

April 12, 2024

Ms. Latoya Tolbert, Board Chair Dr. Monica Green, Executive Director Capital Village Public Charter 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 Capital Village Public Charter School for a Qualitative Site Review because the school is eligible for its five-year charter review during school year 2024 – 25.

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Capital Village Public Charter School from January 8 – 24, 2024. 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 Capital Village Public Charter School's sample English language arts and math assignments to determine whether the assignments align with gradeappropriate standards. See the team's findings in the enclosed Qualitative Site Review report.

DC PCSB conducted all classroom observations in accordance with the <u>Qualitative</u> <u>Site Review Protocol</u>. See page 7 of the protocol for information about disputing Qualitative Site Review findings.

Sincerely,

Melodi Sampson Chief School Performance Officer

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

OBSERVATION SUMMARY	1
Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities Classroom Environment nstruction	4 5 9
ASSIGNMENT REVIEW	14
APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC	19
APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC	21
APPENDIX III: ASSIGNMENT REVIEW CRITERIA	24
APPENDIX IV: OVERALL ASSIGNMENT RATING SCALE	26

# **Qualitative Site Review (QSR) Report**

Capital Village Public Charter School (Capital Village PCS)					
Year Opened	2020 – 21	Ward	5		
Grades Served	5 – 8	Total Enrollment	95 <sup>1</sup>		
Students with Disabilities Enrollment	41	Emerging Multilingual Learners Enrollment <sup>2</sup>	8		
Mission Statement					
The mission of Capital Village Public Charter School is to prepare all students, regardless of background or circumstance, to reach their full potential in college, career, and life in order to become agents of change in their communities					
Observation Window In-Seat Attendance Rate on Observation Day					
		Visit 1. 01/09/24: 74.9%			
01/08/24 three	$h = \frac{1}{2} $	Visit 2. 01/12/24: 9	93.7%		
01/08/24 through 01/24/24		Visit 3. 01/18/24: 78.6%			
		Visit 4. 01/22/24: 93.1%			

#### **OBSERVATION SUMMARY**

During the observation window, the QSR team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction at Capital Village PCS. The QSR team comprised three DC PCSB staff members and consultants, including one special education expert.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>This enrollment figure is based on preliminary, unvalidated data as of the QSR document submission date, December 22, 2024.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> DC PCSB updated its terminology referring to charter students learning a new language. Emerging multilingual learner (EML) replaces the term English Learner (EL). For more information, see the DC PCSB announcement linked here: <u>https://bit.ly/44plsmb</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The typical QSR observation window lasts two weeks. The QSR team visited Capital Village PCS over a three-week period because it could not complete all observations during a two-week period due to inclement weather and school closures.

In the <u>Classroom Environment</u> domain, the average was 3.04, indicating an overall rating just above proficient. The QSR team scored 100% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 2a, "Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport," with 100% of observations rated as distinguished or proficient. In the distinguished classroom, the teacher respected and encouraged students' efforts. Across observations, interactions amongst teachers and students were uniformly respectful. See below for a breakdown of scores by component:<sup>4</sup>

Domain			Cla	assroom Enviro	nment	
	2a	2b	2c	2d	<b>2e</b> <sup>5</sup>	
Component	Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Establishing a Culture for Learning	Managing Classroom Procedures	Managing Student Behavior	Organizing Physical Space	SY23 – 24 Average
Distinguished	16.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Proficient	83.3%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Basic	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Unsatisfactory	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Component Average	3.17	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Domain Average			3.04			95.8%
% Proficient or above			100%			<ul> <li>Distinguished</li> <li>Proficient</li> <li>Basic</li> <li>Unsatisfactory</li> </ul>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Each component score is out of four. See Appendices I and II for a detailed description of each level of performance.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Component 2e, "Organizing Physical Space" is not included in the "Domain Average," nor is it included in the "% Proficient or above" rate. While this component has been part of the 2013 edition of the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching*, SY 2023 – 24 is the first year in which DC PCSB pilots the evaluation of 2e. DC PCSB expects to evaluate component 2e beginning in SY 2024 – 25 officially.

