Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Educational Impact, Inc.
School Name: Academy Adventures Primary School
Site Visit Date: December 3, 2014

Required for: Failing School
Evaluation Criteria Area: Curriculum

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[C.1] **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **pre post** **Curriculum Review (yearly) by teachers** **4.10.14 notes**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the process for evaluating curriculum and how the Charter Holder evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to meet the standards. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • On an annual basis the teachers review the curriculum used over the past year. They complete a form noting the pros and cons of the curriculum, if they need more training on it and if they would like to continue using it or look at other options. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • On a weekly basis the teachers and administration are evaluating the curriculum and its effectiveness through the lesson plans and the formative and summative assessments. Teachers are conducting pre and posttests of units to determine if students have learned the material or if needs to be retaught and incorporating the necessary changes to their weekly lessons and interventions. • Teachers complete curriculum review forms independently and then at a team meeting the information is verbally shared and discussed with the Administration Team and the Administration Team then reviews the information and upon further review and discussion determines if additional action needs to be taken regarding current curriculum. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • The charter holder provided lesson plans that identify assessments are given, but do not indicate teachers are utilizing the teachers use pre and posttests of units to determine if students have learned the material or if material needs to be retaught. The lesson plans do not indicate that teachers incorporate changes based on the results of pre- and post- tests into their weekly lessons nor do those indicate teachers use the assessment results to plan interventions. The no "interventions" are identified on the lesson plans, where "accommodations" are identified, there does not appear to be any connection to the assessment results rather the accommodations are general template language that are repeated throughout the plans. Many lesson plans do not identify any accommodations. • The charter holder provided some examples of pre and post test results from Galileo, but some of the examples demonstrated only that a pre- test had been given, and no post-test was administered. Further, the assessment results showed only that the assessments were given and that test results were provided to parents. They did

	not provide evidence that the results were utilized by teachers to determine if students have learned the material or if material needs to be retaught or to incorporate changes based on the results of pre- and post-tests into their weekly lessons or to plan interventions. • The teachers' completed curriculum review forms were provided, but did not demonstrate that the information is shared with the Administration Team nor did they show that the Administration Team uses the forms to determine if additional action needs to be taken regarding current curriculum. Handwritten notes dated 4/10 and titled "Curr Notes" reflected information that summarized some of the teacher comments, but did not reflect further review and discussion or a determination about whether additional action needs to be taken.
[C.2] **1314 admin** **1213 PD** **1314 PD** **1415 PD** **math sup** **math maps** **other maps** **AIMS summary** **teacher notes**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder identifies gaps in the curriculum. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The Charter Holder uses standardized assessments and classroom assessments to note gaps in the curriculum. • The teachers review the AIMS results prior to the new school year starting and note areas where students struggled and compare that to the curriculum map and the current curriculum to see if additional resources are needed to fill the gaps not covered in Investigations, SuperKids or other curriculums. • During pre-service trainings, the teachers compare the standards to the curriculum guides to ensure that all areas are addressed throughout the course of the academic year. If additional supplements are needed/used, teachers are updating and noting those in the curriculum maps and creating a math supplement binder to have materials readily available for easy accessibility the following year. • The focus in the 2014-2015 school year is on math as that is where the district is having more difficulty and then the team will focus on the Language Arts curriculum. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • The charter holder provided administrative team meeting agendas with handwritten notes, emails concerning the school lunch program and Move on When Reading, and a teacher proposal to attend the "No Excuses University Institute" for professional development. These documents did not provide evidence of any processes to identify gaps in the curriculum. The meeting agendas and notes identified discussions about staffing, professional development, evaluations, the FY15 school calendar, 3rd grade retention, budgets, attendance policies, the lunch program, writing rubrics, technology purchases, purchase of consumables for the 3-5 language arts program, fingerprinting, wellness policies, and summer school tutoring. These notes **did not** reflect use of standardized assessments and classroom assessments to note gaps in the curriculum, review of the AIMS results prior to start of the school year to note areas where students struggled and compare that to the curriculum map

