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: Assessment

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[A.1] **ati ela** **ati math** **galileo training** **1213 dibels** **1314 dibels** **1415 dibels** **assessment scores B, M & E** **inv assess** **K math assess** **1st assess** **2nd assess** **3 math assess** **4 math assess** **inv assess**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the types of assessments the Charter Holder uses **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • A variety of assessments are used throughout the school including: standardized assessments, formative and summative assessments, unit tests, informal, subjective and observational teacher assessments. • The school has been using DIBELS Next consistently for beginning, middle & end of year assessments, as well as progress monitoring students, especially those identified as needing intensive support. • In past years the school used a beginning, middle & end of year assessment for the math program, Investigations, for grades 1-5 that was created by the teachers from the bank of questions. For kindergarten the teachers created a math assessment given three times a year. • In the summer of 2014 the school adopted Galileo and in FY15 has used it as the assessment for ELA and mathematics benchmark at the beginning of the year for 2nd-5th grade. In addition, the teachers have started to use it for monthly assessments related to each standard. • Kindergarten & 1st grade students continued to use the prior years assessments. • Standardized assessments include AIMS (now AZ Merit) and Stanford 10. Additional assessments include: pre and post tests on standards being taught that week, SuperKids end of unit assessments, teacher created assessments on chapter books read aloud, spelling and vocabulary tests, and end of unit math assessments.
[A.2] **ati ela** **ati math** **galileo training** **1213 dibels** **1314 dibels** **1415 dibels** **assessment scores B, M & E** **inv assess** **K math assess** **1st assess**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the process for designing or selecting the assessment system **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Members of the administration and team of teachers have been involved in designing and selecting additional assessments and assessment programs. DIBELS Next was chosen based on the state requirements and has been used for 8 years. • After the adoption of Investigations the grade level teachers from each site collaborated to review the test questions provided by Investigations and created a test encompassing each of the standards and lessons to be given three times a year. The team is currently working on updating the math assessments, including creating

2nd assess **3 math assess** **4 math assess** **inv assess**	unit tests in Galileo. • After research and discussions with other schools the administration team decided to adopt Galileo for the 2014-2015 school year to familiarize students with online testing and to have a more regular summative assessment. • Additional classroom assessments are shared and discussed with teachers, especially among grade levels to evaluate the students knowledge and growth of the different standards being taught. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • The documents provided by the charter holder include assessment results and copies of assessments, but no documentation of the process for designing or selecting the assessment system. • The charter holder also provided documentation regarding the training conducted for the teachers to begin using Galileo, but again did not provide information on how the assessment was selected.
[A.3] **math maps** **inv assess** **1213 dibels** **1314 dibels** **1415 dibels** **math supp**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the assessment system is aligned to the curriculum and instructional methodology. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Galileo online benchmark assessment questions are directly tied to the AZCCR standards. These standards are taught primarily through the use of Investigations and Buckle Down to the Common Core State Standards for Arizona workbooks. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The assessment system is aligned to the curriculum by using assessments associated with the curriculum materials. Our math program, Investigations, provides teachers with a bank of assessment questions in relation to each unit. • The assessments are created by pulling questions from the bank, in alignment with what has been taught. • Additionally, supplemental math assessments are administered in accordance with what information Investigations needs to be supplemented with, to adequately address every math standard. These additional assessments are pulled from our primary source of supplemental math materials, Buckle Down to the Common Core State Standards for Arizona workbooks. Again, the source of the curriculum materials is aligned with the source of the assessments. • This connectivity between the curriculum materials and the standards is assessed at the beginning, middle and end of the school year. • DIBELS Next assesses early literacy and early reading skills. The timed passages are scored based on correctly read word count. This assesses reading fluency, with the retell and daze portions addressing comprehension.

	DIBELS was created to focus on the five big ideas in reading: phonemic awareness, alphabetic principle, accuracy and fluency within text, vocabulary and comprehension. This assessment is aligned to both the Superkids reading program used by the Kindergarten through second grade classes, and the balanced literacy approach used in third through fifth grade. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • The documents provided by the charter holder include assessment results and copies of assessments. The copies of assessments do not identify that the assessments are created using assessment questions from the curriculum material, nor do they identify that they align with the material that has been taught or that supplemental math assessments are administered in accordance with what information Investigations needs to be supplemented with, to adequately address every math standard. As stated in the curriculum inventory, the charter holder did not provide evidence to demonstrate that all standards are taught or that there is a consistent curriculum that is implemented with fidelity, thus while there are supplemental worksheets for math provided to us, it is unclear how or when these are used. Additionally, because these materials do not identify standards, there is no evidence they are standards based or that they are pulled from the school's primary source of supplemental math materials, Buckle Down to the Common Core State Standards for Arizona workbooks. • No evidence was provided to demonstrate that connectivity between the curriculum materials and the standards is assessed at the beginning, middle and end of the school year. • No evidence was provided to demonstrate that the DIBELS assessment is aligned to both the Superkids reading program used by the Kindergarten through second grade classes, and the balanced literacy approach used in third through fifth grade
[A.4] **assessment scores B, M & E** **1st assess** **2nd assess** **3 math assess** **4 math assess** **pre post** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **data results** **student data folders** **teach data fol**	**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 **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • A variety of intervals are used to assess student progress based on different grade levels and the various forms of assessments. • Student progress is assessed with benchmark testing three times a year - beginning, middle and end in reading (DIBELS Next), now ELA with Galileo in 2nd-5th grade, writing samples and math (Investigations and now Galileo for 2nd-5th grade). • Regular summative classroom assessments are completed at end of units. • Pre and post tests are completed regularly.