In the <u>Instruction</u> domain, the average was 2.41, indicating an overall rating right between basic and proficient. The QSR team scored 52.2% of observations as proficient in the Instruction domain. The highest performing components in this domain were 3a, "Communicating with Students," and 3d, "Using Assessment in Instruction," both with 66.7% of observations rated as proficient. Across observations, most teachers clearly stated what students would be learning. Most teachers also elicited evidence of student understanding. See below for a breakdown of scores by component:<sup>6</sup>

Domain	Instruction					
	3a	3b	3с	3d	<b>3e</b> <sup>7</sup>	
Component	Communicating with Students	Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	Engaging Students in Learning	Using Assessment in Instruction	Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	SY23 – 24 Average 8.7% 52.2%
Distinguished	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Proficient	66.7%	20.0%	50.0%	66.7%	80.0%	
Basic	33.3%	40.0%	50.0%	33.3%	20.0%	
Unsatisfactory	0%	40.0%	0%	0%	0%	
Component Average	2.67	1.80	2.50	2.67	2.80	39.1%
Domain Average			2.41			
% Proficient or above	52.2%					<ul> <li>Distinguished</li> <li>Proficient</li> <li>Basic</li> <li>Unsatisfactory</li> </ul>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Each component score is out of four. See Appendices I and II for a detailed description of each level of performance.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Component 3e, "Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness," is not included in the "Domain Average," nor is it included in "% Proficient or above" rate. While this component has been part of the 2013 edition of the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching*, SY 2023 – 24 is the first year in which DC PCSB pilots the evaluation of 3e. DC PCSB expects to evaluate component 3e beginning in SY 2024 – 25 officially.

### Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Before the two-week observation window, Capital Village PCS completed a questionnaire about how it serves students with disabilities. According to the school, "Capital Village PCS tailors its special education program to meet the diverse needs of its students, whether that be in an inclusive or self-contained setting." DC PCSB observed specialized instruction in the self-contained setting. Reviewers looked for evidence of the school's articulated program. Overall, DC PCSB found the school implemented its stated special education program with fidelity.

In the <u>Classroom Environment</u> domain, the special education observations' average was 3.00, indicating an overall rating of proficient. In the <u>Instruction</u> domain, the special education observations' average was 2.63, indicating an overall rating just below proficient. See below for a breakdown of scores by component:<sup>8</sup>

Domain		Classroom Environment					İr	nstructio	n	
Component	2a	2b	2c	2d	2e	3a	3b	3с	3d	3e
Component Average	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.00
Domain Average			3.00					2.63		

Key trends from the special education observations are summarized below.

• Self-Contained: DCPCSB observed two self-contained classrooms. In one observation, students worked to complete a presentation of a model of the solar system, including facts about the planets. Students in this observation researched facts about a planet of their choice. In this observation, student engagement with the content was largely passive. In another observation, students worked to complete a school lunch budget with menu items and prices that totaled under \$20 for the school week. While completing this task, students were given strategies and tips for adding decimals. Across both observations, DC PCAB observed the following accommodations: structured routines, frequent breaks, clarification/repetition of directions, providing students with wait-time for verbal responses to questions, access to calculators, and ongoing checks for understanding.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Each component score is out of four. See Appendices I and II for a detailed description of each level of performance.

