Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Concordia Charter School
School Name: Concordia Charter School, Concordia Charter School - Navajo Mission

Site Visit Date: February 5, 2015
Required for: Annual Report
Evaluation Criteria Area: Monitoring Instruction

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[M.1] **Teacher evaluations** **Pop in observations** **Staff meeting notes** **Lesson plans**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the Charter Holder's process for monitoring the integration of standards into classroom instruction and how the Charter Holder monitors whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Observations and evaluations of teachers ensure that teachers are teaching the standards when they must be delivered. • Expectations are for the classroom teacher to produce weekly lesson plans that shows the state standards and are aligned with Core Knowledge and Saxon math. • Curriculum maps and standards checklists are monitored regularly.
[M.2] **Testing data** **Teacher evaluations** **Pop in Observations**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how does the Charter Holder monitor the effectiveness of standards-based instruction throughout the year. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Monitoring the effectiveness of programs is accomplished throughout the school years with formative and summative assessments, STAR benchmark testing and state mandated testing. • Classroom observations looking for effective instruction are also considered.
[M.3] **Teacher evaluations**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the Charter Holder's process for evaluating instructional practices and how this process evaluates the quality of instruction. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • CCS has a formal teacher evaluation and observation program. Teachers are rated using the FAME scale. Two main areas of evaluation are Effective Instruction and Instructional practice.

[M.4] **Teacher evaluations** **Pop in observations**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how this process identifies individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** The teacher evaluation process and the pop in observations provide feedback to teachers about strategies that they are already implementing or need to address.
[M.5]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder provides feedback on strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs based on the evaluation of instructional practices. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • How the Charter Holder provides feedback on strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs based on the evaluation of instructional practices. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following because:** The Charter Holder states that teachers have regularly scheduled meetings with the principal and a formal meeting after formal evaluation is complete. However, they could not provide evidence showing that teachers do in fact meet with administration to review the results of their evaluations and subsequent feedback.
[M.6]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder analyzes this information, what the data about quality of instruction tells the Charter Holder, and what the Charter Holder has done in response. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • How the Charter Holder analyzes this information. What the data about quality of instruction tells the Charter Holder. What the Charter Holder has done in response. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** The Charter Holder indicated that they do not have a process for systematically analyzing data, and rather it is done ad hoc, or as they notice needs that arise from hiring new teachers and using new programs.

[M.7]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • How the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** The Charter Holder indicated that a process for monitoring the instruction of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient does not occur at this time.
[M.8]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs). **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • How the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs). **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** The Charter Holder indicated that a process for monitoring the instruction of English Language Learners (ELLs) which occurs in a whole group setting does not occur at this time.
[M.9]	**N/A**
[M.10]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with disabilities. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • How the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with disabilities. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** The Charter Holder indicated that a process for monitoring the supplemental instruction of students with disabilities during their pull out sessions does not occur at this time.

I, Theresa Esposito, completed this Site Visit Inventory during the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on February 5, 2015. Theresa Esposito

I, Margaret Roush-Meier, received a copy of this document at the end of the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on February 5, 2015. M Roush-Meier