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: Monitoring Instruction

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[M.1] **I Can Statements Photos** **LPs posted Photos** **aims results** **assessment scores B, M & E** **data results** **grade books** **int assess** **pre post** **classroom obs** **walkthroughs** **standards tracker** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **lp reviews** **LPs coaching** **end year evals** **fall evals**	**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 do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Administration regularly reviews lesson plans and formally and informally observes classroom instruction and the classroom environment to ensure standards are integrated throughout instruction. • Administration monitors lesson plans and classroom instruction to check for alignment between standards, instruction and assessments and to ensure fidelity. Administration regularly reviews lesson plans and meets every other week with teachers to discuss lessons and the happenings in the classroom. Formal evaluations are completed two to three times a year and reviewed and discussed with the teachers, along with informal observations and walk-throughs to ensure that the curriculum is being taught with fidelity. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • 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 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. • 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 monitors the integration of standards into classroom instruction and whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. • 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 monitor the integration of standards into classroom instruction or monitor whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. • 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 monitor whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. Further, the limited number of examples from the current year does not provide

	evidence that these observations occur throughout the year.
[M.2] **peer observations** **classroom obs** **walkthroughs** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **end year evals** **fall evals** **1314 supervisory** **1415 supevisory**	**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 do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Follow-up conversations with teachers about end of unit test results and review of benchmark assessments and student growth help determine the effectiveness of instruction. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • The charter holder provided teacher evaluations. The evaluations included hand written notes reflective of the evaluation conversation, none of the notes demonstrated that these evaluations included follow-up conversations with teachers about end of unit test results and review of benchmark assessments and student growth help determine the effectiveness of instruction. • The charter holder provided hand written notes titled "classroom obs" for the current school year and classroom observation forms for the two prior school years. Neither the forms nor the notes indicated an evaluation or discussion of end of unit test results or benchmark assessments and student growth to help determine the effectiveness of instruction. • 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 monitor the effectiveness of standards-based instruction throughout the year by review of benchmark assessments and student growth help determine the effectiveness of instruction. • The notes for the supervisory meetings focus primarily on general issues and classroom management, discussion of data is reflected only once in the notes. In that instance a list of data is provided, but not findings or conclusions are noted. Thus it is not clear that the discussion included an evaluation or discussion of end of unit test results or benchmark assessments and student growth to help determine the effectiveness of instruction.
[M.3] **end year evals** **fall evals** **walkthroughs** **evals notes** **1314 supervisory** **1415 supervisory**	**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:** • Formal evaluations of teachers are conducted two to three times a year by the direct supervisor. The first one is completed and then discussed with the teachers in a 1-on-1 meeting with their supervisor and goals are set. The

Goals **self evals**	end of the year evaluation is conducted by the supervisor and the admin team provides input as appropriate, while the teacher completes a selfevaluation with the same form. The teacher and the administration team meet for an end of the year evaluation at the close of the school year. • Informal observations and walk-throughs happen more regularly by the direct supervisor, as well as the rest of the Administration team.
[M.4] **Goals** **end year evals** **fall evals**	**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 formal evaluation rubric used is very detailed and broken into multiple sections with specific targets/standards identified for each level. The supervisor make notes on certain areas of strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement. • Formal evaluations in the fall are followed up with individual discussions between the supervisor and teacher where we talk about what they feel they are doing well and what they would like to improve upon. Teachers are asked to set goals for the year and we discuss what support and/or professional development is needed to help them meet their goals. • The end of the year evaluation is the same form and the teacher completes the form on themselves and the supervisor also completes the form. • An end of the year evaluation is conducted with each teacher individually and the administration team, together we review and discuss strengths, weaknesses and needs as we prepare for the upcoming school year.
[M.5] **end year evals** **fall evals** **walkthroughs** **evals notes** **1314 supervisory** **1415 supervisory** **goals**	**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 demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Teachers and administration have 1-on-1 meetings twice a month to check in with the teachers. • After formal evaluations immediate feedback is given to the teachers and then a follow-up meeting to review the full document takes place. • Administration often has specific goals for an individual's strengths (ways they can help others or contribute more to the team as a whole), weaknesses (a targeted SMART goal or two for a semester/the year) and learning needs (discussions of professional development opportunities).
[M.6] **end year evals**	**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