#### **Classroom Environment**<sup>9</sup>

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*.<sup>10</sup> The QSR team scored 100% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" in the <u>Classroom Environment</u> domain.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	The QSR team rated <b>16.7%</b> of observations as <b>distinguished</b> in this component. In the distinguished observation, the teacher respected and encouraged students' efforts. In this observation, when a student was having difficulty sharing their answer aloud, the teacher told them to take a second to pause and close their eyes. The student then did so and shared. The teacher then praised the student for sharing.
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	observations, interactions between teachers and students and amongst students were uniformly respectful. In one observation, the teacher referred to students as "Little brother." The teacher said, "Little brother, get the timer for me." The student then joyfully set the timer to the directed time. In another observation, students said, "Thank you" to the teacher as the teacher passed out the assignment for the day. In another observation, the teacher told a joke to a student, and the teacher and student laughed and smiled together. Teachers also successfully responded to disrespectful behavior among students. In one observation, when a student called another an unkind word, the teacher said, "What? No, we are not doing that." The student then apologized. Across all observations, students exhibited respect for their teacher and classmates.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>basic</b> in this component. The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>unsatisfactory</b> in this component.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>distinguished</b> in this component.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> The QSR team may observe teachers more than once by different review team members.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> For details, see the framework's "Classroom Environment Observation Rubric," available in Appendix I.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team rated <b>100%</b> of observations as <b>proficient</b> in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers conveyed an expectation of high levels of student effort. In one observation, a group of students wanted to use the teacher's idea for their project. The teacher said, "No, do not copy my example. You are going to come up with your own." In another observation, the teacher told students, "Do not rush. Take your time with your work." Teachers also demonstrated a high regard for students' abilities. In one observation, a student did not get a three out of four on their exit ticket. The teacher said, "Let's do it again and aim for at least three correct answers. I know you can do it." In another observation, as students prepared for a short homework quiz, the teacher said, "You are going to knock this out of the park." In another observation, a student shared that they thought they would never be multiplying and adding variables. The teacher then said, "Everyone can master it!"
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of observations as <b>basic</b> in this component.
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as <b>unsatisfactory</b> in this component.
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team rated <b>100%</b> of observations as <b>proficient</b> in this component. In the proficient observations, students productively engaged in small-group or independent work. In one observation, students worked productively in small groups as they worked on a project. Most students, two of three groups, remained on task for the entire duration of the observation. Further, across multiple observations, students engaged in independent work without interruption. Transitions between large- and small-group activities were also smooth. In one observation, students transitioned from whole class work to a group activity without losing instructional time. Classroom routines also functioned smoothly. In one observation, the teacher used a timer to keep track of independent work time. When the timer went off, students immediately stopped working and were ready to listen to the next direction. In another observation, students quickly stood up, retrieved their math notebooks, and returned to their seats without losing instructional time. The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>basic</b> in this component.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>unsatisfactory</b> in this component.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>distinguished</b> in this component.
	The QSR team rated <b>100%</b> of observations as <b>proficient</b> in this component. In the proficient
	observations, teacher responses to student misbehavior were effective. In one observation,
	when students talked during independent work, the teacher said, "If you continue to talk, you
	will owe me time." The student then stopped talking. Later, when the student began speaking
	out of turn again, the teacher tapped the student's desk, and the student quickly re-engaged
2d. Managing Student	in their work. In another observation, a student stood up frustrated about miscalculating a
Behavior	math problem. The teacher said, "Now we can just do it again. Take a deep breath. It's not a
	problem." The student then sat back down and continued working. Teachers also frequently
	monitored student behavior. Across observations, teachers circulated classrooms, ensuring
	students remained on task. Overall, across all classrooms, student behavior was generally
	appropriate.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>basic</b> in this component.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>unsatisfactory</b> in this component.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>distinguished</b> in this component.
	The QSR team rated <b>100%</b> of observations as <b>proficient</b> in this component. In the proficient
	observations, classrooms were safe, and students could see and hear the teacher and
	instructional materials. In one observation, students sat facing the teacher, and the teacher
	projected all materials at the front of the classroom. In another observation, desks were spaced
2e Organizing Physical Space	throughout the room, giving students personal space and allowing teachers to circulate easily.
ze. Organizing Physical Space	Teachers also made appropriate use of available technology. In one observation, the teacher
	projected an instructional video on the board for students to use when completing their
	worksheets. In another observation, the teacher used the Smart Board to project student
	examples throughout the class lesson. Teachers also arranged classrooms to support the
	instructional goals and learning activities. In one observation, students were seated in groups,
	allowing them to begin working on their group project quickly.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>basic</b> in this component.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>unsatisfactory</b> in this component.

## Instruction

This table summarizes the school's performance in the <u>Instruction</u> domain during the unannounced visits. The rating categories—"distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory"—come from the *Framework for Teaching*.<sup>11</sup> The QSR team scored 52.2% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" in the <u>Instruction</u> domain.

INSTRUCTION COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	<ul> <li>The QSR team rated none of the observations as distinguished in this component.</li> <li>The QSR team rated 66.7% of the observations as proficient in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers clearly stated what students would be learning. Teachers stated the following learning objectives: <ul> <li>"We will work on a project to showcase a math topic at the Celebration of Learning."</li> <li>"We will work on adding and subtracting decimal numbers."</li> <li>"We will practice budgeting money."</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3a. Communicating with Students	observation, when students were working on unit rates and were confused, the teacher did a model problem with the class. The teacher said, "If I wanted to buy a bundle of toilet paper for \$12.99, the ratio would be finding out how much one roll would cost." Teachers also described specific strategies students might use, inviting students to interpret them in the context of their learning. In one observation, the teacher created a list of helpful strategies on the board as students were working on adding and subtracting decimals. One strategy was to include a zero as a placeholder to help line up all numbers. Across observations, students engaged with the learning tasks, indicating they understood what to do.
	The QSR team rated <b>33.3%</b> of the observations as <b>basic</b> in this component. In the basic observations, teachers' explanation of content consisted of a monologue, with minimal participation or intellectual engagement by students. In one observation, students watched an instructional video for the entire duration of the observation. At times, the teacher paused

 $<sup>^{\</sup>mbox{\tiny II}}$  For details, see the framework's "Instruction Observation Rubric," available in Appendix II.

