learners were not and would not receive language support services until the school updated its schedules. DC PCSB was unable to observe the school's articulated English learner program. Given this, DC PCSB found the school did not implement its stated English learner program with fidelity.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[3]

This table summarizes the school's performance in the <u>Classroom Environment</u> domain during the unannounced visits. The rating categories—"distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory"—come from the *Framework for Teaching*.[4] The QSR team scored 48.2% of classrooms as "proficient" in the <u>Classroom Environment</u> domain.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **64.3%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, interactions between teachers and students and among students were uniformly respectful. In one observation, the teacher said, "That was incredible, I want to give everyone here a shoutout," in response to students working quietly during independent work time. In another observation, one student made a math joke. The teacher laughed and responded, "That was a good one." In another classroom, a student included, "Please," when asking to use the bathroom. The teacher responded by saying, "Of course, and thank you for saying 'please.'" In another observation, one student apologized to the teacher for coming to class unprepared. The teacher responded by telling them where to find the necessary materials for class. Across observations, teachers addressed students by name, welcomed them as they entered the classroom, and offered support when needed.
	The QSR team rated **35.7%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, the quality of interactions between teachers and students and among students were uneven with occasional disrespect or insensitivity. In one observation, a student became visibly upset when their team lost a game. The student argued with the teacher and other students before briefly leaving the classroom without permission. In this observation, multiple students argued with their groupmates throughout the game. As a result, the teacher ended the game early. In another observation, the teacher attempted to redirect a student who used profanity. While the student briefly stopped, they later continued and the teacher ignored the

---

[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
	misbehavior. Across these observations, teachers attempted to redirect instances of disrespect with uneven results. Students repeatedly talked out of turn, used cell phones, and disengaged from classroom conversations.
	The QSR team rated **none** of observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team rated **none** of observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **42.9%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers held high expectations for all students. In one observation, the teacher said, "This is your time to have uninterrupted work time" and "Remember: this is your time; don't waste it playing games." In another observation, the teacher told students at the start of the lesson that they expected them to pay attention and participate. The teacher reminded students that they would be cold-calling students to participate and encouraged them to pay attention. In this observation, when the teacher cold-called students, they provided adequate wait time to allow all students the opportunity to participate. If students stumbled on an answer, the teacher provided scaffolds to support them in answering the question.
	The QSR team rated **57.1%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers held high expectations for only some students. In these observations, small groups of students were consistently off-task and engaged in non-academic conversations. In one observation, the teacher continued to teach although few students listened. Despite the inattention, the teacher continued by only speaking to the small group of students who were engaged. In these observations, teachers' energy for the work was neutral and teachers focused largely on task completion. In one observation, a student asked for a day off to which the teacher responded, "Then you'll have double the work so you might as well just come to school." Across classrooms, teachers did not require active participation from all students. In one observation, the teacher worked closely with a small group of students, while critiquing the work ethic of other students in the class. The teacher said, "You're not like those other jokers," in reference to a group of off-task students.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team rated **none** of observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **50.0%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, classroom routines and procedures functioned smoothly. In one observation, the teacher had an established process for students to get chrome books. All students were able to quickly gather their chrome books and immediately followed along with the assignment that was projected on the board. In another observation, students competed in a spelling bee. Students were in teams and knew the process for responding and waited patiently between turns. Across observations, students transitioned efficiently between whole- and small-group activities without any loss of instructional time.
	The QSR team rated **50.0%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, classroom routines functioned unevenly. In one observation, the teacher took several minutes to set up a game on the white board. The teacher lost instructional time as some students refused to be placed into a group. Other students danced at the front of the room or talked over the teacher repeatedly and required several redirections. Across classrooms, procedures for transitions seemed to have been established but their operation was not smooth. Many transitions took several minutes requiring on-task students to sit idle as they waited for their peers. In one observation, a student asked to use the bathroom and had to wait while the teacher looked for the hallway pass. In another observation, the teacher gave students different options for what they could do if they finished early. However, the teacher had to repeat these instructions several times and some students still did not engage.
	The QSR team rated **none** of observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
2d. Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team rated **none** of observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **35.7%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, student behavior was generally appropriate. In one observation, all students worked quietly on their Chrome Books. The teacher circulated the room and gave individual students praise for their behavior. The teacher said, "This is our first time trying this, and you all did such a good job." In another observation, students waited quietly to receive a handout from the teacher. Before distributing the papers, the teacher reminded them to remain quiet until all students received their copy. All students quietly sat until instructed to speak. In these

