



November 30, 2022

Ms. Mary Wells, Board Chair
Ms. Mashea Ashton, Executive Director
Digital Pioneers Academy Public Charter School – Capitol Hill

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 Digital Pioneers Academy Public Charter School – Capitol Hill for a Qualitative Site Review because your school is eligible for its five-year charter review during school year 2022 – 23.

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of Digital Pioneers Academy Public Charter School – Capitol Hill from September 19 – 30, 2022. The team observed 75.0% of the campus's core content classes. The team also observed elective classes crucial to the school's mission. Observers evaluated classroom environment and instruction, as defined in the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching*. Additionally, the team reviewed Digital Pioneers Academy Public Charter School – Capitol Hill's sample English language arts and math assignments to determine whether the assignments align with grade-appropriate standards. See the team's findings in the enclosed Qualitative Site Review report.

Sincerely,

Rashida Young
Chief School Performance Officer

Qualitative Site Review (QSR) Report

Digital Pioneers Academy Public Charter School – Capitol Hill (Digital Pioneers PCS – Capitol)			
Year Opened	2018 – 19	Ward	6
Grades Served	9 – 10	General Enrollment	119 ¹
Students with Disabilities Enrollment	51	English Learners Enrollment	0
Mission Statement			
The mission of Digital Pioneers PCS is to develop the next generation of innovators. We prepare students to meet or exceed the highest academic standards, while cultivating the strength of character necessary to both graduate from four-year colleges and thrive in 21st century careers.			
Observation Window		In-Seat Attendance Rate on Observation Day(s)	
09/19/22 through 09/30/22		Visit 1. 09/19/22: 78.1% Visit 2. 09/20/22: 76.0% Visit 3. 09/23/22: 74.5% Visit 4. 09/28/22: 68.7% Visit 5. 09/29/22: 78.1%	

Observation Summary

During the two-week observation window, the QSR team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction at Digital Pioneers PCS – Capitol Hill. The QSR team included three DC PCSB employees and consultants, including one special education expert. The QSR team scored 57.1% of observations as “distinguished” or “proficient” in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 2c, “Managing Classroom Procedures,” with 71.4% of observations rated as “proficient.”

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

Across observations, classroom routines functioned smoothly, and teachers had established routines for handling the distribution and collection of materials. The QSR team scored 10.7% of observations as “distinguished” or “proficient” in the Instruction domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 3a, “Communicating with Students,” with 14.3% of observations rated as “proficient.” In most classrooms, teachers clearly stated what students would be learning; however, instruction was primarily teacher led with minimal participation or intellectual engagement by students.

See below for a breakdown of scores by component:

Domain	Classroom Environment				Instruction			
Component	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D
	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	57.1%	42.9%	71.4%	57.1%	14.3%	0%	14.3%	14.3%
Basic	28.6%	42.9%	14.3%	28.6%	85.7%	85.7%	71.4%	71.4%
Unsatisfactory	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	0%	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%
Subdomain Average	2.43	2.29	2.57	2.43	2.14	1.86	2.00	2.00
Domain Average	2.43				2.00			
% Proficient or Above	57.1%				10.7%			

(Each component score is out of four. See Appendices I and II for a detailed description of each level of performance.)

Specialized Instruction for Students with Disabilities

Before the two-week observation window, Digital Pioneers PCS – Capitol Hill completed a questionnaire about how it serves students with disabilities. Reviewers looked for evidence of the school’s articulated program. According to the school, Digital Pioneers PCS – Capitol Hill provides specialized instruction through a combination of push-in co-teaching and pull-out models. DC PCSB attempted to observe the stated specialized instruction models on September 23, 2022 and September 28, 2022. On both occasions, the campus informed DC PCSB that special education instructors were unavailable due to staff absences and coverage needs. As a result, DC PCSB was unable to observe the school’s articulated special education program. Given this, DC PCSB found the school did not implement its stated special education continuum with fidelity.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT²

