

---

**AGENDA ITEM: Consideration of Revocation or Restoration of a Failing School**

**Arizona LEARNS**

In November of 2001, Arizona voters approved Proposition 301 which, among other things, provided funds to the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) to develop “a system to measure school performance based on student achievement, including student performance on the AIMS test.” The legislative requirements for the accountability system are stated in section 15-241 (ARS § 15-241) of the Arizona Revised Statutes. The accountability system created to satisfy the statute is referred to as Arizona LEARNS. The school evaluation given by ADE to each school is referred to as the school’s achievement profile. Arizona law (ARS § 15-241) mandates that the Arizona Department of Education shall compile an annual achievement profile for each public school.

The achievement profile for a school serving grades 3-8 consists of the following performance measures:

1. A status measure based on the performance of students on all three sections of the AIMS (reading, writing, and mathematics) in the current year.
2. A measure of improvement in aggregate student performance on the AIMS compared to the baseline year.
3. A measure of growth in individual student performance. This is the Measure of Academic Progress (MAP).
4. A measure of student performance on the state’s English language proficiency assessment: AZELLA.
5. A measure of whether the school made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. In order to comply with the federal requirement that the state have an integrated accountability system, a school’s AYP determination is factored into the calculation of its achievement profile.

Schools are awarded scale score points based on their performance on measures one through five. Scale score points are then summed up for each school and compared to a scale that relates scale score points to the five profile labels: excelling, highly performing, performing plus, performing, and underperforming.

In accordance with A.R.S. § 15-241(O), if a school remains classified as an underperforming school for a third consecutive year, the department of education shall visit the school site to confirm the classification data and to review the implementations of the school’s improvement plan. The school shall be classified as failing to meet academic standards unless an alternate classification is made after an appeal. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-241(U), if a charter school is designated as a school failing to meet academic standards, the department of education shall immediately notify the charter school’s sponsor. The charter school’s sponsor shall either take action to restore the charter school to acceptable performance or revoke the charter school’s charter. A [Failing Schools Flow Chart](#) has been included for your reference.

## Background Information (Gila Educational Group)

Gila Educational Group, an Arizona non-profit corporation, operates Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School (School) and Gila Preparatory Academy High School. While the High School (9-12) is currently designated as Underperforming Year Two and did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2009, the focus of this report is on the Middle School (7-8) and its failing status. The Middle and High School share the same Principal and some of the same staff.

Gila Educational Group was granted a charter and began operation in the fall of 2002, serving approximately 39 students in grades six, seven, and eight. An amendment was approved for the 2008-09 school year to change grade levels served to seventh and eighth. The Corporation Commission lists two (2) officers and directors: Crae Wilson (President) and Sherli Skinner (Vice President). The Charter Representative is Crae Wilson, Jr., who is also the Principal for the Middle School and a teacher for the High School. The Governing Body is comprised of Crae Wilson, Jr., Sherli Skinner, Dee Lauritzen, Joy Flake and Joanna Robertson.

Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School is located in Safford, Arizona and primarily serves at-risk students, although the school was originally started with a college prep focus. At the time of the failing school site visit on December 15, 2009, the School reported an enrollment of 29 middle school students. The following chart lists some examples of State and Federal approximate revenues received by Gila Educational Group for the middle and high school from FY 2007 – FY 2010. According to the Arizona Department of Education’s grant management system, the School has not applied to receive any additional grants over the past seven years.

Revenue Category	FY 2010	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
100 <sup>th</sup> Day Student Count <i>MS=Middle School</i> <i>HS=High School</i>	MS=23 HS=66	MS=22.215 HS=65.917	MS=31.781 HS=55.070	MS=32.494 HS=56.238
State Equalization Assistance	\$576,672	\$619,156	\$520,735	\$576,504
Classroom Site Fund	\$32,957	\$63,565	\$59,318	\$52,416
Federal Monies	0	0	0	0
Total	\$609,629	\$682,721	\$580,053	\$628,920
Per Pupil Revenue	\$6,850	\$7,747	\$6,679	\$7,088