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	observations, teachers handled minor instances of student misbehavior swiftly. Teachers used proximity, non-verbal hand signals, or silently waited for students to correct their behavior.
	The QSR team rated **57.1%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers attempted to maintain order in the classroom, but had uneven success. In one observation, different groups of students talked throughout the entire observation. One group of two students sat with their backs to the teacher and engaged in non-academic conversations throughout the entire observation. In this observation, a supporting teacher in the room attempted to redirect them, but they continued to talk. The lead teacher did not attempt to redirect these students and instead spoke loudly over them to drown out their conversation. In another observation, several students formed a group at the back of the room while their classmates participated in a game. As a result, the students missed being called to participate. These students had to be called on by the teacher multiple times before they ended their conversations and engaged with the game.
	The QSR team rated **7.1%** 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 <u>Instruction</u> domain during the unannounced visits. The rating categories—"distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory"—come from the *Framework for Teaching*.[5] The QSR team scored 48.9% of classrooms as "proficient" in the <u>Instruction</u> domain.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
3a. Communicating with Students	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **50.0%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers clearly communicated the lesson purpose. In these observations, teachers explained to students what they would be doing. Students in these observations consistently followed along and gave no indication of misunderstanding. In one observation, the teacher introduced students to a spelling bee competition. The teacher explained that all spelling words would come directly from the text. The teacher added that the spelling bee words were also words they used frequently in their writing. Across observations, teachers described specific strategies students might use, inviting students to interpret them in the context of what they would be learning. For example, in one observation, the teacher told a student to "visualize" a word as they attempted to sound it out. The teacher modeled the visualization process for the student.
	The QSR team rated **50.0%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, the teacher provided little elaboration or explanation about what the students would be learning. In these observations, teachers gave procedural instructions such as, "finish the work sheet" and "finish the quiz." In one observation, the teacher told students to research the answers to questions they didn't know. However, the teacher provided no specific directions or strategies on how students should complete the assignment. Across observations, teachers had to clarify learning tasks so students could complete them. In one observation, some students sat idle and had to be reminded several times to complete the assignment. In this classroom, the teacher said, "Make sure you answer all of the questions.

---

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

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	Remember to answer all of the questions before you move on." The teacher repeated this direction several times. Additionally, in these observations, teachers and students rarely used content-specific academic language.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Technique	The QSR team rated **none** of observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **28.6%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers used a mix of open- and closed-ended questions designed to push students to think critically and explain their reasoning. In one observation, the teacher asked, "Are there any other ways we could solve this equation?" The teacher later invited different groups of students to the board to try out different solutions for solving the problem. In another observation, the teacher asked students what they knew about data. The teacher provided students with wait time to generate their answers. Later, the teacher asked multiple students to share one word that came to mind when they thought of data. Multiple students shared an answer.
	The QSR team rated **71.4%** 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. Teachers posed questions such as, "What happened in chapter one?" Students then repeated the sequence of events within the chapter; however, the teacher did not pose additional questions to deepen students' thinking. Teachers also attempted to call on multiple students, but only a few responded. In one observation, the teacher asked, "What do you think is happening here?" Very few students replied. In another observation, the teacher asked a question related to a math problem, but no one responded. Across classrooms, teachers attempted to use a mix of instructional groupings to facilitate academic conversations, but had uneven success. In one observation, the teacher placed students in small groups to discuss their process for solving a math problem. While some students worked together, many students simply sat together and worked independently.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
3c. Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **50.0%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, most students intellectually engaged in the learning task. In one observation, students worked independently to solve problems on a computer application. Students worked quietly at their desks and raised their hands when they needed support from the teacher. In another observation, most students engaged in a conversation about the high school admissions process. Students raised their hands to share what they knew about different high schools and their admissions processes. In another classroom, the teacher asked students to analyze a completed math problem. The teacher asked students to describe the process they used and to justify each step as they solved the problem. All students engaged in this task and offered different responses.
	The QSR team rated **42.9%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, only some students intellectually engaged the learning task. In one observation, many students were off-task, and the teacher redirected them several times. One group nearly missed their turn for the game as they were not paying attention. Another group disengaged once they missed a point. Later, this same group argued among themselves and with other groups, which led the teacher to cancel the game. Across classrooms, teachers attempted to use a variety of instructional groupings to maintain student engagement but had limited success. In one observation, one group of students worked together to read and interpret a text. Other students sat idle and had off-topic conversations for most of the observation.
	The QSR team rated **7.1%** 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.
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **60.0%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers elicited evidence of student understanding. In these observations,

