



August 18, 2022

Donald Hense, Board Chair  
Friendship Public Charter School – Ideal Middle  
6130 North Capitol Street NW  
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Hense:

The DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Review (QSR) visits to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, DC PCSB shall monitor the progress of each school in meeting the goals and student academic achievement expectations specified in the school's charter. Your school was selected to undergo a QSR because it is eligible for its 25-year charter review during school year 2022 – 23.

### **Qualitative Site Review Report**

A QSR team conducted on-site reviews of Friendship Public Charter School-Ideal Middle between March 7 – 18, 2022. The team's report is enclosed. You will find that it focuses primarily on classroom environment and instruction, as defined in the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching*. The report also includes our evaluation of the sample English language arts and math assignments we collected to assess grade-level alignment to college and career ready standards.

We appreciate the assistance your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the QSR at Friendship Public Charter School – Ideal Middle.

Sincerely,

Rashida Young  
Chief School Performance Officer

## Qualitative Site Review Report

**Date:** August 18, 2022

### **Campus Information**

**Campus Name:** Friendship Public Charter School (PCS) – Ideal Middle

**Ward:** 4

**Grade levels:** Fourth through eighth

### **Qualitative Site Review Information**

**Reason for Visit:** School is eligible for 25-year charter review during school year 2022 – 23

**Two-week Window:** March 7 – 18, 2022

**QSR Team Members:** One DC PCSB staff member and two consultants, including a special education (SPED) specialist

**Number of Observations:** 9

**Total Enrollment:** 150

**Students with Disabilities Enrollment:** 32

**English Language Learners Enrollment:** 9

**In-seat Attendance on Observation Days:**

**Visit 1:** March 9, 2022 – 80.9%

**Visit 2:** March 15, 2022 – 90.7%

**Visit 3:** March 16, 2022 – 78.2%

### **Summary**

Friendship PCS's mission is to:

Provide a world-class education that motivates students to achieve high academic standards, enjoy learning, and develop as ethical, literate, well-rounded and self-sufficient citizens who contribute actively to their communities.

The Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team observed evidence that Friendship PCS – Ideal Middle is achieving the school's mission. Across classrooms, teachers provided challenging content through clear learning objectives, higher order questioning, and engaging learning tasks. Teachers fostered caring classroom environments as they encouraged students to take turns and to respectfully disagree. Teachers developed students' literacy skills as they conferred with students about essays, providing specific and timely feedback.

During the two-week observation window, the QSR team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction (see Appendices I and II). The QSR team scored 94% of observations as

distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest rated components in this domain were 2a, “Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport,” and 2d, “Managing Student Behavior,” with 100% of observations scored as distinguished or proficient in each component. Classroom interactions were highly respectful as students listened to the teacher, complied with directions promptly, took turns when speaking, and raised their hands to share. Teachers were warm and friendly to students, praising their work and encouraging students to respond to questions. The QSR team scored 75% of observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 3a, “Communicating with Students,” with 89% of observations scored as proficient in this component. Across classrooms, teachers clearly stated instructional outcomes. Students engaged with learning tasks, showing they understood what to do. A breakdown of the scores by component can be found below.<sup>1</sup>

Percent	<b>2a</b>	<b>2b</b>	<b>2c</b>	<b>2d</b>	<b>3a</b>	<b>3b</b>	<b>3c</b>	<b>3d</b>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Basic</b>	0%	11%	11%	0%	11%	33%	33%	22%
<b>Proficient</b>	78%	78%	78%	67%	89%	67%	67%	78%
<b>Distinguished</b>	22%	11%	11%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Subdomain Average</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.78</b>

	<b>Domain 2</b>	<b>Domain 3</b>
<b>% Proficient or above</b>	94%	75%
<b>Domain Averages</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>2.75</b>

### Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Prior to the two-week observation window, Friendship PCS – Ideal Middle completed a questionnaire about how it serves its students with disabilities. Reviewers looked for evidence of the school’s articulated program. Friendship PCS – Ideal Middle says it provides specialized instruction outside the general education setting and in a SPED resource rooms. The school also said observers would see its Intensive Language and Sensory class, among other SPED services. The questionnaire indicated that Friendship PCS – Ideal Middle does not offer specialized instruction using any form of co-teaching.