This table summarizes the school’s performance in the Classroom Environment domain during the unannounced visits. The rating categories—“distinguished,” “proficient,” “basic,” and “unsatisfactory”—come from the *Framework for Teaching*.³ The QSR team scored 57% of classrooms as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment 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 57.1% 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 complimented students for following instructions saying, “You are all stacking up merits today. I’m so proud of you all!” In another observation, the teacher insisted students show respect when their peers were speaking. In this observation the teacher said, “Please don’t interrupt your classmates. One mic, one voice.” In another observation, the teacher greeted students individually as they entered the classroom. Across all proficient observations, students exhibited respect for their teacher.
	The QSR team rated 28.6% 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 some instances of disrespect. In one observation, the teacher engaged in a back-and-forth exchange with a student to which the student responded, “Why you so angry?” In another observation, a student yelled loudly to another, “I feel so bad for you. Just shut up.” Other students then laughed, and the teacher did not address the situation.

² The QSR team may observe teachers more than once by different review team members.

³ For details, see the framework’s “Classroom Environment Observation Rubric,” available in Appendix I.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	<p>The QSR team rated 14.3% of observations as unsatisfactory 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.</p>
<p>2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning</p>	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as distinguished in this component.</p>
	<p>The QSR team rated 42.9% of observations as proficient in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers held high expectations for most students. In one observation, the teacher circulated the room to ensure students were using complete sentences. In this observation, the teacher said, “I am looking for complete sentences,” and “Let me see you write a little more.” In another observation, the teacher cold called students, particularly those who were off-task, to ensure they participated in the classroom discussion. In the proficient observations, teachers insisted students use precise language. In one observation, the teacher said to a student, “What do you mean ‘do the same thing’? We need to make our answer crisp. Say exactly what we need to do.” Across all proficient observations, students expended good effort to complete high-quality work.</p>
	<p>The QSR team rated 42.9% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, teachers held high expectations for only some students. Across observations, multiple teachers called on the same few students to respond to most questions. When students did not respond, teachers attempted to engage them, but often reverted to asking the same few students. In one observation, students either sat idle or engaged in off-topic conversations during partner work. The teacher did not correct the misbehavior. In the basic observations, many students exhibited a limited commitment to completing work on their own and many indicated they were looking for an “easy path.”</p>
<p>The QSR team rated 14.3% of observations as unsatisfactory 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.</p>	

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team rated none of the observations as distinguished in this component.
	The QSR team rated 71.4% of observations as proficient in this component. In the proficient observations, classroom routines and procedures functioned smoothly. In one observation, the teacher had a “Do Now” projected on the board and materials on each desk as students entered the classroom. The students quickly began their work. In another observation, the teacher displayed a timer at the front of the room. When the timer went off, students knew to stop working and track the teacher for the next direction. In another observation, the teacher pre-assigned a student to collect and store materials at the end of a lesson. Across all proficient observations, teachers maximized instructional time by using efficient classroom routines.
	The QSR team rated 14.3% of observations as basic 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 14.3% of observations as unsatisfactory 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.
2d. Managing Student Behavior	The QSR team rated none of the observations as distinguished in this component.
	The QSR team rated 57.1% of observations as proficient in this component. In the proficient observations, student behavior was generally appropriate. Students worked cooperatively in groups, took turns sharing when appropriate, and complied immediately when redirected by the teacher. In one observation, a group of students were off-task. The teacher responded by knocking gently on their desks. The students quickly complied and re-engaged with the learning task. In observations rated proficient, teachers effectively responded to student misbehavior. In one observation, when a student was talking during independent work time, the teacher said, “I’m hearing a soft murmur. We are supposed to be at a level zero.” The student quickly