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	teachers used monitoring strategies such as: cold calling, inviting students to the board to model how they solved a problem, and giving students a written assignment. In one observation, the teacher asked students to analyze a classmate's problem using a detailed rubric. The teacher said, "You will be graded on how accurately you grade them. Use the rubric." The teacher also said, "Don't just give them all fours because they are your friend." In another observation, the teacher invited students to evaluate their own work. The teacher said, "You can make last minute changes to your argument and add things." Teachers circulated the room and provided feedback as students assessed their own work.
	The QSR team rated **10.0%** 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 **30.0%** of observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component. In the unsatisfactory observations, teachers gave no indication of what high-quality work should look like. Teachers provided vague criteria for completing assignments such as: "Answer every question" and "Show your work." Further, teachers did not provide students with any feedback. Students worked to finish and submit a task during the class period. However, at no point did students receive feedback from the teacher.

Assignment Review

DC PCSB staff and The New Teacher Project (TNTP) consultants reviewed sample English language arts (ELA) and math assignments Two Rivers PCS – Young Middle 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]

Of the five ELA samples submitted, two assignments received an overall rating of "sufficient." These assignments allowed students to engaged with a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. These assignments required students to cite evidence from the text in their responses. One assignment received an overall rating of "minimal." This assignment was based on a grade-appropriate text, but it did not require students to engage with tasks at the appropriate depth of the targeted grade-level standard. Two assignments received an overall rating of "no opportunity." These assignments were not based on a grade-appropriate text and did not reach the full depth of the targeted standards. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	7	Students analyzed how the author used figurative language and repetition in *Punching the Air*. Students wrote a five to six-sentence paragraph using direct evidence from the text in their response.	Sufficient	This assignment was aligned to a high-quality, grade-appropriate text and reached the depth of the standards. This assignment also required students to use what they learned in

---

[6] See the ELA Assignment Review Protocol here: https://bit.ly/3eSEXQe. See the Math Assignment Review Protocol here: https://bit.ly/3UavzHI. These evaluation tools are based on TNTP's study, *The Opportunity Myth*, available here: https://bit.ly/2Dv7yId.
[7] For details, see a breakdown of each rating in Appendix III.

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
				the text and allowed them to use their personal voice in writing their claim.
Sample 2	7	Students identified what they believe to be the most effective form of resistance in song lyrics from "Almeda" by Solange. Students cited several pieces of evidence from various songs to come to their own conclusion about how change is created.	Sufficient	This assignment was aligned to a high-quality, grade-appropriate text and reached the depth of the standards. This assignment also required students to use what they learned in the text and allowed students to use their personal voice in writing their claim.
Sample 3	8	Students answered a question about foreshadowing based on the short story, "The Lottery."	Minimal	This assignment was aligned to a grade-appropriate text; however, the questions did not allow students to reach the full depth of the standard.
Sample 4	6	Students identified symbols and ideas found in Washington, DC murals using the "MuralsDC" website.	No Opportunity	This assignment was not aligned to a high-quality, grade-appropriate text and did not reach the full depth of the standards.
Sample 4	8	Students answered writing-prompt questions about the short story, "The Moustache."	No Opportunity	This assignment was not aligned to a high-quality, grade-appropriate text and did not reach the full depth of the standards.