	and the current curriculum to see if additional resources are needed to fill the gaps not covered current curriculums, or pre-service trainings in which teachers compare the standards to the curriculum guides to ensure that all areas are addressed throughout the course of the academic year. • The charter holder also provided 2014-2015 PD agendas with some handwritten notes. The agendas reflect agenda items including "Curriculum Maps" and "Common Curriculum Training". The common curriculum training materials reflect that "Common Curriculum" is a lesson planning software/website. In the training, the teachers were directed to include the following lesson plan components: standards, audience, objectives, prior knowledge, time, materials/resources, plan detail, accommodations, assessment, and reflection. This training does not address use of standardized assessments and classroom assessments to note gaps in the curriculum, review of the AIMS results prior to start of the school year to note areas where students struggled and compare that to the curriculum map and the current curriculum to see if additional resources are needed to fill the gaps not covered current curriculums, or pre-service trainings in which teachers compare the standards to the curriculum guides to ensure that all areas are addressed throughout the course of the academic year. • The charter holder also provided the 2014 Staff/Team Development agenda. The agendas reflect agenda items including "Common Curriculum & Lesson Plans Evaluation Form" for 90 minutes, "Policies and Procedures" for 75 minutes, and "Curriculum Maps" for 60 minutes. Sign ins and minutes indicates that a "basic introduction" to the Math curriculum materials was provided to new staff only, whole staff training on district systems and policies was provided, and training was conducted on "curriculum map revisions." However, neither the minutes nor the agendas provide evidence of the use of standardized assessments and classroom assessments to note gaps in the curriculum, review of the AIMS results prior to start of the school year to note areas where students struggled and compare that to the curriculum map and the current curriculum to see if additional resources are needed to fill the gaps not covered current curriculums, or pre-service trainings in which teachers compare the standards to the curriculum guides to ensure that all areas are addressed throughout the course of the academic year. • The charter holder also provided 2012-2014 PD agendas and minutes with some handwritten notes. Some of these indicated that staff received training on policies and procedures, curriculum development and assessment, lesson planning, analyzing data to identify problems in instruction and/or curriculum, and engaged in one professional development session in which they reviewed pre-assessments and identified Tier III students and planned for interventions. The documents did not, however, provide evidence of the use of standardized assessments and classroom assessments to note gaps in the curriculum, review of the AIMS results prior to start of the school year to note areas where students struggled and compare that to the curriculum map and the current curriculum to see if additional resources are needed to fill the gaps not covered current curriculums, or pre-service trainings in which teachers compare the standards to the curriculum guides to ensure that all areas are addressed throughout the course of the academic year.

	• The charter also provided several math worksheets identified as "math sup". These documents did not provide evidence of the use of standardized assessments and classroom assessments to note gaps in the curriculum, review of the AIMS results prior to start of the school year to note areas where students struggled and compare that to the curriculum map and the current curriculum to see if additional resources are needed to fill the gaps not covered current curriculums, or pre-service trainings in which teachers compare the standards to the curriculum guides to ensure that all areas are addressed throughout the course of the academic year. • The charter also provided documents described as curriculum maps that included math calendars for each grade level some with units, lessons, and assessments identified the school year, others with standards and assessments identified for the school year, an ELA calendar with some "lessons" and page numbers, some broad literature types, some "book clubs" and some assessments identified. These documents did not provide evidence of the use of standardized assessments and classroom assessments to note gaps in the curriculum, review of the AIMS results prior to start of the school year to note areas where students struggled and compare that to the curriculum map and the current curriculum to see if additional resources are needed to fill the gaps not covered current curriculums, or pre-service trainings in which teachers compare the standards to the curriculum guides to ensure that all areas are addressed throughout the course of the academic year. • The charter also provided AIMS test result reports for the school and one page of hand written notes. The notes include summary statements about overall performance in math/reading and the students who fell in each category, and include "thoughts" about needing "more math instruction", "teacher training", and collaboration between Adventure School and Academy Adventures Primary School. The notes also indicate that the math curriculum "doesn't hit it all" and is "hard to teach", and for each grade level have general notes about instructional areas. While these documents do demonstrate a cursory analysis of AIMS data, they do not provide evidence of the use of standardized assessments and classroom assessments to note gaps in the curriculum, review of the AIMS results prior to start of the school year to note areas where students struggled and compare that to the curriculum map and the current curriculum to see if additional resources are needed to fill the gaps not covered current curriculums, or pre-service trainings in which teachers compare the standards to the curriculum guides to ensure that all areas are addressed throughout the course of the academic year.
[C.3] **ELA responses** **curr teach input** **ELA review notes** **ela review sign-in** **vendor comm**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the Charter Holder's process for adopting or revising curriculum based on its evaluation processes. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Teachers evaluate resource options based on 8 criteria: alignment to standards, assessment, ease of implementation, teacher desire to use, and 4 content specific pieces. • School leadership seeks input from teachers on the adoption of curriculum resources. • The administrative team conducts meetings with teacher to discuss the evaluation of the curriculum options