INSTRUCTION COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	the video to ask questions, but then quickly re-started the video limiting student engagement
	with the lesson.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>unsatisfactory</b> in this component.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>distinguished</b> in this component.
	The QSR team rated <b>20.0%</b> of observations as <b>proficient</b> in this component. In the proficient
	observation, many students actively engaged in discussions. In this observation, students
	debated what the keyword was in a sentence. During the debate, multiple students shared
	their perspectives. The teacher also called on most students, even those who didn't initially
	volunteer. The teacher ensured all students contributed by cold calling and saying, "[Student
	name], help them out!" and "Let me hear from [student name]."
	The QSR team rated <b>40.0%</b> of observations as <b>basic</b> in this component. In the basic
	observations, teachers framed some questions designed to promote student thinking, but
	many had a single correct answer, and the teacher called on students quickly. Teachers posed
	the following questions:
3b. Using Questioning and	<ul> <li>"If we eat half of a pizza, what is the decimal amount?"</li> </ul>
Discussion Techniques	<ul> <li>"What is on the left side of the decimal?"</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>"What is another part of our decimal number?"</li> </ul>
	Although some questions led to discussion, no further prompting was made, which limited
	discussion opportunities. Teachers also invited students to respond directly to one another's
	Ideas, but few responded. In one observation, the teacher said, "Does anyone agree with
	[student name]?" No students responded, and the teacher quickly moved on.
	The QSR team rated <b>40.0%</b> of observations as <b>unsatisfactory</b> in this component. In the
	unsatisfactory observations, questions were rapid-fire with a single correct answer and did not
	invite student thinking. Leachers posed the following questions:
	"What is the answer to number six?"
	The answer to number seven is?"
	"What is the first rock?"

INSTRUCTION COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	<ul> <li>"What is a?" What is b?"</li> </ul>
	Teachers quickly moved on as soon as one student responded, allowing no opportunity for
	discussion. Further, when a student did not answer, the teacher answered the question and
	moved on. Across observations, all discussions were between the teacher and students, and
	teachers did not invite students to speak directly to one another.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>distinguished</b> in this component.
	The QSR team rated <b>50.0%</b> of observations as <b>proficient</b> in this component. In the proficient
	observations, most learning tasks had multiple correct responses or approaches and
	encouraged higher-order thinking. In one observation, the teacher tasked students with
	creating a project about a math topic from the unit. Students were given autonomy over their
	project and were able to choose from a variety of topics. In another observation, students
	created a lunch budget. Students could select any items on the menu as long as they stayed
	within budget. Materials and resources also required intellectual engagement as appropriate.
	In one observation, the teacher provided students with a lunch menu, but students did the
	heavy lifting of the task by ensuring they stayed within budget. In another observation,
3c. Engaging Students in	students were required to teach their math topic to other students and had to think about
Learning	how to present the math content in an accessible way. Across observations, teachers
	intellectually engaged most students in lessons.
	The QSR team rated <b>50.0%</b> of observations as <b>basic</b> in this component. In the basic
	observations, learning tasks were a mix of those requiring thinking and those requiring recall.
	In one observation, students watched a video and completed a worksheet. All questions on
	the worksheet consisted of recall, as students could locate all answers in the video. Further,
	few materials and resources required student thinking or asked students to explain their
	thinking. In one observation, the teacher instructed students to choose a planet and write
	down facts about their planet. However, students simply copied down facts and were not
	required to engage with the content intellectually. In another observation, as students
	completed a worksheet, they copied their answers onto the worksheet as the teacher paused

INSTRUCTION COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	the instructional video. The pacing of lessons was also uneven, suitable in some parts but dragged in others. In one observation, students spent 30 minutes watching an instructional video talking about science vocabulary. However, students then only had five minutes to complete an exit ticket before the class period ended. As a result, students rushed to complete their exit tickets.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>distinguished</b> in this component.
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team rated <b>66.7%</b> of observations as <b>proficient</b> in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers elicited evidence of student understanding. In one observation, the teacher explained two academic vocabulary words and then prompted students to provide examples of the vocabulary words. In another observation, the teacher explained a concept and then asked multiple students questions to identify their understanding by putting it in their own words. In another observation, the teacher asked students for a thumbs up or down regarding their understanding of the learning task. Feedback also included specific and timely guidance. In one observation, the teacher checked in one-on-one with students and provided individual feedback about the next steps they should take with their work. In another observation, the teacher told students, "Yes, you got it," "Are you sure you added that up correctly," and "You might want to go back and check this answer."
	The QSR team rated <b>33.3%</b> of observations as <b>basic</b> in this component. In the basic observations, there was little evidence students understood how teachers would evaluate their work. In one observation, students completed a project about a previously taught math unit. However, the teacher did not provide specific guidelines for what the project should look like or include. Teachers' feedback to students was vague and not oriented toward future work improvement. Teachers often gave global feedback such as "Good Job!" and "Nice work!" Teachers monitored understanding through a single method or without eliciting evidence of