DC PCSB observed specialized instruction outside the general education setting in an English language arts (ELA) resource classroom and in the Intensive Language

<sup>1</sup> Each component score is out of four. A breakdown of the critical attributes for each component can be found in Appendices I and II.

and Sensory class. Overall, DC PCSB found the school implements its stated special education continuum with fidelity. However, evidence indicated uneven results as far as the provision of specialized accommodations, modifications and supports. Key trends from the special education observations are summarized below:

- **Resource Rooms:** DC PCSB observed an ELA resource classroom during the observation window. One special education teacher and one additional adult supported this setting. DC PCSB observed accommodations including clarification and repetition of directions, providing students with wait-time to respond to questions, read aloud (by an adult reader), and graphic organizers. Friendship PCS – Ideal Middle’s questionnaire said DC PCSB would also see students use spellcheck and engage in project-based learning (instead of completing written reports). DC PCSB did not observe these accommodations. Instead of using spellcheck, students asked the teacher for spelling assistance. Instead of engaging in project-based learning, DC PCSB observed students writing essays.
- **Intensive Language and Sensory Class:** DC PCSB observed the Intensive Language and Sensory class during the observation window. The classroom included three adults and three students. During the observation, two students worked on a vocabulary and reading comprehension assignment. The third student worked one-on-one on an individualized activity. When providing whole group instruction to two of the three students, the special educator and additional adult used wait time, read aloud, and closely monitored student progress and performance. The students received Guided Notes and one-on-one guidance in using the Guided Notes to collect information communicated during the class activity. The lesson’s pace was appropriate based on students’ needs, with ongoing checks for understanding. Students complied with rote academic tasks (e.g., copying definitions from the board) but did not demonstrate active engagement with the content. For example, students rarely responded to the teacher's content-specific questions. DC PCSB did not observe intensive language or sensory supports during the observation window.

## CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT<sup>2</sup>

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Classroom Environment domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of “distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” and “unsatisfactory” are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 94% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain.

Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>	<p>The QSR team rated 100% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observations, interactions between teachers and students were highly respectful. The teacher and students frequently laughed together as the teacher used humor to encourage persistence. For example, a teacher complimented a student for their reliability and “ambition,” saying, “I appreciate your life.” In another observation, the teacher got down to the students’ level to discuss their work, praising them and patting them on the back.</p>	Distinguished	22%
	<p>In the proficient observations, talk between teachers and students and among students was uniformly respectful. In one observation, a student thanked a classmate for apologizing for interrupting them. In these observations, teachers responded successfully to disrespectful behavior among students, telling them, “You can disagree. It’s OK,” and asking students to quiet down. Teachers demonstrated general care and respect for students, encouraging them to give classmates a chance to respond, admiring student work, and telling them to take breaks if their hands hurt from writing.</p>	Proficient	78%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as basic in this component.</p>	Basic	0%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
	<p>The QSR team rated 89% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the</p>	Distinguished	11%

<sup>2</sup> Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	<p>distinguished observation, the teacher communicated a genuine passion for the subject. The teacher shared a video related to academic content. The teacher and students watched together. Then, the teacher used the video as an opportunity for students to practice math skills, which they did enthusiastically.</p> <p>In proficient observations, teachers held high expectations for all students. They cold-called students to ensure participation, looked at each student's work as they completed math problems on individual white boards, and pushed students to use subject-specific vocabulary. Teachers demonstrated a high regard for student abilities, telling them, "You almost got it," "I like it!" and "Nice!" Across classrooms, students understood their role as learners, freely discussing assignments with each other and with the teacher. In one observation, students researched information, wrote essays, and made observations about a map posted on the board.</p>	Proficient	78%
	<p>The QSR team rated 11% of the observations as basic in this component. This represents one observation and qualitative evidence will not be included in the report.</p>	Basic	11%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
		Distinguished	11%

Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>The QSR team rated 89% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In the distinguished observation, a student took the initiative to fulfill a classroom job when the designated student was absent. Without the teacher’s prompting, the student helped classmates sanitize their hands before the lesson started. Likewise, students cleaned their hands before sitting at their desks with no prompting from the teacher.</p> <p>In the proficient observations, there was little loss of instructional time due to effective classroom routines and procedures. Students worked productively in small groups with and without the teacher in these observations. Teachers used verbal warnings, timers, chants, and student timekeepers to signal transitions. Teachers and students used resources and materials effectively. Teachers posted directions and learning tasks on boards, quickly displayed visuals for discussion, and used individual white boards to observe students’ work.</p>	Proficient	78%
	<p>The QSR team rated 11% of the observations as basic in this component. This represents one observation and qualitative evidence will not be included in the report.</p>	Basic	11%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
	<p>The QSR team rated 100% of observations as distinguished or proficient in this component. In</p>	Distinguished	33%