	• The Charter Holder communicates with curriculum vendors to gather additional knowledge and background information and samples to conduct a review of potential curriculum resources.
[C.4] **ELA responses** **ela review sign-in**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** who is involved in the process for adopting or revising curriculum. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Teachers and administrators participate in the curriculum adoption process.
[C.5] **ELA responses** **ELA review notes**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** when adopting curriculum, how the Charter Holder evaluates curriculum options to determine which curriculum to adopt. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Teachers evaluate resource options based on 8 criteria: alignment to standards, assessment, ease of implementation, teacher desire to use, and 4 content specific pieces. • School leadership seeks input from teachers on the adoption of curriculum resources. • The administrative team conducts meetings with teacher to discuss the evaluation of the curriculum options • The Charter Holder communicates with curriculum vendors to gather additional knowledge and background information and samples to conduct a review of potential curriculum resources.
[C.6] **1314 admin** **math maps** **other maps** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **classroom obs** **walkthroughs**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the Charter Holder's process for ensuring consistent implementation of the curriculum across the school(s) operated by the Charter Holder. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The two schools under the Charter conduct professional development together over the summer and throughout the school year and participate in Professional Learning Communities. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The administration reviews lesson plans. • The grade level teachers of each school work together to create/update the curriculum mapping guides, create assessments, discuss lesson plans to ensure consistency. All lesson plans are available for teachers to share and review with one another and communication among the teachers is encouraged. • The administration team meets regularly to discuss what is happening at each school, share ideas and ensure that there is continuity among the schools in regards to curriculum, evaluations, observations and the schools as a whole. The teachers from both sites meet at least monthly in the PLC's to review, update, & revise curriculum maps, create assessments and compare notes, lessons and classroom activities and to analyze data.

- The administration conducts both formal and informal classroom observations. These observations occur throughout the year. Formal observations are scheduled and conferenced two to three times a year for each teacher. Informal observations and walk-throughs are more frequent.

The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:

- The charter also provided documents described as curriculum maps that included math calendars for each grade level some with units, lessons, and assessments identified the school year, others with standards and assessments identified for the school year, an ELA calendar with some "lessons" and page numbers, some broad literature types, some "book clubs" and some assessments identified. These documents did not provide evidence that grade level teachers of each school work together to create/update the curriculum mapping guides, create assessments, and discuss lesson plans to ensure consistency.

- The charter holder provided lesson plans for the past three years. The lesson plans are difficult to align to the curriculum maps as the plans do not identify the work that will be done in the same manner that they are identified in the plans. In those plans where there is common identification, the plans do not align consistently with the curriculum maps in some cases the teacher is not using the curriculum resource that was identified on the curriculum map, in other cases the teacher is not covering the standards identified in the curriculum map. Additionally, when compared to the "Lesson Tracker" documents the charter holder provided as evidence that they track the standards, the lesson plans, curriculum maps, and lesson trackers do not align. Thus, these documents do not demonstrate that grade level teachers of each school work together to create/update the curriculum mapping guides, create assessments, discuss lesson plans to ensure consistency. Nor do they document that all lesson plans are available for teachers to share and review with one another and communication among the teachers is encouraged. Further the non-alignment between curriculum maps and lesson plans indicates that teachers from both sites meet are not meeting monthly in the PLC's to review, update, & revise curriculum maps.

- For prior years, but not the current year, the charter holder provided lesson plan reviews. While some of the current year lesson plans include handwritten notes that could indicate reviews were conducted, these notes are not consistently present and there does not appear to be any established criteria by which the plans are evaluated. Thus, the charter holder did not provide evidence to demonstrate lesson plans are reviewed.

- The Charter Holder provided administrative team meeting notes for 2013-2014, but did not provide any notes for 2014-2015. The notes from the prior year identified discussions about staffing, professional development, evaluations, the FY15 school calendar, 3rd grade retention, budgets, attendance policies, the lunch program, writing rubrics, technology purchases, purchase of consumables for the 3-5 language arts program, fingerprinting, wellness policies, and summer school tutoring. These notes **did not** reflect the administration team meets regularly to discuss what is happening at each school, share ideas and ensure that there is continuity among the schools in regards to curriculum.

