DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

November 30, 2022

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

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 – Johenning 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 – Johenning 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 Pioneer Academy Public Charter School – Johenning'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 – Johenning (Digital Pioneers PCS – Johenning)			
Year Opened	2018 – 19	**Ward**	8
Grades Served	6 – 8	**General Enrollment**	340[1]
Students with Disabilities Enrollment	53	**English Learners Enrollment**	1
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: 82.6% Visit 2. 09/20/22: 90.0% Visit 3. 09/23/22: 79.5% Visit 4. 09/26/22: 81.2% Visit 5. 09/28/22: 81.1% Visit 6. 09/29/22: 88.5%	

Observation Summary

During the two-week observation window, the QSR team used the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to examine classroom environment and instruction at Digital Pioneers PCS – Johenning. The QSR team included four DC PCSB employees and consultants, including one special education expert. The QSR team scored 73.7% of

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

observations as “distinguished” or “proficient” in the Classroom Environment domain. The highest performing components in this domain were 2a, “Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport” and 2d, “Managing Student Behavior,” with 84.2% of observations rated as “distinguished” or “proficient” in each component. Across observations, talk between teachers and students was uniformly respectful. In most classrooms, student behavior was generally appropriate. The QSR team scored 45.2% of observations as “proficient” in the Instruction domain. The highest performing component in this domain was 3a, “Communicating with Students,” with 66.7% of observations rated as “proficient.” In most classrooms, teachers clearly stated what students would be learning and modeled the process to be followed in a task.

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	5.3%	0%	0%	5.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Proficient	78.9%	52.6%	73.7%	78.9%	66.7%	25.0%	47.1%	33.3%
Basic	10.5%	47.4%	21.1%	10.5%	33.3%	75.0%	52.9%	66.7%
Unsatisfactory	5.3%	0%	5.3%	5.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Subdomain Average	**2.84**	**2.53**	**2.68**	**2.84**	**2.67**	**2.25**	**2.47**	**2.33**
Domain Average	**2.72**				**2.43**			
% Proficient or Above	**73.7%**				**45.2%**			

(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 – Johenning 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 – Johenning provides specialized instruction through a combination of push-in co-teaching and pull-out models. During the observation window, special education teachers were absent or served as substitutes for general education teachers. Consequently, DC PCSB could only observe specialized instruction in the pull-out setting.

Overall, DC PCSB found the school did not implement its stated special education continuum with fidelity. DC PCSB observed two pull-out classes. During both observations, students worked independently on English language arts (ELA) and math content using Chromebooks. Teachers circulated the classroom monitoring student behavior and providing feedback as students completed academic tasks. In one observation, when the DC PCSB observer arrived, there was no teacher in the classroom. Students worked quietly until the teacher arrived three minutes after DC PCSB began the observation. During one observation, the teacher informed a student they were only being pulled for special education services for the purpose of DC PCSB's observation.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT[2]

This table summarizes the school's performance in the Classroom Environment domain during the unannounced visits. The rating categories—"distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory"—come from the *Framework for Teaching*.[3] The QSR team scored 73.7% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" in the Classroom Environment domain.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	The QSR team rated **5.3%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observation, there was no disrespectful behavior among students. The teacher respected and encouraged students' efforts. When a student answered a question incorrectly, the teacher responded by saying, "Nobody is perfect. We get things wrong, but guess what? You're trying and that's what is important."
	The QSR team rated **78.9%** 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 individually greeted students as they entered the classroom. When a student who was new to the cohort entered the classroom, the teacher said, "Welcome to your new cohort!" with a friendly smile. In another observation, a student did not have the needed lesson materials. Another student quickly offered to share theirs. In another observation, a teacher tripped over a shoelace, and students quickly asked teacher if they were hurt.
	The QSR team rated **10.5%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, the quality of interactions between teachers and students and among students was uneven, and occasionally disrespectful. In one observation, when the teacher asked the class to model what a 'level zero' should sound like, students replied by screeching and laughing. In the same observation, students repeatedly spoke over the teacher and their classmates. In another observation, when a student put an