In the fall of 2007 Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School was designated as a first year underperforming school in accordance with A.R.S. §15-241. The School was required to notify the parents of the students attending Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School of the underperforming classification and create an Arizona School Improvement Plan (ASIP). Following the submission of the ASIP, the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) scheduled a Solutions Team to visit the School and meet with stakeholders. This visit took place on March 26 - 27, 2008. Using the *Standards and Rubrics for School Improvement*, the team answered three questions:

1. Does the school’s Arizona School Improvement Plan appear to be a sound plan for improving student performance?

2. Do the structures and conditions appear to be in place for successful implementation of the school's Arizona School Improvement Plan?
3. What recommendations can be provided that will assist the school with the implementation of its Arizona School Improvement Plan?

Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School received a copy of the Solution Team's Statement of Findings to use as technical assistance to validate or to re-direct the School's improvement efforts as well as offer specific recommendations for moving forward. An underperforming school may revise its ASIP at any time, using new data to evaluate and revise its goals and benchmarks as appropriate. An ASSIST Coach was also assigned to offer support for school improvement efforts. The School did provide evidence of a current revised ASIP for 2009-10.

In addition, the school was designated as a second year underperforming school in the fall of 2008 and subsequently Failing to Meet Academic Standards in 2009. This failing designation led to a joint evaluation of the School by staff from ADE's School Effectiveness Division and the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools (ASBCS). The remainder of this report includes findings from the failing school site visit conducted on December 15, 2009, in which interviews with school personnel and the leadership team members were conducted, and the School was provided the opportunity to produce evidence of progress made toward school improvement. The findings include the review of all areas required in A.R.S. 15-241.U. A summary and staff recommendation follows.

### Summary of Findings

- In the fall of 2007, the School was designated as a first year underperforming school in accordance with A.R.S. § 15-241.
- The School was designated as a second year underperforming school in the fall of 2008.
- The School was designated as Failing to Meet Academic Standards in the fall of 2009.
- In FY 2003 through 2009, the Middle School did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) six out of the past seven years.

Year	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No

- The joint failing school site visit on December 15, 2009 by ADE and ASBCS reveals a low percentage of outcomes met the criteria on all seven (7) outcomes that include twenty (20) indicators in this report.
  - 50% of the outcomes failed to meet criteria
- 60% of the instructional staff (3 of 5) are non-highly qualified in the core content area they are assigned to teach.
- The School has not developed or implemented an explicit, written curriculum for Reading, Writing, and Math that is aligned with Arizona Academic Standards.

### Findings

#### **Outcome 1:** Has the school properly implemented its school improvement plan?

- To some extent the school is actively and with consistency, reliability, and commitment implementing the Arizona School Improvement Plan (ASIP) as outlined by the specific steps, actions and prescribed timeline.

- To a minimal extent the priorities of the Solutions Team Statement of Findings have been addressed.
- To a minimal extent the ASIP has been revised and adjusted to address ongoing needs based on data.

**Outcome 2: Is the school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards?**

- To a minimal extent the school has developed an explicit, written curriculum for at least Reading, Writing, and Math that is aligned with Arizona Academic Standards down to the performance objective level.
- There is not a process for monitoring, evaluating, and reviewing the curriculum in place.
- The curriculum does not integrate the fine arts, social studies, and science *for elementary grades served*.

**Outcome 3: Does the school provide teacher training/professional development?**

- Teacher training activities are not linked to the ASIP goals. Professional development activities are not evaluated to determine effectiveness and relativity to the ASIP.
- Professional development activities are not evaluated to determine effectiveness and relativity to the ASIP.
- To a minimal extent follow-up occurs after training sessions to provide feedback and to ensure that training is applied in the classroom.
- There is no plan to evaluate on-going, job-embedded professional development. (teacher training programs)

**Outcome 4: Has the school prioritized its budget?**

- To a minimal extent resources are allocated to match the identified student needs outlined in the ASIP.
- To a minimal extent procurement of instructional materials and resources is consistently compliant with school calendar and instructional timelines.
- To a minimal extent school-wide comprehensive professional learning is funded to support continuous improvement of school staff.