	• The charter holder provided hand written notes titled "classroom obs" for the current school year. The documents include a variety of notes from visits to classrooms dated 10/23/2014. The notes do not appear to have any clear criteria the administrator was looking for, they primarily contain observations of what was occurring in each classroom and some suggestions about the specific classroom. Some, but not all, of the observations include notes about whether the lesson plans are posted or whether the lesson plans align to activities in the classroom. In contrast, the charter holder also provided classroom observation forms for the two prior school years. Those forms identify clear criteria the observer is looking for including a clearly discernable lesson plan. These documents do not provide evidence that the charter holder conducts walkthroughs and observations to ensuring consistent implementation of the curriculum across the school. • The charter holder also provided completed walk-through forms for the end of October and beginning of November during the current school year and a variety of dates in the prior school year. In these documents, the administrator conducting the walk-through looks for a variety of items including: student engagement, standards-based instruction, student self-assessment, teacher feedback, appropriate grade level assignments, time on task, smooth transitions, differentiated assignments, display of student work, minimal discipline interruptions, classroom procedures, and respectful relationships. None of these criteria, however, identify that this is a process that is used to ensure the consistent implementation of the curriculum across the school. Further, the limited number of examples from the current year does not provide evidence that these observations occur frequently throughout the year. • The charter holder provided PLC meeting notes. In the notes, for the beginning of the year there is discussion about creating "curriculum maps" as each month progresses and one set of notes identifies that the standards for that month were selected based on student need. In notes from November, four teachers identify that their task is to "create standards-based assessments to cover all standards for [each] grade level in the area of math", but the action plan coming out of the meeting is to "create their scope and sequence for math for their grade level" because they could not create the assessment "without a scope and sequence of standards-based objectives to be taught." Notes from a November 12, 2014 meeting identify that "tests need to be used to build curriculum." Notes from the November 18, 2014 meeting indicate that "curriculum mapping for math is complete for the school year." These notes indicate not that teachers from both sites meet monthly in the PLC's to review, update, & revise curriculum maps, but rather that even through November teachers were *creating* the curriculum.
[C.7] **sk pacing** **inv pacing** **math maps** **other maps**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** that tools exist that identify what must be taught and when it must be delivered and how the Charter Holder ensures that all grade-level standards are covered within the academic year. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:**

azccrs-3-5-ela-standards-final10_28_13 **azccrs-k-2-ela-standards-final10_28_13** **grade-1-placemat-11-2013** **grade-2-placemat-11-2013** **grade-3-placemat-11-2013** **grade-4-placemat-11-2013** **grade-5-placemat-11-2013** **grade-k-placemat-11-2013** **standards tracker** **assessment scores B, M & E**	• The teachers created curriculum maps for Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies. The Investigations and SuperKids curriculums both have Planning and Implementation Guides to support the teacher and provide planning guidance. The Buckle Down workbooks are divided into sections. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The teachers are currently in the process of reviewing and updating the math curriculum maps in the PLC teams. The teachers focus on one section at a time in the Buckle Down workbooks and also look at the relationship to the Investigations planning guide. • The curriculum maps were created with the standards and the math curriculum map is currently being reviewed by PLC teams who are updating and ensuring that all AZCCR Standards are included. Once the math is updated then the teams will begin focusing on the English Language Arts curriculum maps. • Beginning, middle and end of year assessments that cover the standards help guide if something has/hasn't been covered. The administration reviews lesson plans regularly and has a checklist of the standards and notes what day the lesson was being covered to ensure that all standards are covered over the year. The teachers are also using the ELA and math standards checklist to help with their planning of lessons and to ensure all standards are being taught to students. These checklists and maps also support the teachers in creating their assessments. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • While the charter holder provided the ACCRS state standards and teacher created described as curriculum maps that included math calendars for each grade level some with units, lessons, and assessments identified the school year, others with standards and assessments identified for the school year, an ELA calendar with some "lessons" and page numbers, some broad literature types, some "book clubs" and some assessments identified. Because the "curriculum maps" do not all identify the standards and there is connection between these documents and the state standards documents that were provided, these documents did not provide evidence that the curriculum maps were created with the standards. They also do not provide evidence that the staff is currently in the process of reviewing and updating the maps. • While the charter holder provided a "lesson tracker" for math and ELA for each grade, the trackers only show a limited number of standards that have been "introduced" and no standards that have been "practiced" or "assessed". Additionally, several of the trackers were not updated after October, and others early November. It does not appear these trackers have been consistently used and they do not provide evidence that the administration reviews lesson plans regularly and has a checklist of the standards and notes what day the lesson was being covered to ensure that all standards are covered over the year, or that teachers are using the standards checklist to help with their planning of lessons and to ensure all standards are being taught to students, or that the checklists and maps also support the teachers in creating their assessments. • The charter holder also provided trackers for beginning, middle, and end of year assessments for the current