[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
	incorrect answer on the board, students yelled out, "That's not correct!" The teacher did not address the comments.
	The QSR team rated **5.3%** 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.
2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **52.6%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers conveyed an expectation of high levels of student effort. In one observation, a student responded to question with a single word answer. The teacher responded, "Okay, I am going to push you on this. What else could you add?" The student then shared a more thorough response. In another observation, when students finished their work early, the teacher asked students to independently review their work and correct any errors. In the proficient observations, teachers also demonstrated a high regard for student abilities. In one observation, when a student was having difficultly reading a word, the teacher said, "You got it!" and helped the student sound the word out. The student was then able to read the word and the teacher said, "See, I knew you could do it!"
	The QSR team rated **47.4%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, students exhibited a limited commitment to completing work on their own, and many students indicated that they were looking for an "easy path." In one observation, students sat idle during independent work time and waited to copy the answers onto their paper when the teacher reviewed the assignment. In another observation, when working in groups, students copied answers from their partners and then engaged in off-task behavior for the remainder of the time. Additionally, in the basic observations, teachers held high expectations for only some students. Throughout these observations, teachers encouraged some students to try their best while other students sat idle and did not complete any work for the duration of the observation.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **73.7%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, classroom routines functioned smoothly. In one observation, the teacher used visual timers and gave time warnings before transitioning between activities. In another observation, students knew the procedure for logging into and navigating between online programs and required minimal support from the teacher. In another observation, during a "turn and talk," students were able to quickly identify their partner and begin discussing the question at hand. In the proficient observations, transitions between large- and small-group activities were also smooth. In one observation, students quickly transitioned between whole-group and small-group instruction with almost no reminders from the teacher. Across all proficient observations, instructional time was maximized due to efficient classroom routines.
	The QSR team rated **21.1%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, procedures for transitions seem to have been established, but their operation was not smooth. In one observation, when the timer went off indicating that independent work time was over, students sat idle for five minutes and did not receive any directions for what to do next. As a result, students quickly became disengaged, and the classroom became loud and disruptive. In another observation, 15 minutes passed before students began working on a "Do Now" activity that was intended to take five minutes.
	The QSR team rated **5.3%** 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 **5.3%** of observations as **distinguished** in this component. In the distinguished observation, there were no instances of student misbehavior. In this observation, all students followed instructions promptly and consistently.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMPONENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	The QSR team rated **78.9%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers effectively responded to student misbehavior. In one observation, a student was talking during independent work time. The teacher said, "Come sit up here. We need to be at a level zero right now." The student responded by saying, "I'm sorry," and quickly moved their seat where the teacher asked. In the proficient observations, teachers frequently monitored student behavior. In one observation, the teacher continuously reinforced positive behavior through narration and awarding merits to students. Across all proficient observations, student behavior was generally appropriate.
	The QSR team rated **10.5%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, the teacher attempted to maintain order in the classroom, but with uneven success. In one observation, the teacher repeatedly corrected student behavior, but students disregarded the teacher and continued to engage in off-task behavior. In another observation, students complied with teacher redirections, but only for a short period of time before once again engaging in the same off-task behavior. Across all basic observations, instructional time was lost due to constant teacher redirections.
	The QSR team rated **5.3%** of observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component. This represents one observation and qualitative evidence will not be included in the report.