INSTRUCTION COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	understanding from students. In one observation, evidence of understanding was monitored solely through call and response, leaving room for many individual students to be confused.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>distinguished</b> in this component.
3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	The QSR team rated <b>80.0%</b> of observations as <b>proficient</b> in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers offered students other approaches to try when they experienced difficulty. In one observation, students did not understand how to solve for unit rate. The teacher said, "So if you buy a bundle of hair that brings five packs for sixty dollars, what would the price of just one pack be?" The student arrived at the answer of twelve dollars and then understood the content. In another observation, when students added decimals, the teacher listed strategies and tips on the board to support students. In another observation, students didn't understand the meaning of specific vocabulary words. The teacher then provided students with an example and prompted students to think about their everyday conversations with friends and to give an example of a slang word with the same meaning. Students then provided examples and gained a more robust understanding of the vocabulary words. The QSR team rated <b>20.0%</b> of observations as <b>basic</b> in this component. This represents one observation. DC PCSB only reports qualitative evidence for a single observation when the performance is rated distinguished or proficient.
	The QSR team rated <b>none</b> of the observations as <b>unsatisfactory</b> in this component.

### ASSIGNMENT REVIEW

DC PCSB staff and The New Teacher Project (TNTP) consultants reviewed sample English language arts (ELA) and math assignments Capital Village PCS 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.<sup>12</sup>

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.<sup>13, 14</sup>

Assignments are rated out of six total points across three domains (e.g., Content, Practice, and Relevance).<sup>13</sup> Each domain rating has a numerical value:

- Sufficient 2 points
- Minimal 1 point
- No Opportunity 0 points

Then, the domain ratings are summed to get an overall score out of six points. Sufficient assignments require a minimum of four points.<sup>14</sup>

Of the five ELA samples submitted, one assignment received an overall rating of "sufficient." This assignment aligned to a high-quality, grade-appropriate text and contained questions that reached the depth of the targeted grade-level standard. Two assignments received an overall rating of "minimal." These assignments aligned to a high-quality, grade-appropriate text, but did not contain questions that reached the full depth of the targeted grade-level standards. Two assignments received an overall rating of "no opportunity." These assignments did not align to a high-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> See the ELA Assignment Review Protocol here: <u>https://bit.ly/3eSEXQe</u>. See the Math Assignment Review Protocol here: <u>https://bit.ly/3UavzHI</u>. These evaluation tools are based on TNTP's study, *The Opportunity Myth*, available here: <u>https://bit.ly/2Dv7yId</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> For details, see a breakdown of each rating in Appendix III.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> For information about determining overall ratings, see the description and scale in Appendix IV.

quality, grade-appropriate text and did not contain questions that reached the depth of the targeted grade-level standards. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Task Description	Rating		Evidence
Sample 1	8	Students responded to the focus question, "What are the most important things we can do to ensure that our food is healthy and sustainable?" Students were required to include evidence from the text to support their argument.	Sufficient	6 points	This assignment aligned to a high-quality, grade-appropriate text and contained questions that reached the depth of the targeted grade-level standards. This assignment also integrated more than one standard in service of comprehension, required students to use what they learned in the text in a grade-appropriate way, and allowed students the opportunity to use their personal voice.
Sample 2	7	Students read a text and then evaluated the title of the text.	Minimal	2 points	This assignment aligned to a high-quality, grade-appropriate text, but did not contain questions that reached the depth of the targeted grade-level standards. Further, the task did not incorporate more than one standard in service of comprehension or require students to use what they learned from the text in a grade-appropriate way. This task also did not allow students to use their personal voice.
Sample 3	8	Students read and annotated a text and then asked questions focused on their understanding of the text.	Minimal	2 points	This assignment aligned to a high-quality, grade-appropriate text, but did not contain questions that reached the depth of the targeted grade-level standards. Further, the task did not incorporate more than one

Assignment	Grade Level	Task Description Rating		Evidence	
					standard in service of comprehension or require students to use what they learned from the text in a grade-appropriate way. This task also did not allow students to use their personal voice.
Sample 4	7	Students were tasked with identifying the narrator in a text and the point of view of the narrator. Students also had to use text evidence to support the point of view.	No Opportunity	0 points	This assignment did not align to a high- quality, grade-appropriate text and did not contain questions that reached the depth of the targeted grade-level standards.
Sample 5	8	Students were tasked with identifying the narrator in a text and determining the narrator's point of view. Students then described how the story would change if told from a different point of view.	No Opportunity	0 points	This assignment did not align to a high- quality, grade-appropriate text and did not contain questions that reached the depth of the targeted grade-level standards.

