# Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Aprender Tucson
School Name: Southside Community School
Site Visit Date: January 20, 2015

Required for: Annual Report
Evaluation Criteria Area: Assessment

| Document Name/Identification | Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome |
|---|---|
| [A.1] | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the types of assessments the Charter Holder uses<br><br>**The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:**<br>• Students are tested using a combination of school wide benchmarks, curriculum-based and teacher-made tests. School wide benchmarks include Galileo (administered four times per year in reading, math and science) and Degrees of Reading Power ("DRP") administered three times per year to test fluency, accuracy and comprehension. Galileo includes a pretest in August, a post test in May, and two midyear benchmarks in fall and winter.<br>• DRP includes a pretest in August, a midyear test in December and a post test in May. All tests are composed primarily of non-fiction cloze texts with high content and academic vocabulary, and are administered on computers. Interactive testing tools such as highlighters and magnifying glasses help differentiate the test for students with diverse needs and prepare students for the upcoming digitized state test.<br>• In previous years we used the Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) test to measure students' grade levels in fluency and accuracy skills. This year we replaced the DIBELS test with DRP because of its emphasis on comprehension and active engagement with a text, which will more fully align with the new ACCR standards.<br>• Teachers also implement curriculum or teacher-made tests in reading and math at intervals of 1-2 weeks following each unit. These assessments are documented in teachers' weekly lesson plans and gradebooks.<br>• Student portfolios are also created in order to provide information about students' daily, weekly, monthly and/or quarterly work accomplishments. Benchmark test results and report cards are saved in these folders, including other work that particularly reflects each student's progress when deemed appropriate. |
| [A.2] | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the process for designing or selecting the assessment system<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:**<br>• Members of the executive team and our reading specialist are responsible for researching available standards-aligned assessments that will provide our staff with the most extensive data to help inform their instruction. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Meetings are called with assessment representatives. Executive team members gather information from the meetings and participate in demonstrations of how the assessments would be presented to students, and how staff members could interpret and use the data. This information is later discussed during weekly executive team meetings. Information and sample materials are presented to instructional staff during staff meetings soon after to gather feedback. The executive team then makes the final decision about which assessment to adopt based on all the information acquired during the entire process. Student performance is also taken into account when selecting a new assessment for the school.<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:**<br>• The emails provided include a series of communications instigated by the Reading Coach on the effectiveness of DIBELS. Follow up emails include further discussion about having the Reading Coach present additional information about the two assessments. The documentation does not provide evidence of a systematic process for designing or selecting an assessment system. Specifically, the documentation did not provide evidence of meetings with assessment representatives, that information is discussed during weekly executive team meetings or presented to instructional staff to gather feedback, or of the process used by the executive team to make the final decision about which assessment to adopt based on all the information acquired during the entire process. Further no evidence is provided that student performance is taken into account when selecting a new assessment for the school. |
| **[A.3]** | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the assessment system is aligned to the curriculum and instructional methodology.<br><br>**The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:**<br>• Galileo is standards-based, so it aligns with ACCR standards.<br>• Galileo quizzes are made and administered by teachers in between benchmark testing times. The standards included on these quizzes are hand-picked by teachers to mirror what is currently being taught in the classroom, and can be used with the whole class or small group to monitor the progress of interventions. |
| **[A.4]** | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the intervals that are used to assess student progress and how the assessment plan includes data collection from multiple assessment, such as formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments<br><br>**The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:**<br>• Students are tested in math and reading using Galileo four times per year, in August, then once in the fall, in the winter, and again in May. Grades 4 and 6-9 are also tested in science.<br>• Last year opportunities were given for analysis of data from Galileo. Data questionnaires were completed by data teams to guide analysis and planning. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • This year data teams completed a 6 week plan for re-teaching using a template provided by the Quality Schools Program consultant.<br>• Curriculum-based or teacher-made tests are administered every 1-2 weeks in math and reading in each class at the end of each unit. These summative assessments are recorded on teachers' weekly lesson plans. |
| **[A.5]** | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the assessment system provides for analysis of assessment data and what intervals are used to analyze assessment data<br><br>**The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:**<br>• In previous years, data teams completed targeted questionnaires during staff data meetings that helped to guide their analysis and help with planning. Sign-in sheets were collected from these meetings to record participation. This year is our first year participating in the Quality Schools Program that provided their own documents and led teachers to develop a 6-week plan for re-teaching following testing.<br>• At the beginning of each year, teachers examine student benchmark data to identify students at risk. Two documents are submitted to team leaders in these first weeks: the first, a graphic identifying which of their students are below grade level in either math or reading on any of the most current benchmark tests, including both state and school wide tests, and the degree to which students are behind, options including up to one year and more than one year below grade level; the second, a chart ranking students into three tiers based on level of need.<br>• ILP's identify specific skills that will be targeted during each student's intervention and a performance goal. ILP's are updated 2 times annually.<br>• Teachers also design original Galileo quizzes that address the particular needs of their students as determined by benchmark data to monitor student progress at smaller intervals.<br>• DRP data is used to identify students' individual reading levels and group them for interventions as well as select appropriate texts for interventions, tutoring or practice at home.<br>• Report cards are also reviewed for consistency with benchmark results by team leaders before finalization each quarter. When teachers' grading systems can be seen to significantly and/or consistently diverge from benchmark results, teachers are asked to provide valid justification or reasoning to ensure grades are not casually allotted and to encourage further consideration and analysis of data among teachers. |
| **[A.6]** | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the analysis is used to evaluate instructional and curricular effectiveness<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:**<br>• During data team breakout sessions in staff meetings, staff completes a Data Meeting Focus Sheet questionnaire |