	school year and the last two school years. This school year's tracker has been completed only with the beginning of year assessment score and the "Middle Goal". These trackers indicate that assessments are given, but do not demonstrate that the Beginning, middle and end of year assessments that cover the standards help guide if something has/hasn't been covered. The trackers do not identify individual standards, thus it is not clear how these trackers can be used to identify if individual standards have not been covered.
[C.8] **math maps** **other maps** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **1213 PD** **1314 PD** **1415 PD** **end year evals** **lp reviews** **LPs coaching** **1314 supervisory** **1415 supevisory**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the expectation for consistent use of these tools and how these expectations are communicated. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The expectation is that teachers use the curriculum maps, standards checklists and materials planning guides to create their weekly lesson plans. Lesson plans are reviewed regularly by administration and follow-up discussions individually or group occur as needed. These expectations are communicated during staff training days, before each school year begins. • The communication continues throughout the year during individual coaching sessions, team meetings and through the monitoring and reviewing of lesson plans and assessment results. • Teachers self-monitor to ensure that all standards are covered throughout the year with their curriculum maps and planning guides. • Teachers reflect on the tools during PLC discussions, supervisory meetings and lesson plans. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • While the charter holder provided teacher created described as curriculum maps that included math calendars for each grade level some with units, lessons, and assessments identified the school year, others with standards and assessments identified for the school year, an ELA calendar with some "lessons" and page numbers, some broad literature types, some "book clubs" and some assessments identified, the "curriculum maps" do not align with the lesson plans and lesson trackers. As a result of this lack of alignment, these documents do not serve as evidence that the school's expectation is that teachers use the curriculum maps, standards checklists and materials planning guides to create their weekly lesson plans or that expectations are communicated during staff training days. The misalignment and the lack of any follow-up regarding this misalignment also means these documents do not serve as evidence that lesson plans are reviewed regularly by administration and follow-up discussions individually or group occur as needed or that teachers self-monitor to ensure that all standards are covered throughout the year with their curriculum maps and planning guides or reflect on the tools during PLC discussions, supervisory meetings and lesson plans. • The charter holder also provided 2014-2015 PD agendas with some handwritten notes. The agendas reflect agenda items including "Curriculum Maps" and "Common Curriculum Training". The common curriculum training

materials reflect that "Common Curriculum" is a lesson planning software/website. In the training, the teachers were directed to include the following lesson plan components: standards, audience, objectives, prior knowledge, time, materials/resources, plan detail, accommodations, assessment, and reflection. This training does not address the expectation is that teachers use the curriculum maps, standards checklists and materials planning guides to create their weekly lesson plans.

- The charter holder also provided the 2014 Staff/Team Development agenda. The agendas reflect agenda items including "Common Curriculum & Lesson Plans Evaluation Form" for 90 minutes, "Policies and Procedures" for 75 minutes, and "Curriculum Maps" for 60 minutes. Sign ins and minutes indicates that a "basic introduction" to the Math curriculum materials was provided to new staff only, whole staff training on district systems and policies was provided, and training was conducted on "curriculum map revisions." However, neither the minutes nor the agendas provide evidence that the expectation that teachers use the curriculum maps, standards checklists and materials planning guides to create their weekly lesson plans was communicated during this training.
- The charter holder also provided 2012-2014 PD agendas and minutes with some handwritten notes. Some of these indicated that staff received training on policies and procedures, curriculum development and assessment, lesson planning, analyzing data to identify problems in instruction and/or curriculum, and engaged in one professional development session in which they reviewed pre-assessments and identified Tier III students and planned for interventions. The documents also did not serve as evidence that the school's expectation is that teachers use the curriculum maps, standards checklists and materials planning guides to create their weekly lesson plans or that expectations are communicated during staff training days.
- The charter holder provided teacher evaluations. The evaluation form includes a domain on planning and preparation that looks for lessons that are aligned to ACCR standards and school curriculum maps, but there is no evidence that lesson plans are reviewed regularly by administration and follow-up discussions individually or group occur as needed. Further, despite a lack of alignment of lesson plans to school curriculum maps, all teachers in the current year received an evaluation of "effective" on the domain and measure related to lesson planning alignment. This demonstrates evidence that the lesson plans are not being reviewed in accordance with the evaluation rubric.
- For prior years, but not the current year, the charter holder provided lesson plan reviews. While some of the current year lesson plans include handwritten notes that could indicate reviews were conducted, these notes are not consistently present and there does not appear to be any established criteria by which the plans are evaluated. Thus, the charter holder did not provide evidence to demonstrate lesson plans are reviewed regularly by administration and follow-up discussions individually or group occur as needed.
- For the current year, the charter holder provided a document called "LP coaching." The document included a sheet dated 10/24/2014 with 5 bullet points addressing: completion of the form, prior knowledge, objectives that are aligned to activities, standards, and assessments, a thorough description of assessments, and the need