Of the five math samples submitted, three assignments received an overall rating of "sufficient." These assignments contained questions aligned to grade-level standards and allowed students to engage with mathematical practices at the appropriate depth. These assignments also allowed students to relate academic content to the real world in a meaningful way. Two assignments received an overall rating of "minimal." These assignments contained questions that did not reach the full depth of the grade-level standards. These assignments allowed for students to relate academic content to the real world, but not in a meaningful way. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Task Description	Rati	ng	Evidence
Sample 1	6	Students analyzed the relationship between the number of miles and the number of hours a person rides their bike. Students then used their understanding of the relationship to respond to questions.	Sufficient	6 points	This assignment contained questions that aligned to grade-level standards and allowed students to engage with mathematical practices at the appropriate depth. This assignment also allowed students to relate academic content to the real world in a meaningful way.
Sample 2	7	Students created a table and graph to show the relationship between amount of time and the number of miles to prove a proportional relationship. Students were then required to write an equation to show the proportional relationship.	Sufficient	5 points	This assignment contained questions that aligned to grade-level standards and allowed students to engage with mathematical practices at the appropriate depth. This assignment also allowed students to relate academic content to the real world, but not in a meaningful way.
Sample 3	8	Students read real-world problems and made sense of the problems using the Pythagorean Theorem.	Sufficient	5 points	This assignment contained questions that aligned to grade-level standards and allowed students to engage with mathematical practices at the appropriate depth. This assignment also allowed students to relate academic content to the real world, but not in a meaningful way.
Sample 4	6	Students identified the ratio between two objects and then identified ratios related to word problems.	Minimal	3 points	This assignment only topically aligned to a grade-level standard and contained questions that did not reach the full depth of the targeted standards. Students also had the opportunity to engage with a mathematical practice, but not at the appropriate depth. Further, students related

Assignment	Grade Level	Task Description	Rating		Evidence
					academic content to the real world, but not in a meaningful way.
Sample 5	6	Students identified the ratio between two objects and then identified ratios related to word problems.	Minimal	3 points	This assignment only topically aligned to a grade-level standard and contained questions that did not reach the full depth of the targeted standards. Students also had the opportunity to engage with a mathematical practice, but not at the appropriate depth. Further, students related academic content to the real world, but not in a meaningful way.

# APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC<sup>15</sup>

Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Patterns of classroom interactions, both between teacher and students and among students, are mostly negative, inappropriate, or insensitive to students' ages, cultural backgrounds, and developmental levels. Student interactions are characterized by sarcasm, put- downs, or conflict. The teacher does not deal with disrespectful behavior.	Patterns of classroom interactions, both between teacher and students and among students, are generally appropriate but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, and disregard for students' ages, cultures, and developmental levels. Students rarely demonstrate disrespect for one another. The teacher attempts to respond to disrespectful behavior, with uneven results. The net result of the interactions is neutral, conveying neither warmth nor conflict.	Teacher-student interactions are friendly and demonstrate general caring and respect. Such interactions are appropriate to the ages, cultures, and developmental levels of the students. Interactions among students are generally polite and respectful, and students exhibit respect for the teacher. The teacher responds successfully to disrespectful behavior among students. The net result of the interactions is polite, respectful, and business-like, though students may be somewhat cautious about taking risks.	Classroom interactions between the teacher and students and among students are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth, caring, and sensitivity to students as individuals. Students exhibit respect for the teacher and contribute to high levels of civility among all members of the class. The net result is an environment where all students feel valued are comfortable taking intellectual risks.
2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	The classroom culture is characterized by a lack of teacher or student commitment to learning, and/or little or no investment of student energy in the task at hand. Hard work and the precise use of language are not expected or valued. Medium to low expectations for student achievement are the norm, with high expectations for learning reserved for only one or two students.	The classroom culture is characterized by little commitment to learning by the teacher or students. The teacher appears to be only "going through the motions," and students indicate that they are interested in the completion of a task rather than the quality of the work. The teacher conveys that student success is the result of natural ability rather than hard work, and refers only in passing to the precise use of language. High expectations for learning are reserved for those students thought to have a natural aptitude for the subject.	The classroom culture is a place where learning is valued by all; high expectations for both learning and hard work are the norm for most students. Students understand their role as learners and consistently expend effort to learn. Classroom interactions support learning, hard work, and the precise use of language.	The classroom culture is a cognitively busy place, characterized by a shared belief in the importance of learning. The teacher conveys high expectations for learning for all students and insists on hard work; students assume responsibility for high quality by initiating improvements, making revisions, adding detail, and/or assisting peers in their precise use of language.
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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Danielson, C. (2014). The Framework for Teaching: Evaluation Instrument (2013 ed.). The Danielson Group.

Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
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.
2e. Organizing Physical Space	The classroom environment is unsafe, or learning is not accessible to many. There is poor alignment between the arrangement of furniture and resources, including computer technology, and the lesson activities.	The classroom is safe, and essential learning is accessible to most students. The teacher makes modest use of physical resources, including computer technology. The teacher attempts to adjust the classroom furniture for a lesson or, if necessary, to adjust the lesson to the furniture, but with limited effectiveness.	The classroom is safe, and students have equal access to learning activities; the teacher ensures that the furniture arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities and uses physical resources, including computer technology, effectively.	The classroom environment is safe, and learning is accessible to all students, including those with special needs. The teacher makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology. The teacher ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities. Students contribute to the use or adaptation of the physical environment to advance learning.

## **APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC**<sup>16</sup>

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
3a. Communicating with Students	The instructional purpose of the lesson is unclear to students, and the directions and procedures are confusing. The teacher's explanation of the content contains major errors and does not include any explanation of strategies students might use. The teacher's spoken or written language contains errors of grammar or syntax. The teacher's academic vocabulary is inappropriate, vague, or used incorrectly, leaving students confused.	The teacher's attempt to explain the instructional purpose has only limited success, and/or directions and procedures must be clarified after initial student confusion. The teacher's explanation of the content may contain minor errors; some portions are clear, others difficult to follow. The teacher's explanation does not invite students to engage intellectually or to understand strategies they might use when working independently. The teacher's spoken language is correct but uses vocabulary that is either limited or not fully appropriate to the students' ages or backgrounds. The teacher rarely takes opportunities to explain academic vocabulary.	The instructional purpose of the lesson is clearly communicated to students, including where it is situated within broader learning; directions and procedures are explained clearly and may be modeled. The teacher's explanation of content is scaffolded, clear, and accurate and connects with students' knowledge and experience. During the explanation of content, the teacher focuses, as appropriate, on strategies students can use when working independently and invites student intellectual engagement. The teacher's spoken and written language is clear and correct and is suitable to students' ages and interests. The teacher's use of academic vocabulary is precise and serves to extend student understanding.	The teacher links the instructional purpose of the lesson to the larger curriculum; the directions and procedures are clear and anticipate possible student misunderstanding. The teacher's explanation of content is thorough and clear, developing conceptual understanding through clear scaffolding and connecting with students' interests. Students contribute to extending the content by explaining concepts to their classmates and suggesting strategies that might be used. The teacher's spoken and written language is expressive, and the teacher finds opportunities to extend students' vocabularies, both within the discipline and for more general use. Students contribute to the correct use of academic vocabulary.
3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	The teacher's questions are of low cognitive challenge, with single correct responses, and are asked in rapid succession. Interaction between the teacher and students is predominantly recitation style, with the teacher mediating all questions and answers; the teacher accepts all contributions without asking students to explain their reasoning. Only a few students participate in the discussion.	The teacher's questions lead students through a single path of inquiry, with answers seemingly determined in advance. Alternatively, the teacher attempts to ask some questions designed to engage students in thinking, but only a few students are involved. The teacher attempts to engage all students in the discussion, to encourage them to respond to one another, and to explain their thinking, with uneven results.	While the teacher may use some low- level questions, he poses questions designed to promote student thinking and understanding. The teacher creates a genuine discussion among students, providing adequate time for students to respond and stepping aside when doing so is appropriate. The teacher challenges students to justify their thinking and successfully engages most students in the discussion, employing a range of strategies to ensure that most students are heard.	The teacher uses a variety or series of questions or prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high- level thinking and discourse, and promote metacognition. Students formulate many questions, initiate topics, challenge one another's thinking, and make unsolicited contributions. Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discussion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Danielson, C. (2014). The Framework for Teaching: Evaluation Instrument (2013 ed.). The Danielson Group.