[A.5] **PLC notes** **assessment scores B, M & E** **1st assess** **2nd assess** **3 math assess** **4 math assess** **1213 dibels** **1314 dibels** **1415 dibels** **ati ela** **ati math** **1314 supervisory** **1415 supevisory**	**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 **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Teachers compile their beginning of the year assessments and use this data to help determine initial class groupings for reading and math and who may need to see the Interventionist and/or benefit from tutoring. • The school started PLCs this school year with a focus on reviewing/analyzing data on a consistent basis. The PLCs meet weekly in different formats (K-2 and 3-5 teachers, site based and district based). The teams review and analyze the data to help determine how to support individual students/groups of students. One-on-one formal and informal supervisory meetings also include discussion of individual students and class growth from week to week. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • Completed PLC meeting templates were provided. The templates include areas for notes on" "Follow up", "Data discussed", "Student achievement", "Student challenges", and "How we will address challenges." Notes from the meetings at the beginning of the year in August indicate teachers discussed Galileo data and would implement small intervention groups. Subsequent meeting did not indicate any data was reviewed or analyzed to help determine how to support individual students/groups of students, rather all subsequent meeting focused on curriculum mapping and creating assessments and behavior issues. These notes did not provide evidence that teachers meet in weekly PLCs with a focus on reviewing/analyzing data on a consistent basis. • The charter holder also provided copies of assessments and assessment results, but did not provide evidence that the data is used to help determine initial class groupings for reading and math and who may need to see the Interventionist and/or benefit from tutoring. • 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 analysis to determine what is and isn't working in the classroom as a whole and for individual students.
[A.6] **assessment scores B, M & E** **1st assess** **2nd assess** **3 math assess** **4 math assess** **1213 dibels** **1314 dibels** **1415 dibels**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the analysis is used to evaluate instructional and curricular effectiveness **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Assessment data analysis is beneficial to the administration in evaluating both instructional and curricular effectiveness. • The data analysis allows administration and teachers to determine what is and isn't working in the classroom as a whole and for individual students. The analysis is used to talk with teachers in supervisory meetings, team

end year evals **1314 supervisory** **1415 supevisory** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **lp reviews** **LPs coaching** **PLC notes**	meetings and evaluations to analyze the instruction by the teacher, the lesson plans and the curriculum being addressed in the lesson plans. • In regards to curricular effectiveness the data analysis helps determine components that the curriculum may be lacking or that students really struggle with year after year. This information allows teachers to discuss what should be taught in earlier grades or share teaching concepts to supplement the missing pieces. In reviewing the lesson plans one is able to determine if adequate time was given to teaching the lesson and how the lesson was taught. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • The charter holder also provided copies of assessments and assessment results, but did not provide evidence that the data from the assessments is analyzed to evaluate instructional and curricular effectiveness. • 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 these notes do not provide evidence that supervisory meeting are used to analyze data to determine what is and isn't working in the classroom as a whole and for individual students. • Completed PLC meeting templates were provided. The templates include areas for notes on" "Follow up", "Data discussed", "Student achievement", "Student challenges", and "How we will address challenges." Notes from the meetings at the beginning of the year in August indicate teachers discussed Galileo data and would implement small intervention groups. Subsequent meeting did not indicate any data was reviewed or analyzed to determine what is and isn't working in the classroom as a whole and for individual students or to analyze the instruction by the teacher, the lesson plans and the curriculum being addressed in the lesson plans, rather all subsequent meeting focused on curriculum mapping and creating assessments and behavior issues. The discussion notes regarding curriculum did not include discussion of data to determine components that the curriculum may be lacking or that students really struggle with year after year or what should be taught in earlier grades or share teaching concepts to supplement the missing pieces. • 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. The notes from the current year and the forms from the prior year do not indicate that lesson plans were reviewed to evaluate the amount of time given to teaching lessons or how lessons were taught. Thus, the charter holder did not provide evidence to demonstrate lesson plans are reviewed to determine if adequate time was given to teaching the lesson and how the lesson was taught. • The charter holder provided teacher evaluations for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 school year, but none for the current year. The evaluation form includes handwritten notes about the conversations conducted during the