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 45.2% of classrooms as "distinguished" or "proficient" in the Instruction domain.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
3a. Communicating with Students	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **66.7%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers clearly stated what students would be learning. In one observation, the teacher had a student read the day's objective a loud to before beginning the lesson. In the proficient observations, teachers modeled the process to be followed in a task. In one observation, the teacher modeled highlighting different sections of text-evidence using the pre-determined color codes. In another observation, the teacher modeled how to find the area of a polyhedron on the board. Teachers in the proficient observations invited student participation and thinking when explaining academic content. In one observation, students wrote sentence starters on the board for their peers to use as they composed their paragraphs.
	The QSR team rated **33.3%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers had to clarify learning tasks several times for students to complete them. In one observation, several students were confused about the task at hand. Though the teacher restated the directions, students remained confused. Additionally, in the basic observations, teachers' content explanations consisted of a monologue with minimal participation by students. In one observation, the teacher completed a problem on the board while students watched and copied the teacher's work onto their work packets. Across all basic observations, there were minimal opportunities for students to engage intellectually during the teacher's explanation of content.

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

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	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 **25.0%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers used open-ended questions inviting students to think and offer multiple possible answers. In one observation, the teacher posed questions such as, "What evidence in the text supports this response? There is a variety of text evidence to support this, so I want to hear a variety of answers." In the proficient observations, teachers asked students to justify their thinking. In one observation the teacher replied to a student's response by saying, "How do you know that this is what the vocabulary word means? What made you think that?" Across all proficient observations, many students actively engaged in classroom discussions.
	The QSR team rated **75.0%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, teachers primarily asked closed-ended questions with single correct answers, which limited student participation and thinking. In one observation, the teacher asked questions such as, "When we plot points, which axis do we start with?" and "We should go over how many on our 'x axis' and up how many on our 'y axis'?" Similarly, in another observation, the teacher posed questions such as, "What is the formula for the area of a parallelogram?" and "What is the name of this polyhedron?" Across all basic observations, only a small number of students participated in classroom discussions. In one observation, only four students participated throughout the lesson. In another observation, the teacher asked students respond to a question in pairs, but only a small number of partners engaged in the discussion.
	The QSR team rated **none** of observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
3c. Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **47.1%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, teachers used groupings that suited lesson activities. In one observation, students worked in groups to correct an incorrect code within a computer

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	program. Students in this observation had access to individual Chrome books and a video to help them complete the task. In the proficient observations, students were required to explain their thinking as part of completing tasks. In one observation, when completing an assignment, students had to include and explain the specific text evidence that led them to their response. In another observation, students were required to show all their thinking when completing math problems.
	The QSR team rated **52.9%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, few students engaged with the learning tasks and engagement was passive. In one observation, many students sat idle and did not engage in the lesson until the teacher instructed them to "Just write it down," because the information would be on an upcoming test. In another observation, students worked in groups to complete an assignment, but only three out of six groups were on-task for the duration of the observation. In another observation, four students slept throughout most of the academic lesson. In the basic observations, learning tasks were also a mix of those requiring thinking and those requiring recall. In most observations, students completed rote tasks such as solving problems using procedural steps, filling in the blank, and copying notes directly from the board.
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team rated **none** of observations as **distinguished** in this component.
	The QSR team rated **33.3%** of observations as **proficient** in this component. In the proficient observations, feedback included specific and timely guidance, at least for groups of students. In one observation, while students worked, the teacher provided all students with individual feedback via Google Docs. In another observation, the teacher circulated the classroom checking in with individual students as they completed their work. In another observation, as students were reading aloud to the class, the teacher provided students with direct feedback on how to accurately pronounce specific words.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	SCHOOL WIDE RATING AND EVIDENCE
	The QSR team rated **66.7%** of observations as **basic** in this component. In the basic observations, feedback to students was vague and not oriented toward work future improvement. In one observation, the teacher circulated the classroom and gave feedback to individual students by saying, “Good work, keep it up!” Similarly, in another observation, the teacher provided whole-class general feedback, such as, “Wow, great job guys!” In another observation, the teacher limited feedback to only a small portion of the class. In these observations, teachers also checked for understanding using a single method. In one observation, the teacher asked whole-class questions such as, “Which one would you circle?” or “What goes on this line?”
	The QSR team rated **none** of the observations as **unsatisfactory** in this component.