Of the five math samples submitted, three assignments received an overall rating of "sufficient." These assignments gave students the opportunity to practice in-depth grade-level standards, to engage in meaningful mathematical practices, and to connect their understanding to the real-world. Two assignments received an overall rating of "minimal." These assignments were based on grade-appropriate standards. However, the assignments did not connect to the real world in a meaningful way or did not give students the opportunity to engage with a critical math practice. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	6	Students used ratios and reasoning skills to make predictions and solve real-world problems with a focus on the difference between additive and multiplicative reasoning. Students responded both qualitatively and quantitatively in this assignment.	Sufficient	This assignment reached the full depth of the targeted standards and allowed students to engage with a mathematical practice at the appropriate depth. This task also related academic content to the real-world.
Sample 2	6	Students practiced describing the relationship between two quantities using ratios and ratio language with an emphasis on both part-to-part and part-to-whole ratios. This task included both qualitative and quantitative ratio problems.	Sufficient	This assignment reached the full depth of the targeted standards and allowed students to engage with a mathematical practice at the appropriate depth. This task also related academic content to the real-world.
Sample 3	8	Students used Google Maps to identify line and angle relationships and to practice measuring angles for roads near their school. Students sketched the two situations, identified various mathematical terms using proper vocabulary, and used a protractor as a tool.	Sufficient	This assignment reached the full depth of the targeted standards and allowed students to engage with a mathematical practice at the appropriate depth. This task also related academic content to the real-world.
Sample 4	7	Students used various operations and problem-solving strategies to make sense of problems involving positive and negative	Minimal	This assignment some contained questions that reached the full depth of the targeted standards. However, students were not able to

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
		rational numbers. Students received support with practice related to gardening in the real-world, while they worked independently to evaluate expressions.		apply mathematical practices and relate academic content to the real-world at the appropriate depth of grade-level standards.
Sample 5	7	Students used properties such as distribution and substitution to rewrite and solve a variety of linear expressions/equations. Students performed some limited error analysis and one instance of applying mathematical operations to the real world.	Minimal	This assignment reached the full depth of the targeted standards and allowed students to engage with a mathematical practice at the appropriate depth. However, the task did not allow students to relate academic content to the real world.

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC[8]

Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are negative or inappropriate and characterized by sarcasm, putdowns, or conflict.	Classroom interactions are generally appropriate and free from conflict but may be characterized by occasional displays of insensitivity.	Classroom interactions reflect general warmth and caring, and are respectful of the cultural and developmental differences among groups of students.	Classroom interactions are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring toward individuals. Students themselves ensure maintenance of high levels of civility among member of the class.
2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	The classroom does not represent a culture for learning and is characterized by low teacher commitment to the subject, low expectations for student achievement, and little student pride in work.	The classroom environment reflects only a minimal culture for learning, with only modest or inconsistent expectations for student achievement, little teacher commitment to the subject, and little student pride in work. Both teacher and students are performing at the minimal level to "get by."	The classroom environment represents a genuine culture for learning, with commitment to the subject on the part of both teacher and students, high expectations for student achievement, and student pride in work.	Students assumes much of the responsibility for establishing a culture for learning in the classroom by taking pride in their work, initiating improvements to their products, and holding the work to the highest standard. Teacher demonstrates as passionate commitment to the subject.

---

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

Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	Classroom routines and procedures are either nonexistent or inefficient, resulting in the loss of much instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures have been established but function unevenly or inconsistently, with some loss of instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures have been established and function smoothly for the most part, with little loss of instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures are seamless in their operation, and students assume considerable responsibility for their smooth functioning.
2d. Managing Student Behavior	Student behavior is poor, with no clear expectations, no monitoring of student behavior, and inappropriate response to student misbehavior.	Teacher makes an effort to establish standards of conduct for students, monitor student behavior, and respond to student misbehavior, but these efforts are not always successful.	Teacher is aware of student behavior, has established clear standards of conduct, and responds to student misbehavior in ways that are appropriate and respectful of the students.	Student behavior is entirely appropriate, with evidence of student participation in setting expectations and monitoring behavior. Teacher's monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive, and teachers' response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs.