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	<p>stopped talking. In these observations, teachers frequently circulated the classroom, monitoring student behavior.</p>
	<p>The QSR team rated 28.6% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, teachers attempted to redirect student behavior with uneven success. In one observation, the teacher repeatedly asked students who were working in groups to get back on task. Ultimately, the teacher asked students to leave the group. Only some students responded, while others refused to change seats. In the same observation, the teacher abruptly told a student “Yep, you got it,” before issuing a consequence to the student. The student responded by repeatedly yelling, “Got what? Got what?” and “Man, you didn’t even give me another chance.”</p>
	<p>The QSR team rated 14.3% of observations as unsatisfactory 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.</p>

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school's performance in the Instruction domain during the unannounced visits. The rating categories—"distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory"—come from the *Framework for Teaching*.⁴ The QSR team scored 11% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" for the Instruction domain.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
3a. Communicating with Students	The QSR team rated none of the observations as distinguished in this component.
	The QSR team rated 14.3% of observations as proficient in this component. In this observation, the teacher clearly explained academic content to students. The teacher used a mix of strategies (e.g., modeling and having students repeat back the required steps) to ensure students understood the learning tasks. Students in this observation engaged with the learning tasks, indicating that they understood what to do.
	The QSR team rated 85.7% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, teachers had to clarify learning tasks several times before students could complete them. In one observation, several students asked follow-up questions after being instructed to begin an assignment. Students frequently asked questions like, "What are we supposed to be doing?" In another observation, as the teacher circulated the classroom, students indicated they didn't understand the assignment, saying, "I don't get it," and "I'm confused." At times, teachers attempted to regroup the class. However, many times, they instructed students to "just try," though there was significant misunderstanding. Teachers' content explanations were purely procedural with no indication of how students could think strategically.
	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 the observations as distinguished in this component.
	The QSR team rated none of the observations as proficient in this component.
	The QSR team rated 85.7% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, teachers used mostly closed-ended questions with a single path of inquiry.

⁴ For details, see the framework's "Instruction Observation Rubric," available in Appendix II.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	<p>In one observation, the teacher posed questions such as, “What is the mean?” and “What is the average?” As a result of the questions asked, student participation was limited to very few students. Teachers attempted to engage all students in discussions with uneven results. In one observation, two students dominated the class discussion. The teacher said, “I’m looking for different hands,” yet, no new students participated. The teacher also cold called some students, but very few responded.</p> <p>The QSR team rated 14.3% of observations as unsatisfactory 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.</p>
<p>3c. Engaging Students in Learning</p>	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as distinguished in this component.</p> <p>The QSR team rated 14.3% of observations as proficient in this component. In the proficient observation, most students were intellectually engaged with the learning tasks. Students worked in both small groups and with partners to share their ideas. As students worked, the teacher circulated the classroom to ensure all students participated and often assigned points for “innovation,” and “creativity,” which motivated students to engage with the content.</p> <p>The QSR team rated 71.4% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, few students were intellectually engaged in lessons. Across observations, participation was limited to individual or small groups of students, while others engaged in off-task behavior, such as drawing and playing with items from their desk. Learning tasks in the basic observations consisted primarily of procedures, requiring minimal thinking from students. In one observation, students completed a worksheet using a pre-determined procedure and all questions on the task consisted of the same problem type with different numbers.</p> <p>The QSR team rated 14.3% of observations as unsatisfactory 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.</p>
	<p>The QSR team rated none of the observations as distinguished in this component.</p>

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	<p>The QSR team rated 14.3% of observations as proficient in this component. In the proficient observation, feedback included specific and timely guidance, at least for groups of students. In this observation, as students independently completed their work, the teacher consistently circulated the classroom providing students with individual feedback and assistance. During this observation, when a student had difficulty completing their work, the teacher led the student through a conversation to support them in solving it. The student then understood how to proceed with the remainder of the task.</p>
	<p>The QSR team rated 71.4% of observations as basic in this component. In the basic observations, teachers checked for comprehension using only global indicators of student understanding. Across observations, teachers regularly asked students to simply fill in the blank or respond with verbatim definitions taken directly from the book. Feedback to students was also vague and not focused on future work improvement. In one observation, the teacher primarily provided student feedback by saying, “Good job,” and “That’s right.”</p>
	<p>The QSR team rated 14.3% of observations as unsatisfactory 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.</p>