fall evals **walkthroughs** **evals notes** **goals**	Holder has done in response. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The administration team meets annually to discuss the evaluations as a team which allows for healthy analysis of the individual evaluations. • The team discusses interventions, counseling, goals, professional development and other needs that may exist at grade level instruction, individual sites or the district as a whole so we can take action to make the necessary changes. • The data provided in formal and informal observations provide us with strengths & weaknesses for individuals as well as the school/district as a whole. • In response, administration has tailored Professional Development and book studies to improve weaknesses and provide new or additional knowledge in needed areas. At times teachers have been counseled on repeated problem areas, improvement plans have been created and/or change of placement has been made as needed. We continue to analyze staff strengths and weaknesses for individuals from both sites.
[M.7] **end year evals** **fall evals** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **classroom obs** **walkthroughs** **int assess** **int notes** **co teacher schedule**	**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:** • Our monitoring process for non-proficient students begins with teacher lesson plans and ends with classroom observations. In the teacher lesson plans, the school requires accommodations to be explicitly noted for both lessons and assessments. The purpose of this process is to communicate to the site administration what is being done for struggling students as well as to help the classroom teachers deliberately articulate what they need to be doing each day for non-proficient students. • When the administration conducts classroom observations, Administration looks at the lessons/activities and the instruction the non-proficient students are receiving to ensure teachers are working with and addressing the needs of this population (i.e. pull-outs, peer support, number lines/hundreds charts, listening centers, re-teaching and/or interventions). • The teachers use pre/post tests and monitor homework and classroom work to determine additional supports. **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 additional supports. The no "additional supports" 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. • While the charter holder provided lesson plans and stated that accommodations are required to be explicitly noted for both lessons and assessments, 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 lack of appropriate accommodations and lack of improvement in this area demonstrates that the charter holder is not monitoring for non-proficient students beginning with teacher lesson plans. Thus, no evidence was provided to demonstrate that administration looks at the lessons/activities and the instruction the non-proficient students are receiving to ensure teachers are working with and addressing the needs of this population. • The charter holder also provided walk through observation forms and notes. The charter holder provided hand written notes titled "classroom obs" for the current school year, which 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 and they primarily contain observations of what was occurring in each classroom and some suggestions about the specific classroom issues. Some, these notes do not address differentiation. 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 the documents for the current year, the administrator conducting the walk-through looks for a variety of items including: student differentiated assignments. However, the limited number of examples from the current year does not provide evidence that these observations occur frequently throughout the year as a method for looking at the lessons/activities and the instruction the non-proficient students are receiving to ensure teachers are working with and addressing the needs of this population. In the forms provided for the prior year, differentiation is not identified as a criteria to be reviewed. • The charter holder provided notes and a schedule from the reading interventionist and the co-teacher schedule. The documents do not provide evidence of the monitoring of the instruction provided by the specialist or the co-teacher.
[M.8] **end year evals** **fall evals** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **classroom obs** **walkthroughs** **int assess**	**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:** • Our monitoring process for English Language Learners involves review of teacher lesson plans and classroom observations. In the teacher lesson plans, ELL accommodations are noted as needed. The purpose of this process is to communicate to the site administration what is being done for the ELLs as well as to help the classroom teachers deliberately articulate what they need to be doing each day for these students.

int notes **co teacher schedule**	• When the administration conducts classroom observations, administration observes the lessons/activities and the instruction the ELLs are receiving to ensure teachers are working with and addressing the needs of this population (i.e. pull-outs, peer support, reading/listening apps on the ipads, listening centers, speaking in English, re-teaching and/or interventions). • All instruction is in English, but teachers will use Spanish (all current ELL students are Spanish speakers) as needed to ensure students fully grasp a concept. Teachers use "I Can" statements in student friendly language and prior knowledge to review what standards are being addressed and to provide students with background or a connection to the lesson and standard being taught. **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 additional supports. The no "additional supports" 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. • While the charter holder provided lesson plans and stated that accommodations are required to be explicitly noted for both lessons and assessments, 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 lack of appropriate accommodations and lack of improvement in this area demonstrates that the charter holder is not monitoring for non-proficient students beginning with teacher lesson plans. Thus, no evidence was provided to demonstrate that administration looks at the lessons/activities and the instruction the non-proficient students are receiving to ensure teachers are working with and addressing the needs of this population. • The charter holder also provided walk through observation forms and notes. The charter holder provided hand written notes titled "classroom obs" for the current school year, which 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 and they primarily contain observations of what was occurring in each classroom and some suggestions about the specific classroom issues. Some, these notes do not address differentiation. 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 the documents for the current year, the administrator conducting the walk-through looks for a variety of items including: student differentiated assignments. However, the limited number of examples from the current year does not provide evidence that these observations occur frequently throughout the year as a method for looking at the lessons/activities and the instruction the non-

	proficient students are receiving to ensure teachers are working with and addressing the needs of this population. In the forms provided for the prior year, differentiation is not identified as a criteria to be reviewed. • The charter holder provided notes and a schedule from the reading interventionist and the co-teacher schedule. The documents do not provide evidence of the monitoring of the instruction provided by the specialist or the co-teacher.
[M.9]	**Not applicable.**
[M.10] **end year evals** **fall evals** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans**	**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:** • Instruction for students with disabilities is monitored through lesson plans, classroom observations and annual IEP meetings. During classroom observations the charter holder notes that IEP accommodations and modifications are being addressed for students with disabilities and that they are receiving instruction and support appropriate for them to be successful in the general education classroom. **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 additional supports. The no "additional supports" 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. • While the charter holder provided lesson plans and stated that accommodations are required to be explicitly noted for both lessons and assessments, 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 lack of appropriate accommodations and lack of improvement in this area demonstrates that the charter holder is not monitoring for non-proficient students beginning with teacher lesson plans. Thus, no evidence was provided to demonstrate that administration looks at the lessons/activities and the instruction the non-proficient students are receiving to ensure teachers are working with and addressing the needs of this population. • The charter holder also provided walk through observation forms and notes. The charter holder provided hand written notes titled "classroom obs" for the current school year, which 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 and they primarily contain observations of what was occurring in each classroom and some suggestions about

	the specific classroom issues. Some, these notes do not address differentiation. 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 the documents for the current year, the administrator conducting the walk-through looks for a variety of items including: student differentiated assignments. However, the limited number of examples from the current year does not provide evidence that these observations occur frequently throughout the year as a method for looking at the lessons/activities and the instruction the non-proficient students are receiving to ensure teachers are working with and addressing the needs of this population. In the forms provided for the prior year, differentiation is not identified as a criteria to be reviewed.

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

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