| | |
|---|---|
| | to help guide data analysis and planning. Teachers are guided to examine the performance of the class as a whole, and then orient themselves to more subtle trends. Sample questions include "(On some questions) did all the students choose the same wrong answer? Why?" and "Do the results (of one standard) influence another?" Answers to these questions draw teachers' focus to common misconceptions amongst students, and areas of strength and weakness for example. Observing how students perform on standards that have already been taught, the depth of understanding or lack thereof, shows teachers whether or not instruction has been effective. If it has, instruction can move forward. If it has partially, re-teaching can focus on particular aspects of standards that continue to elude students. If instruction has not been effective, then teachers will need to find an alternate way of re-teaching the same material, and further examination of the data beginning with the Data Meeting Focus Sheet can provide clues for understanding just where to start.<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:**<br>• The school moved away from the in depth analysis conducted in prior years using the data questionnaires, and has moved toward the 6 week instructional plan. This 6 week instructional plan does not specifically use data to evaluate instructional and curricular effectiveness. |
| **[A.7]** | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the analysis is used to adjust curriculum and instruction in a timely manner and what intervals are used to adjust curriculum and instruction<br><br>**The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:**<br>• Data Meeting Focus Sheets or 6-week Plans are completed by data teams following the availability of assessment data (usually 1-2 weeks following testing to accommodate late finishers and absentees) during the next staff meeting. These 6 week plans are used to adjust instruction.<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:**<br>• data analysis is used to adjust curriculum in a timely manner<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:**<br>• the 6-week Plans and ILPs are focused on instruction, but none of the evidence addressed the use of data to adjust curriculum in a timely manner. |
| **[A.8]** | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the assessment system is adapted to meet the assessment needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students<br><br>**The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:**<br>• The Reading Coach assesses students in the bottom 25% at intake, 1st semester, 2nd semester, and upon exit using a criterion referenced assessment identifying reading behaviors not observed in skilled readers.<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • A process for assessing students in the bottom 25% on supplemental math instruction.<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:**<br>• While assessment on supplemental reading instruction was clear, assessments on supplemental math instruction not identifiable in the documentation provided including ILPs. |
| **[A.9]** | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the assessment system is adapted to meet the assessment needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:**<br>• ELD teachers also administer weekly teacher-made tests during pullout times to monitor student growth and the effectiveness of ELD instruction. These assessments are noted on weekly ELL lesson plans that are posted on the server. ELD teachers reference ELL standards on a daily basis while planning, and design short assessments to measure student mastery of the specific skills introduced each week. Assessments must be brief to fit within the pullout block, and so ELD teachers are able to quickly grade them and plan the next week in response to student performance. |
| **[A.10]** | **N/A** |
| **[A.11]** | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the assessment system is adapted to meet the assessment needs of students with disabilities<br><br>**The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:**<br>• Progress toward student's IEP goals is tracked quarterly and it is revisited during IEP meetings annually which teachers also attend.<br>• Students with IEPs in reading are monitored through the "Read Naturally" program. |

I, Katherine Poulos, completed this Site Visit Inventory during the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on January 20, 2015. _____

I, Christine Curtis, received a copy of this document at the end of the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on January 20, 2015. _____