Assignment Review

DC PCSB staff and The New Teacher Project (TNTP) consultants reviewed sample ELA and math assignments Digital Pioneers PCS – Johenning 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.[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, three assignments received an overall rating of "sufficient." These assignments were based on a high-quality grade-appropriate text, reached the full depth of the targeted standard, and provided students with an opportunity to use their personal voice. One assignment received an overall rating of "minimal." This assignment was based on a high-quality grade-appropriate text but did not allow students an opportunity to use their personal voice. One assignment received an overall rating of "no opportunity." This assignment was not aligned to a grade-level standard. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	6	Students completed a literary analysis on how the title of a text relates to the overall theme.	Sufficient	This assignment was aligned to a grade-level standard and used grade-appropriate text. It required students to use what they learned in the text and allowed students to use their voice.

[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/2Dv7yId.
[6] For details, see a breakdown of each rating in Appendix III.

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 2	6	Students read a text and then completed an argumentative essay in response to a writing prompt.	Sufficient	This assignment was based on a grade-appropriate text. It reached the full depth of the targeted standard and allowed students to use their voice.
Sample 3	7	Students read a portion of a text and identified conclusions within that section. Students then evaluated evidence to support those conclusions.	Minimal	Although this assignment was aligned to a grade-level standard and used a grade-appropriate text, it did not give students the opportunity to use their personal voice.
Sample 4	7	Students read a text and then answered two text-based questions related to the main character in the text.	Sufficient	This assignment was based on to a grade-appropriate text, reached the full depth of the standard, and required students to use what they learned in the text.
Sample 5	8	Students read a text and then answered text-based questions. Questions related to analyzing key details, word choice, and the title of the text.	No Opportunity	This assignment used an eighth-grade text; however, the activity was aligned to a seventh-grade standard.

Of the five math samples submitted, one assignment received an overall rating of "sufficient." This assignment reached the full depth of the targeted standard and mathematical practice, while also connecting academic content to real-world experiences. Two assignments received an overall rating of "minimal." These assignments were only partially aligned to a grade-level standard and did not allow students to connect academic content to the real-world in an authentic way. Two assignments received an overall rating of "no opportunity." These assignments did not reach the full depth of the targeted standards. Evidence is captured below:

Assignment	Grade Level	Assignment	Rating	Evidence
Sample 1	8	Students used their understanding of writing equations for lines to solve systems of equations.	Sufficient	This assignment was aligned to a grade-level standard, allowed for students to engage in mathematical practices at the appropriate level of depth, and connected academics to a real-world context.
Sample 2	7	Students identified and described corresponding points, segments, and angles in a pair of figures.	Minimal	This assignment was aligned to a grade-level standard and more than half of the questions in the task reached the depth of the standard, while also relating academics to the real-world. However, this assignment did not allow students to engage in mathematical practices in a meaningful way.
Sample 3	8	Students completed a worksheet that introduced students to translations and rotations of plane figures.	Minimal	This assignment reached the full depth of the targeted standard but did not allow students to engage in mathematical practices in a meaningful way. This task also did not allow students the opportunity to relate academics to the real-world.
Sample 4	6	Students compared the amounts of the plane covered by two tiling patterns.	No Opportunity	Although this assignment was aligned to a grade-level standard, less than half of the task's questions reached the depth of the targeted standard.
Sample 5	6	Students calculated the area of a region by decomposing it and rearranging the pieces. Students then explained their work in writing.	No Opportunity	Although this assignment was aligned to a grade-level standard, the task did not allow for meaningful opportunity with mathematical practices. Further, the task did not provide students with an opportunity to relate academics to the real world.

APPENDIX I: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC[7]

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 RUBRIC[8]

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

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

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

APPENDIX III: ASSIGNMENT REVIEW CRITERIA[9]

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.