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
3c. Engaging Students in Learning	The learning tasks/activities, materials, and resources are poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes, or require only rote responses, with only one approach possible. The groupings of students are unsuitable to the activities. The lesson has no clearly defined structure, or the pace of the lesson is too slow or rushed.	The learning tasks and activities are partially aligned with the instructional outcomes but require only minimal thinking by students and little opportunity for them to explain their thinking, allowing most students to be passive or merely compliant. The groupings of students are moderately suitable to the activities. The lesson has a recognizable structure; however, the pacing of the lesson may not provide students the time needed to be intellectually engaged or may be so slow that many students have a considerable amount of "downtime."	The learning tasks and activities are fully aligned with the instructional outcomes and are designed to challenge student thinking, inviting students to make their thinking visible. This technique results in active intellectual engagement by most students with important and challenging content and with teacher scaffolding to support that engagement. The groupings of students are suitable to the activities. The lesson has a clearly defined structure, and the pacing of the lesson is appropriate, providing most students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.	Virtually all students are intellectually engaged in challenging content through well-designed learning tasks and activities that require complex thinking by students. The teacher provides suitable scaffolding and challenges students to explain their thinking. There is evidence of some student initiation of inquiry and student contributions to the exploration of important content; students may serve as resources for one another. The lesson has a clearly defined structure, and the pacing of the lesson provides students the time needed not only to intellectually engage with and reflect upon their learning but also to consolidate their understanding.
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	Students do not appear to be aware of the assessment criteria, and there is little or no monitoring of student learning; feedback is absent or of poor quality. Students do not engage in self- or peer assessment.	Students appear to be only partially aware of the assessment criteria, and the teacher monitors student learning for the class as a whole. Questions and assessments are rarely used to diagnose evidence of learning. Feedback to students is general, and few students assess their own work.	Students appear to be aware of the assessment criteria, and the teacher monitors student learning for groups of students. Questions and assessments are regularly used to diagnose evidence of learning. Teacher feedback to groups of students is accurate and specific; some students engage in self- assessment.	Assessment is fully integrated into instruction, through extensive use of formative assessment. Students appear to be aware of, and there is some evidence that they have contributed to, the assessment criteria. Questions and assessments are used regularly to diagnose evidence of learning by individual students. A variety of forms of feedback, from both teacher and peers, is accurate and specific and advances learning. Students self-assess and monitor their own progress. The teacher successfully differentiates instruction to address individual students' misunderstandings.

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	The teacher ignores students' questions; when students have difficulty learning, the teacher blames them or their home environment for their lack of success. The teacher makes no attempt to adjust the lesson even when students don't understand the content.	The teacher accepts responsibility for the success of all students but has only a limited repertoire of strategies to use. Adjustment of the lesson in response to assessment is minimal or ineffective.	The teacher successfully accommodates students' questions and interests. Drawing on a broad repertoire of strategies, the teacher persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning. If impromptu measures are needed, the teacher makes a minor adjustment to the lesson and does so smoothly.	The teacher seizes an opportunity to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous event or students' interests, or successfully adjusts and differentiates instruction to address individual student misunderstandings. Using an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies and soliciting additional resources from the school or community, the teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help.

# **APPENDIX III: ASSIGNMENT REVIEW CRITERIA**<sup>17</sup>

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.		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> These criteria are based on TNTP's (2018) The Student Experience Toolkit, available here: <u>https://bit.ly/3YMPUFO</u>.

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.	

#### APPENDIX IV: OVERALL ASSIGNMENT RATING SCALE

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

The overall assignment rating is used to reflect whether an assignment is considered grade-appropriate (*Sufficient*) or not grade-appropriate (*Minimal* or *No*), according to the TNTP assignment rating point scale.

There are three domains to the TNTP assignment tools: Content, Practices, and Relevance. Each domain is rated as 2 points (pts) – Sufficient, 1 point – Minimal, or 0 points – No.

TNTP's definition of a grade-appropriate assignment is an assignment that receives:

- both possible 2 points in the Content domain and
- at least 4 out of 6 points across the three domains of the rating scale

Content	Practice	Relevance	Overall Assignment Rating
Sufficient (2 pts)	Sufficient (2 pts)	Sufficient (2 pts)	Sufficient (6 pts)
Sufficient (2 pts)	Sufficient (2 pts)	Minimal (1 pt)	Sufficient (5 pts)
Sufficient (2 pts)	Sufficient (2 pts)	No (0 pts)	Sufficient (4 pts)
Sufficient (2 pts)	Minimal (1 pt)	Minimal (1 pt)	Sufficient (4 pts)
Sufficient (2 pts)	Minimal (1 pt)	No (0 pts)	Minimal (3 pts)
Minimal (1 pt)	Minimal (1 pt)	Minimal (1 pt)	Minimal (3 pts)
Minimal (1 pt)	Minimal (1 pt)	No (0 pts)	Minimal (2 pts)
Minimal (1 pt)	No (0 pts)	Minimal (1 pt)	Minimal (2 pts)
Sufficient (2 pts)	No (0 pts)	No (0 pts)	Minimal (2 pts)
Minimal (1 pt)	No (0 pts)	No (0 pts)	No (1 pt)
No (0 pts)	No (0 pts)	No (0 pts)	No (0 pts)