Assignment Review

DC PCSB staff and The New Teacher Project (TNTP) consultants reviewed sample English language arts (ELA) and math assignments Digital Pioneers PCS – Capitol Hill students received. The campus submitted five ELA samples and five math samples covering a range of 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.⁵

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.⁶

Of the five ELA samples submitted, two assignments received an overall rating of “sufficient.” These assignments were based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. They required students to use what they learned in the text and allowed students to use their personal voice. Three assignments received an overall rating of “no opportunity.” These assignments were not based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. Further, the questions did not reach the full depth of the targeted standard. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	9	Students read a text and wrote an essay in response to a text-based prompt. Students were required to cite text evidence.	Sufficient	This assignment was based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. It reached the full depth of the standard and allowed students to use their personal voice.
Sample 2	9	Students read a text and wrote an essay in response to a text-based prompt. Students were required to cite text evidence.	Sufficient	This assignment was based on a high-quality, grade-appropriate text. It reached the full

⁵ 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/2Dv7yld>.

⁶ For details, see a breakdown of each rating in Appendix III.

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
				depth of the standard and allowed students to use their personal voice.
Sample 3	10	Students read a comic strip and answered text-based questions about specific characters in the text.	No Opportunity	This assignment was not based on a high-quality text. All the task's questions involved basic recall, and thus, did not reach the full depth of the standard.
Sample 4	10	Students read a comic strip and answered questions related to the text and author's craft.	No Opportunity	This assignment was not based on a high-quality text. The task's questions did not reach the full depth of the standard.
Sample 5	9	Students used a graphic organizer to gather evidence in support or disagreement of a writing prompt. This assignment was based on a short video.	No Opportunity	This assignment was not based on a high-quality text, and the task was not aligned to a grade-appropriate standard.

Of the five math samples submitted, four assignments received an overall rating of “sufficient.” These assignments were aligned to a grade-level standard, reached the full depth of the targeted standard and mathematical practice, and related academic content to the real-world. One assignment received an overall rating of “minimal.” This assignment was only partially aligned to a grade-level standard and did not relate academics to the real-world. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	9	In groups, students had to create a dot plot, histogram, and box plot to display specific data. Students then had to write two sentences summarizing the information represented.	Sufficient	This assignment was aligned to a grade-level standard. It reached the depth of the targeted standard and mathematical practice while also connecting academic content to real-world experiences.

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 2	10	Students completed a worksheet with math problems based on the undefined notions of a point, line, distance along a line, and distance around a circle.	Sufficient	This assignment was aligned to a grade-level standard. It reached the depth of the targeted standard and mathematical practice while also connecting academic content to real-world experiences.
Sample 3	10	Students compared the distance of segments and created geometric constructions using previous constructions.	Sufficient	This assignment was aligned to a grade-level standard. It reached the depth of the targeted standard and mathematical practice.
Sample 4	10	Students independently and collaboratively completed cumulative practice problems.	Sufficient	This assignment was aligned to a grade-level standard. It reached the depth of the targeted standard and mathematical practice.
Sample 5	10	Students answered questions about a data set and explained what a statistical question and non-statistical question is.	Minimal	This assignment was only partially aligned to a grade level standard. Only some of the task's questions reached the depth of the targeted standard.

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC⁷

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.

⁷ Danielson, Charlotte. *The Framework for Teaching: Evaluation Instrument*. Princeton, NJ: Danielson Group, 2013.

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

APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC⁸

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 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.
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 many 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.

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

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

APPENDIX III: ASSIGNMENT REVIEW CRITERIA⁹

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.

⁹ *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.