	for accommodations for tier 2 and 3 students. The coaching notes dated 11/6/20104 indicate an administrator met with each teacher to discuss the needed components and the "lesson plan accountability system" and will be coming on every Monday to give feedback on weekly plans. The coaching notes dated 11/10/20104 indicate an administrator read each teacher's lesson plans and wrote positive comments, then met with teachers to discuss the process. These notes provide evidence that in late October, the charter holder began implementing additional accountability for lesson plans that continued for three weeks. No evidence was provided to demonstrate this coaching is continuing. Further, none of the coaching indicates that the discussions relate to the expectation that teachers use the curriculum maps, standards checklists and materials planning guides to create their weekly lesson plans. • The charter holder provided notes from the "supervisory meetings" between the site administrator and teachers. The notes indicate discussions about failure to turn in lesson plans, using a different program to turn in lesson plans because of problems with Common Curriculum, and failure to list accommodations and assessments. None of these meetings indicate discussion about teachers use the curriculum maps, standards checklists and materials planning guides to create their weekly lesson plans. None of the comments indicate teachers are reflecting on the tools in supervisory meetings.
[C.9] **student data folders** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **classroom obs** **walkthroughs**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** evidence to demonstrate usage of these tools in the classroom and alignment with instruction. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • To ensure that the tools are being used in the classroom and are aligned with instruction there are weekly lesson plans and classroom observations. Completed workbooks and assessments by students (SuperKids, Investigations, Triumph Learning workbooks) demonstrate that instruction was taught and lessons completed on different standards in alignment with the planning tools. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • While the charter holder provided teacher created described as curriculum maps that included math calendars for each grade level some with units, lessons, and assessments identified the school year, others with standards and assessments identified for the school year, an ELA calendar with some "lessons" and page numbers, some broad literature types, some "book clubs" and some assessments identified, the "curriculum maps" do not align with the lesson plans and lesson trackers. As a result of this lack of alignment, these documents do not provide evidence that the tools are being used in the classroom and are aligned with instruction or that there are weekly lesson plans and classroom observations that ensure the use of these tools. • While student data folders were provided, they included only trackers, but did not include evidence of completed workbooks and assessments by students from SuperKids, Investigations, or Triumph Learning workbooks) and did not demonstrate instruction was taught and lessons completed on different standards in

	alignment with the planning tools.
[C.10] **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **math maps** **other maps** **math sup** **sk pacing** **inv pacing**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder knows the curriculum is aligned to standards. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The curriculum materials being used by the teachers have been chosen with review of the Arizona Standards. As the new AZCCR standards were implemented new implementation guides were distributed by the vendors (Superkids & Investigations) on the curriculum to ensure that the new standards were included in the curriculum needs for classroom instruction. • As the teachers review and revise their curriculum maps and their lesson plans they are identifying which standards are being taught that week so they can ensure they are included in the curriculum. If the teachers see a standard that is not included in the curriculum they find alternate options to supplement the curriculum to ensure the students are being taught all of the AZCCR standards. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • While the charter holder provided teacher created described as curriculum maps that included math calendars for each grade level some with units, lessons, and assessments identified the school year, others with standards and assessments identified for the school year, an ELA calendar with some "lessons" and page numbers, some broad literature types, some "book clubs" and some assessments identified, the "curriculum maps" do not provide evidence that the curriculum materials being used by the teachers have been chosen with review of the Arizona Standards nor do they identify that the school ensured that the new standards were included in the curriculum needs for classroom instruction. • The charter also provided several math worksheets identified as "math sup", which do not identify the standards taught or why they were chosen, or when they are to be used. These documents did not provide evidence that teachers review and revise their curriculum maps and their lesson plans, or that they are identifying which standards are being taught that week so they can ensure they are included in the curriculum, or that if the teachers see a standard that is not included in the curriculum they find alternate options to supplement the curriculum to ensure the students are being taught all of the AZCCR standards. • The charter holder provided two text/curriculum resource pacing guides, but as is noted in other area it is not clear that these are the resource being used, these resources do not appear to be used in their totality, and in many places teachers have identified that these resources do not cover all the required standards. Thus, these documents do not serve as evidence that the curriculum is aligned to standards.