Classroom Environment	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	<p>distinguished observations, student behavior was almost entirely appropriate. Teachers' monitoring of student behavior was preventative; they walked around and checked student work, ensuring students engaged the learning task. Teachers' responses to off-task behavior were quick and respectful. For example, a teacher quietly asked a student to pick themselves up.</p>	Proficient	67%
	<p>In proficient observations, student behavior was generally appropriate. Students followed established standards of conduct, raising their hands to speak, listening to the teacher and classmates, and completing individual work when prompted to do so. Teachers redirected off-task behavior subtly and effectively through proximity, eye contact, and by asking students questions about their classwork. For example, teachers said things like, "Let's let them go first," and, "Student X is speaking." In another observation, the teacher told students, "I love how y'all waited for me," before awarding Dojo points.</p>		
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as basic in this component.</p>	Basic	0%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%



**INSTRUCTION**

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of “distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” and “unsatisfactory” are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored 75% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Instruction domain.

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
<p><b>Communicating with Students</b></p>	<p>The QSR team rated 89% of observations proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers clearly communicated the lesson’s purpose. Across observations, teachers modeled processes to be followed during learning tasks (e.g., solving math problems, matching vocabulary to definitions) before asking students to do so independently. In these observations, teachers’ explanations invited student participation and thinking. Teachers asked students what steps they would take to solve math problems and how thesis statements responded to essay prompts. Teachers used vocabulary suited to lessons as they described different components of an essay like topic sentences, conclusion, and thesis statement.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	89%
	<p>The QSR team rated 11% of the observations as basic in this component. This represents on observation and qualitative data will not be included in the report.</p>	Basic	11%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<p><b>Using Questioning/ Prompts and Discussion Techniques</b></p>	<p>The QSR team rated 67% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers used a mix of open-ended questions designed to promote student thinking. Teachers established students’ baseline knowledge before probing with thought-provoking questions. Across classrooms, teachers created genuine discussions among students. Teachers built on student responses effectively, asking, “Can you suggest any ways we can help?”, “Who agrees? Who disagrees?” and “How do you know he’s right?” Teachers called on most students, even those who did not initially volunteer. For example, one teacher said, “Let me get somebody else I haven’t heard from.”</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	67%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team rated 33% of the observations as basic in this component. In basic observations, teachers' questions generally led students down a single path of inquiry. Students answered questions with predetermined answers. Teachers framed some questions to promote student thinking with uneven results. Few students responded to the teacher's deeper questions. In some instances, students sat in silence as the teacher answered their own questions. In one observation, the teacher attempted to facilitate a classroom discussion, but only a few students participated.</p>	Basic	33%
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	<p>The QSR team rated 67% of observations proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, most students intellectually engaged with the lesson. In these observations, students raised their hands to participate in class discussions, conferred with teachers about their writing, and completed math problems individually. Students in several observations had choice in how they completed learning tasks. In one observation, students got to answer math problems with "pictures, words or numbers." In another observation, students examined lab equipment to describe and justify with an example whether the equipment's purpose was safety, procedural, or measurement. Across classrooms, teachers scaffolded to support engagement, providing example pieces of writing on the board, referring students to anchor charts as they wrote their thesis statements, and talking them through each step of a math problem.</p>	Distinguished	0%
	<p>The QSR team rated 33% of the observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, the learning tasks were largely passive with students exercising little choice in how they completed the tasks. In these observations, students completed rote assignments like matching vocabulary words to definitions and copying information from textbooks. Across these observations, lesson pacing was unsuitable. In one observation, students sat idly for several minutes due to confusion about the learning task.</p>	Basic	33%

Instruction	Evidence	School Wide Rating	
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	The QSR team rated 78% of observations proficient and none as distinguished in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers regularly monitored student learning through various methods. They asked questions like, "How do you know that's right?" and "Can you tell me what you see?" In several observations, teachers provided individual feedback geared towards future improvement. In one observation, the teacher clearly explained the assessment criteria saying, "Cite evidence from the text to support your response. Your essay should include an introduction paragraph, a body, and a conclusion."	Distinguished	0%
	The QSR team rated 22% of the observations as basic in this component. In one observation, the teacher made minimal lesson adjustments in response to student misunderstanding. Students repeatedly called out incorrect answers with no redirection by the teacher. In another observation, there was little evidence students understood how the teacher would evaluate their work. Students spent the entire class making observations about a map with no indication of assessment criteria.	Proficient	78%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Basic	22%
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as unsatisfactory in this component.	Unsatisfactory	0%

## APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

The Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<b>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>	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.
<b>Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>	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.
<b>Managing Classroom Procedures</b>	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.
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>	Student behavior is poor, with no clear expectations, no monitoring of student behavior, and inappropriate response to student misbehavior.	Teacher makes an effort to establish standards of conduct for students, monitor student behavior, and respond to student misbehavior, but these efforts are not always successful.	Teacher is aware of student behavior, has established clear standards of conduct, and responds to student misbehavior in ways that are appropriate and respectful of the students.	Student behavior is entirely appropriate, with evidence of student participation in setting expectations and monitoring behavior. Teacher's monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive, and teachers' response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs.

## APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<b>Communicating with Students</b>	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 situated 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.
<b>Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</b>	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 many of the high-level questions and assume responsibility for the participation of all students in the discussion.
<b>Engaging Students in Learning</b>	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.
<b>Using Assessment in Instruction</b>	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.

## Work Sample Review

DC PCSB reviewed ten student work samples in addition to conducting classroom observations. Friendship PCS – Ideal Middle submitted five ELA samples and five math samples covering a range of grade levels and assignment types. The QSR team evaluated the work samples based on grade-level alignment to college and career ready standards, including Common Core.<sup>3</sup> The team reviewed each work sample in the areas of content, practice, and relevance.<sup>4</sup>

The goal of the review is to answer three essential questions:

1. Does this assignment align with the expectations defined by grade-level standards, including a high-quality text and text-based questions?
2. Does the assignment provide meaningful practice opportunities for this content area and grade-level?
3. Overall, does the assignment give students an authentic opportunity to connect academic standards to real-world issues and/or context?

DC PCSB used the criteria below to assign an overall rating to each ELA assignment.<sup>5</sup>

	<b>Content</b>	<b>Practice</b>	<b>Relevance</b>
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.

Of the five ELA samples submitted, four assignments received an overall rating of “sufficient.” These assignments were based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text and all questions reached the depth of the grade-level standard. One assignment

<sup>3</sup> See here for more information on the shifts in the college and career ready standards:

<https://achievethecore.org/category/419/the-shifts>.

<sup>4</sup> Reviewers used this tool for ELA work samples: <https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/Ss1Ffy9Ab7>. Reviewers used this tool for Math work samples: <https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/Ca2F71NXld>. The review tools are based on The New Teacher Project’s report: *The Opportunity Myth*, available here:

<https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org/>.

<sup>5</sup> The overall assignment rating scale can be found here:

[https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/NteqkVdqCO/Overall\\_Assignment\\_Rating\\_Scale.pdf](https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/NteqkVdqCO/Overall_Assignment_Rating_Scale.pdf)

received an overall rating of “minimal.” This assignment was not based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. Further, it did not require students to engage with a grade-level standard at the appropriate depth. Some evidence is captured below:

- Sixth grade students read and analyzed an informational text. This assignment was based on a grade-level standard; however, it did not focus on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text.
- Eighth grade students read a classic novel and produced a detailed account of an individual character’s experience. This assignment was based on a high-quality text and required students to use what they learned from the text to respond.

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

	<b>Content</b>	<b>Practice</b>	<b>Relevance</b>
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.

Of the five math samples submitted, one assignment received an overall rating of “sufficient.” This assignment reached the full depth of the grade-level standard and gave students the opportunity to engage with a least one critical math practice. Three assignments received an overall rating of “minimal.” These assignments reached the depth of the grade-level standard, but they did not connect academic content to real-world experiences. One assignment received an overall rating of “no opportunity.” This assignment only partially aligned to grade-level content and did not connect academic content to real-world experiences. Some evidence is captured below:

- Fourth grade students solved multiple step word problems. This assignment was aligned to a grade-level standard, but more than half of the assignment's questions did not reach the full depth of the standard.
- Sixth grade students represented ratios. This assignment reached the full depth of the grade-level standard and allowed students to connect academic content to real-world experiences.