**Outcome 5: Does the school provide other proven strategies to improve academic performance?**

- To some extent systems and procedures are in place to create and maintain a safe school environment, a positive climate and productive culture that sustains the instructional and school improvement process.
- The school does not have a comprehensive assessment plan that utilizes data in a variety of ways to measure student performance and plan for teaching and learning.
- The school does not provide scientific research-based, intensive intervention strategies for those students who are identified as *Falls Far Below* or *Approaches the Standard* in Reading, Mathematics, or Writing.

**Outcome 6: Has the school demonstrated improvement in its ability to meet grade level academic standards in Mathematics and/or Reading and increase student academic achievement based on a review of the measures used to calculate AZ LEARNS achievement profiles?**

- AIMS reading scores in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade decreased from 2008 to 2009.
- AIMS math scores in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade increased from 2008 to 2009.
- 2009 AIMS reading and mathematics student scores were less (anywhere from 42% to 66%) than the State average as displayed in the table below:

Middle School	Reading (State Avg.) 2009	Reading Gila 2009	Math (State Avg.) 2009	Math Gila 2009
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	69%	29%	63%	21%
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	73%	7%	73%	21%
% students scoring at the meets or exceeds levels on AIMS in 2009.				

- 2007, 2008, and 2009 AIMS reading and mathematics student scores:

Middle School	Reading 2007	Reading 2008	Reading 2009	Math 2007	Math 2008	Math 2009
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	29%	33%	29%	7%	6%	21%
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	21%	25%	7%	14%	19%	21%
% students scoring at the meets or exceeds levels on AIMS in 2009.						

**Outcome 7: Does the charter and school have the capacity/sustainability for continued improvement?**

- There is no evidence of the roles and responsibilities of corporate entity, governing body and school leadership being appropriately implemented.
- There is no evidence that the leadership is capable of supporting the school site in the allocation of resources (fiscal, human, physical and time); and in the ongoing monitoring and technical assistance necessary for the school to progress on their ASIP goals.
- There is no evidence that school leadership demonstrates the skills necessary to lead a continuous school improvement process focused on increasing student achievement.
- To a minimal extent the instructional staff is capable of supporting the school; utilizing sufficient knowledge of subject matter, instructional techniques and assessments.

**Board Options**

- Make a determination to refer the matter to hearing for consideration of revocation of the charter.
- OR
- Provide an opportunity for the charter operator to enter into a Consent Agreement to restore the charter to acceptable performance by Fall 2010 for the Board’s consideration at its next meeting.

## **Staff Recommendation**

Refer the matter to hearing for consideration of revocation of the charter.

I move that, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-241(U), the Board refer this matter to hearing for consideration of revocation of the charter of Gila Educational Group. The hearing will be held by this Board in accordance with the uniform administrative hearing procedures contained at A.R.S. §§ 41-1092 through -1092.12. The Board will consider the evidence and testimony and then make Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and issue a Final Order.

I further move that:

- Within 48 hours of receipt of the Notice the charter operator shall notify staff and parents/guardians of registered students of Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School and Gila Preparatory Academy High School the Notice of Intent to Revoke and the Notice of Hearing and provide a school location where the copy may be reviewed;
- Within 20 days of receipt of the Notice the charter operator shall provide copies of all correspondence and communications used to comply with the preceding provision; and
- Within 20 days of receipt of the Notice the charter operator shall provide the Board with the names and mailing addresses of parents/guardians of all students registered with the school.

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

**Gila Educational Group**

Site: Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School

**Background Information**

Gila Educational Group, an Arizona non-profit corporation, operates Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School (School) and Gila Preparatory Academy High School. While the High School (9-12) is currently designated as Underperforming Year Two and did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2009, the focus of this report is on the Middle School (7-8) and its failing status. The Middle and High School share the same Principal and some of the same staff.

Gila Educational Group was granted a charter and began operation in the fall of 2002, serving approximately 39 students in grades six, seven, and eight. An amendment was approved for the 2008-09 school year to change grade levels served to seventh and eighth. The Corporation Commission lists two (2) officers and directors: Crae Wilson (President) and Sherli Skinner (Vice President). The Charter Representative is Crae Wilson, Jr., who is also the Principal for the Middle School and a teacher for the High School. The Governing Body is comprised of Crae Wilson, Jr., Sherli Skinner, Dee Lauritzen, Joy Flake and Joanna Robertson.

Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School is located in Safford, Arizona and primarily serves at-risk students, although the school was originally started with a college prep focus. At the time of the failing school site visit on December 15, 2009, the School reported an enrollment of 29 middle school students. The following chart lists some examples of State and Federal approximate revenues received by Gila Educational Group for the middle and high school from FY 2007 – FY 2010. According to the Arizona Department of Education’s grant management system, the School has not applied to receive any additional grants over the past seven years.

Revenue Category	FY 2010	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
100 <sup>th</sup> Day Student Count <i>MS=Middle School</i> <i>HS=High School</i>	MS=23 HS=66	MS=22.215 HS=65.917	MS=31.781 HS=55.070	MS=32.494 HS=56.238
State Equalization Assistance	\$576,672	\$619,156	\$520,735	\$576,504
Classroom Site Fund	\$32,957	\$63,565	\$59,318	\$52,416
Federal Monies	0	0	0	0
Total	\$609,629	\$682,721	\$580,053	\$628,920
Per Pupil Revenue	\$6,850	\$7,747	\$6,679	\$7,088

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

In the fall of 2007 Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School was designated as a first year underperforming school in accordance with A.R.S. §15-241. The School was required to notify the parents of the students attending Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School of the underperforming classification and create an Arizona School Improvement Plan (ASIP). Following the submission of the ASIP, the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) scheduled a Solutions Team to visit the School and meet with stakeholders. This visit took place on March 26 - 27, 2008. Using the *Standards and Rubrics for School Improvement*, the team answered three questions:

1. Does the school's Arizona School Improvement Plan appear to be a sound plan for improving student performance?
2. Do the structures and conditions appear to be in place for successful implementation of the school's Arizona School Improvement Plan?
3. What recommendations can be provided that will assist the school with the implementation of its Arizona School Improvement Plan?

Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School received a copy of the Solution Team's Statement of Findings to use as technical assistance to validate or to re-direct the School's improvement efforts as well as offer specific recommendations for moving forward. An underperforming school may revise its ASIP at any time, using new data to evaluate and revise its goals and benchmarks as appropriate. An ASSIST Coach was also assigned to offer support for school improvement efforts. The School did provide evidence of a current revised ASIP for 2009-10.

In addition, the school was designated as a second year underperforming school in the fall of 2008 and subsequently Failing to Meet Academic Standards in 2009. This failing designation led to a joint evaluation of the School by staff from ADE's School Effectiveness Division and the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools (ASBCS). The remainder of this report includes findings from the failing school site visit conducted on December 15, 2009, in which interviews with school personnel and the leadership team members were conducted, and the School was provided the opportunity to produce evidence of progress made toward school improvement. The findings include the review of all areas required in A.R.S. 15-241.U. A summary and staff recommendation is provided at the end of this report.

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

**Findings**

**OUTCOME 1: Has the school properly implemented its school improvement plan?**

**Background:** ADE provides training and a template for completing the prescribed format for the ASIP. Additional support may be requested for completing the plan. As stated previously, a Solutions Team does provide a Statement of Findings, which includes priority recommendations to assist the school in successfully implementing and sustaining its ASIP.

Based on a review of the information available it has been determined that:

- The school is actively and with consistency, reliability, and commitment implementing the Arizona School Improvement Plan (ASIP) as outlined by the specific steps, actions and prescribed timeline.
- To some extent the school is actively and with consistency, reliability, and commitment implementing the Arizona School Improvement Plan (ASIP) as outlined by the specific steps, actions and prescribed timeline.
- To a minimal extent the school is actively and with consistency, reliability, and commitment implementing the Arizona School Improvement Plan (ASIP) as outlined by the specific steps, actions and prescribed timeline.
- The school is not actively and with consistency, reliability, and commitment implementing the Arizona School Improvement Plan (ASIP) as outlined by the specific steps, actions and prescribed timeline.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- A copy of the 2009-10 ASIP indicates revisions have been made, to include 10 written goals. Goals range from increasing reading, writing, and mathematics AIMS scores to creating individual professional development plans for teachers.
- The principal provided a written and oral report on the progress made towards the ASIP goals this school year. Some examples are:
  - A written curriculum for core content areas is being developed by a curriculum consultant who was hired in November, 2009
  - Two benchmark assessments have been given to students in the fall of 2009
  - Teachers have created individual professional development plans