[C.11] **sk teach guide** **inv teach guide** **read comp tg** **write out tg** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **int wprk** **center pics**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder ensures that the curriculum addresses the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The curriculum programs Investigations and SuperKids both have guidance and instruction for differentiation to support the bottom 25% of students, which is used to provide curriculum that addresses the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%. • Teachers use their lesson plans to differentiate instructions for students who need extra support with certain standards. They have groups based on abilities and during their centers they will reteach a lesson or take more time to teach the lesson to allow the students to better grasp the concept. • Students in the bottom 25% work with the Interventionist to focus on phonics, vocabulary, decoding and reading fluency in addition to strategies to support their reading and math in the classroom. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • While the charter holder provided copies from the Investigations and SuperKids curriculum programs, the charter holder provided no evidence that these programs are being implemented with fidelity or that the differentiation and support structures within these curriculum programs are being used. As noted above, the charter holder provided teacher created described as curriculum maps that included math calendars for each grade level some with units, lessons, and assessments identified the school year, others with standards and assessments identified for the school year, an ELA calendar with some "lessons" and page numbers, some broad literature types, some "book clubs" and some assessments identified, the "curriculum maps" in some cases demonstrate that the Investigations and SuperKids curriculum programs are not consistently being used. • While the charter holder provided lesson plans that identify teachers are supposed to identify "accommodations", many lesson plans do not identify any accommodations and where there are accommodations identified they use general template language that is repeated throughout the plans. This language does not identify the use of the Investigations or SuperKids differentiation strategies. • While some lesson plans included student groups, these did not identify that the groups are based on abilities are that during their centers teachers will reteach a lesson or take more time to teach the lesson to allow the students to better grasp the concept. Identification of student groups was not identified on all lesson plans. Thus, these lesson plans did not provide evidence that teachers have groups based on abilities and during their centers they will reteach a lesson or take more time to teach the lesson to allow the students to better grasp the concept. • The charter holder provided student work and a 1st grade tracker identified as "int wprk" which demonstrated student work completed in matching upper and lower case letters and recognizing the alphabet, initial letter sounds, initial blends, sequencing, listening, comprehension retell, and geometric patterns. The work did not

	identify if this was supplemental work, which students were assigned this work or why. This documentation provides evidence that first grade students are working on these skills, but does not provide evidence that Students in the bottom 25% work with the Interventionist to focus on phonics, vocabulary, decoding and reading fluency in addition to strategies to support their reading and math in the classroom. • The charter holder also provided pictures of students working in groups on a workbook, games, and a variety of art projects. This did not provide evidence that teachers have groups based on abilities and during their centers they will reteach a lesson or take more time to teach the lesson to allow the students to better grasp the concept or that teachers use their lesson plans to differentiate instructions for students who need extra support with certain standards.
[C.12] **sk teach guide** **inv teach guide** **read comp tg** **write out tg** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **Morning Meeting Overview** **tech programs**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder ensures that the curriculum addresses the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs). **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Teachers include differentiation in their lesson plans for these students and ensure when they are teaching they include prior knowledge and review as needed for the students. The instructional guides for SuperKids and Investigations include differentiation and reteach options for teachers to use. • Teachers use technology based programs to supplement the curriculum (MobyMax and Ten Marks), which is valuable for ELL students as they can hit a button to have the math problem/instruction read to them so they can follow along to improve their English reading ability and to focus on the math problem. • Teachers use the Responsive Classroom Morning Meeting on a daily basis to start the day in the classrooms, which provides the ELLs with the opportunity to enhance their speaking and listening skills as well as have an understanding as to the goals for the day in both a visual and written form. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • While the charter holder provided copies from the Investigations and SuperKids curriculum programs, the charter holder provided no evidence that these programs are being implemented with fidelity or that the differentiation and support structures within these curriculum programs are being used. As noted above, the charter holder provided teacher created described as curriculum maps that included math calendars for each grade level some with units, lessons, and assessments identified the school year, others with standards and assessments identified for the school year, an ELA calendar with some "lessons" and page numbers, some broad literature types, some "book clubs" and some assessments identified, the "curriculum maps" in some cases demonstrate that the Investigations and SuperKids curriculum programs are not consistently being used. • While the charter holder provided lesson plans that identify teachers are supposed to identify