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
3a. Communicating with Students	Teacher's oral and written communication contains errors or is unclear or inappropriate to students. Teacher's purpose in a lesson or unit is unclear to students. Teacher's explanation of the content is unclear or confusing or uses inappropriate language.	Teacher's oral and written communication contains no errors, but may not be completely appropriate or may require further explanations to avoid confusion. Teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose, with limited success. Teacher's explanation of the content is uneven; some is done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow.	Teacher communicates clearly and accurately to students both orally and in writing. Teacher's purpose for the lesson or unit is clear, including where it is situation within broader learning. Teacher's explanation of content is appropriate and connects with students' knowledge and experience.	Teacher's oral and written communication is clear and expressive, anticipating possible student misconceptions. Makes the purpose of the lesson or unit clear, including where it is situated within broader learning, linking purpose to student interests. Explanation of content is imaginative, and connects with students' knowledge and experience. Students contribute to explaining concepts to their peers.
3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	Teacher makes poor use of questioning and discussion techniques, with low-level questions, limited student participation, and little true discussion.	Teacher's use of questioning and discussion techniques is uneven with some high-level question; attempts at true discussion; moderate student participation.	Teacher's use of questioning and discussion techniques reflects high-level questions, true discussion, and full participation by all students.	Students formulate may of the high-level questions and assume responsibility for the participation of all students in the discussion.
3c. Engaging Students in Learning	Students are not at all intellectually engaged in significant learning, as a result of inappropriate activities or materials, poor representations of content, or lack of lesson structure.	Students are intellectually engaged only partially, resulting from activities or materials or uneven quality, inconsistent representation of content or uneven structure of pacing.	Students are intellectually engaged throughout the lesson, with appropriate activities and materials, instructive representations of content, and suitable structure and pacing of the lesson.	Students are highly engaged throughout the lesson and make material contribution to the representation of content, the activities, and the materials. The structure and pacing of the lesson allow for student reflection and closure.

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

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	Students are unaware of criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and do not engage in self-assessment or monitoring. Teacher does not monitor student learning in the curriculum, and feedback to students is of poor quality and in an untimely manner.	Students know some of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and occasionally assess the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards. Teacher monitors the progress of the class as a whole but elicits no diagnostic information; feedback to students is uneven and inconsistent in its timeliness.	Students are fully aware of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards. Teacher monitors the progress of groups of students in the curriculum, making limited use of diagnostic prompts to elicit information; feedback is timely, consistent, and of high quality.	Students are fully aware of the criteria and standards by which their work will be evaluated, have contributed to the development of the criteria, frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards, and make active use of that information in their learning. Teacher actively and systematically elicits diagnostic information from individual students regarding understanding and monitors progress of individual students; feedback is timely, high quality, and students use feedback in their learning.

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

ELA			
Rating	**Content**	**Practice**	**Relevance**
Sufficient	The assignment is based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text and contains questions that reach the depth of the grade-level standards.	The assignment both integrates standards and requires students to use what they learned from the text.	The assignment builds grade-appropriate knowledge, gives students a chance to use their voice and/or connects to real-world issues.
Minimal	The assignment is based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text but does not contain questions that reach the depth of the standard.	Either the assignment does not integrate standards, or it does not require students to use what they learn from the text.	The assignment builds grade-appropriate knowledge but does not give students a chance to use their voice and does not connect to real-world issues.
No Opportunity	The assignment is not based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text.	The assignment does not integrate standards and does not require students to use what they learn from the text.	The assignment does not build grade-appropriate knowledge, does not give students a chance to use their voice and does not connect to real-world issues.

---

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

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

Math			
Rating	**Content**	**Practice**	**Relevance**
Sufficient	All the questions on the assignment reach the depth of the targeted grade-level standard(s).	The assignment includes an opportunity to engage with at least one mathematical practice at the appropriate level of depth.	The assignment connects academic content to real-world experiences and allows students to apply math to the real world in a meaningful way. It may also include novel problems.
Minimal	More than half (but not all) of the questions on the assignment reach the depth of the targeted grade-level standard(s).	The assignment includes an opportunity to engage with at least one critical math practice, but not at the level of depth required by the standard.	The assignment connects academic content to real-world experiences, but the problems do not allow students to apply math to the real world in a meaningful way.
No Opportunity	Less than half of the questions on the assignment reach the depth of the targeted grade-level standard.	The assignment provides no opportunity to engage with critical mathematical practices while working on grade-level content.	The assignment does not connect academic content to real-world experiences.