	evaluation, but there is no evidence that the evaluation includes discussion of data to analyze the instruction by the teacher or the lesson plans and the curriculum being addressed in the lesson plans. • 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 what is and isn't working in the classroom as a whole and for individual students. The coaching discussions also do not demonstrate analysis the instruction by the teacher or the lesson plans and the curriculum being addressed in the lesson plans or whether adequate time was given to teaching the lesson and how the lesson was taught.
[A.7] **int notes** **1314 tutoring** **1415 tutoring** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **stud data folders** **teach data fol** **aims results**	**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 **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The data analysis from AIMS results are provided in the summer so it can be noted if specific areas were problematic for the entire population and teachers can plan and adjust curriculum and instructional methods as necessary for the upcoming academic year. • The benchmark assessments are compiled and reviewed within the first month of school which allows teachers to group students according to needs and determine a starting point for instruction based on ability levels of students as a result of benchmarks. These results also allow for guidance in determining who should participate in sessions with the Interventionist and receive after school tutoring. • Pre and post tests, unit tests and classroom review and observations of daily work guide immediate adjustments to curriculum and instruction as the teachers modify and adjust lesson plans and instruction based on student need and assessment results and review of the data. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • The charter holder provided copies of the school's prior year AIMS results, but did not provide evidence that the results were analyzed or used to plan and adjust curriculum and instructional methods as necessary for the

	upcoming academic year. • Completed PLC meeting templates were provided. The templates include areas for notes on" "Follow up", "Data discussed", "Student achievement", "Student challenges", and "How we will address challenges." Notes from the meetings at the beginning of the year in August indicate teachers discussed Galileo data and would implement small intervention groups, these notes do not, however indicate that the results were used to determine a starting point for instruction based on ability levels of students as a result of benchmarks or to determine who should participate in sessions with the Interventionist and receive after school tutoring. Additionally, later meetings did not incorporate data discussions that were used to guide immediate adjustments to curriculum and instruction as the teachers modify and adjust lesson plans and instruction based on student need and assessment results and review of the data. Rather later discussions focused on completing curriculum mapping. • The charter holder provided tutoring sign-ins and logs, which demonstrate that tutoring was being provided. However, the charter holder also provided a sign-up sheet for parents who were able to select whether to participate in tutoring. No evidence was provided to demonstrate that the students were targeted or selected for tutoring based on benchmark assessment results, rather it appears the tutoring was made available to all students. No evidence was provided to demonstrate that the students who took advantage of the tutoring students where those whose benchmark assessment results indicated a need. • 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 also provided an email from the reading interventionist, in which she described the intervention program and lists the students that are seen. Neither the description, nor the lists identify that students are selected for the services based on benchmark assessments or even pre and post tests, unit tests and classroom review. The program is identified as providing generalized instruction in identified areas, but did not identified as being targeted to student needs identified through an analysis of assessment results. • The charter holder also provided student and teacher data folders, the data folders demonstrate that teachers have students grouped according to DIBELs assessment results, but do not identify student grouping in mathematics according to mathematics results. The student folders indicate that students are encouraged to use trackers to chart their assessment results. However, these documents do not provide evidence that data analysis guides immediate adjustments to curriculum and instruction, or that data is used to evaluate student

	tutoring/interventionist work.
[A.8] **int notes** **1314 tutoring** **1415 tutoring** **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans**	**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 **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • There are a variety of assessments used and teachers adapt assessments when and where appropriate for students. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • Completed PLC meeting templates were provided. The templates include areas for notes on" "Follow up", "Data discussed", "Student achievement", "Student challenges", and "How we will address challenges." Notes from the meetings at the beginning of the year in August indicate teachers discussed Galileo data and would implement small intervention groups, these notes do not, however indicate that a variety of assessments were being used where appropriate or that results were used to guide assess or discuss ongoing progress of students in the bottom 25%. • The charter holder provided tutoring sign-ins and logs, which demonstrate that tutoring was being provided. However, the charter holder did not provide any evidence to demonstrate that the students attending the tutoring were in the bottom 25% or that the students receiving tutoring were being assessed during tutoring to determine its effectiveness in addressing the needs of students in the bottom 25%. • The charter holder provided lesson plans that identify centers are used in classrooms, but again did not identify that students in the bottom 25% were being assessed to determine the effectiveness of additional supports provided to them. Further, Where "accommodations" are identified on the lesson plans, there does not appear to be any connection to students identified as the bottom 25% 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 an email from the reading interventionist, in which she described that students are assessed to determine the effectiveness of the reading interventions through the Jennings Informal Reading Inventory, no information was provided regarding math assessments to monitor the progress of students in the bottom 25%.
[A.9] **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans**	**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) **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Assessment of ELLs according to adaptations made to the curriculum (Curriculum Question 12) **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 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. None of the lesson plans identify that ELL students will be assessed to identify if additional supports are effective in meeting their needs.
[A.10]	**Not Applicable**
[A.11] **12-13LessonPlans** **13-14LessonPlans** **14-15LessonPlans** **IEPs**	**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 **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Assessment of students with disabilities according to adaptations made to the curriculum ((Curriculum Question 14) **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. None of the lesson plans identify that students with disabilities will be assessed to identify if additional supports are effective in meeting their needs.

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