	"accommodations", many lesson plans do not identify any accommodations and where there are accommodations identified they use general template language that is repeated throughout the plans. The differentiation for ELLs included: "ELL students will listen as morning message is being read to them." , "ELL students will work in small groups with co-teacher." , "ELL students will work with a partner to complete task.", "ELL/SPED students will partner with another student to help create the study guide." and "Teacher will work with a group of ELL students,". The lesson plans twice identify that students will use Moby Max to practice reading comprehension and approximately 10 times the lesson plans identify teachers will use TenMarks. This language does not identify consistent use of the Investigations or SuperKids differentiation strategies for ELLs or consistent use technology based programs to supplement the curriculum (MobyMax and Ten Marks) for ELLs. These documents also do not identify that these tools are used specifically meet the needs of ELLs. • The charter holder also provided documentation describing the "morning meeting." The stated objectives of this structure are to help all students: have a sense of recognition and belonging, help children learn each other's names and foster friendships, build friendly social skills, develop vocabulary and language skills, give practice speaking and listening, help children get to know classmates, foster active engages participation, develop a shared repertoire of activities, reinforce reading and other academic skills, engage children in exploring academic and social topics, and generate interest and excitement for the day's learning. This document does not provide evidence that this is curriculum that addresses the needs of English Language Learners. • The charter holder provided documents include permission slips for using online programs and training documents for the use of MobyMax and Ten Marks online programs, but no evidence that these programs were used consistently.
[C.13]	**Not Applicable**
[C.14] **sk teach guide** **inv teach guide** **read comp tg** **write out tg** **IEPs** **teacher notes**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder ensures that the curriculum addresses the needs of students with disabilities. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Each of our students with a disability has an IEP to focus on their individual learning goals and to provide them with the needed accommodations and modifications to allow them to be successful in the classroom. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The curriculum programs that are used, Investigations and SuperKids both have guidance and instruction for differentiation. The Buckle Down workbooks have all the information in the lessons so students can go back and review as needed while completing lessons. Book clubs and informational text are read with peers, teacher led groups or one-on-one which allow students to practice their fluency and allow for stronger comprehension of the text with shared/guided reading.

	• A variety of different tools (manipulatives, workbooks, centers) are used to help the students grasp the content needed to be successful. Students with disabilities receive small group and 1-on-1 instruction to focus on their specific learning needs. Additional learning resources are provided for students to reinforce their classroom learning and support their growth including TenMarks, MobyMax and Raz Kids. Accommodations are made in the classrooms and during testing to ensure students are demonstrating their full potential. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • While the charter holder provided lesson plans that identify teachers are supposed to identify "accommodations", many lesson plans do not identify any accommodations and where there are accommodations identified they use general template language that is repeated throughout the plans. The differentiation for students with disabilities included: "Students with IEPs will work every other problem.", and "ELL/SPED students will partner with another student to help create the study guide.". One teacher's plans include more specific identification on the services provided to students with disabilities, stating "Students on IEPs are typically taken for the majority of the literacy block and are having small group intervention with our reading specialist. Then when they return at 1 :45, they are in my small group daily, in order to bring their reading levels up to grade level." The lesson plans twice identify that students will use Moby Max to practice reading comprehension and approximately 10 times the lesson plans identify teachers will use TenMarks. This language does not identify consistent use of the Investigations or SuperKids differentiation strategies for students with disabilities or consistent use technology based programs to supplement the curriculum (MobyMax and Ten Marks) for students with disabilities. These documents also do not identify that these tools are used specifically meet the needs of students with disabilities.

I, Katherine Paulos, completed this Site Visit Inventory after the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on December 3, 2014. _____

I, Maryann Ponce, received a copy of this document after the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on December 3, 2014. _____