- The priorities of the Solutions Team Statement of Findings have been addressed.
- To some extent the priorities of the Solutions Team Statement of Findings have been addressed.
- To a minimal extent the priorities of the Solutions Team Statement of Findings have been addressed.
- The priorities of the Solutions Team Statement of Findings have not been addressed.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- Priority recommendations made by the Solutions Team in 2008 are marginally addressed in the 10 goals included in the revised 2009-10 ASIP.
  - Solutions Team Recommendation #2 -- Instructional practices must be directly linked to State Academic Standards in all content areas. The ASIP includes

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

goals on evaluating teachers incorporating the State Academic Standards into instruction and each teacher creating an individual professional development plan.

- The teacher self-evaluation forms, Rate Your Overall Effectiveness in the Classroom and Rate Your Understanding of Certain State Standards, ask the teachers to rate their overall effectiveness in the classroom and understanding of implementing the standards into instruction.
  - The Classroom Observation form and Walk-thru Observation protocol provided include an area for the Principal to record observation of objectives posted and/or reviewed with students.
  - Solutions Team Recommendation #3 – Professional development must be designed and aligned to meet ASIP goals. The ASIP includes goals focusing on increasing student achievement on AIMS in the areas of math, reading, and writing.
    - The professional development goal in ASIP states teachers will create individual professional development plans.
      - The principal stated in his written progress report on ASIP that teachers were developing their professional development plans based on their weaknesses as evidenced by the teachers' evaluation.
  - According to the Principal, he transitioned into this role in January 2009 and is attempting to address all findings.
- The ASIP has been revised and adjusted to address ongoing needs based on data.
- To some extent the ASIP has been revised and adjusted to address ongoing needs based on data.
- To a minimal extent the ASIP has been revised and adjusted to address ongoing needs based on data.
- The ASIP has not been revised and adjusted to address ongoing needs based on data.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- The School provided a copy of the 2009-10 ASIP which has been revised and includes the Solutions Team Statement of Findings priority recommendations.
- The school lacks the ability to manage and track data and is confident the purchase of Galileo software in the near future will assist in addressing ongoing needs based on available data. According to the Principal, it is a challenge to obtain current and relevant data.

**OUTCOME 2:** Is the school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards?

**Background:** Beginning with the 2004-2005 school year, charter schools were required to submit Declarations of Curricular and Instructional Alignment to the ADE. The three parts of the Declaration ensured that the Governing Board of the charter had adopted a curriculum aligned to the Arizona Academic Standards (“Standards”), and that the charter administration

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

1) provided instructional materials aligned to the Standards, as well as 2) provided opportunities for teachers to receive training related to the Standards, and 3) utilized an evaluation tool to assess whether teachers integrated the Standards into their instructional practices.

Based on a review of the information available it has been determined that:

- The school has developed an explicit, written curriculum for at least Reading, Writing, and Math that is aligned with Arizona Academic Standards down to the performance objective level.
- To some extent the school has developed an explicit, written curriculum for at least Reading, Writing, and Math that is aligned with Arizona Academic Standards down to the performance objective level.
- To a minimal extent the school has developed an explicit, written curriculum for at least Reading, Writing, and Math that is aligned with Arizona Academic Standards down to the performance objective level.
- The school has not developed a written curriculum for at least Reading, Writing, and Math that is aligned with Arizona Academic Standards down to the performance objective level.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- The Leadership Team shared that Dr. Tom Sullivan (consultant) has been hired to support the teaching staff in building curriculum guides this year. According to the November 5, 2009 Governing Board Agenda, Dr. Sullivan was approved as a curriculum consultant and the curriculum work would be completed by the end of November or the first of December of 2009. This board approval occurred approximately six weeks prior to the onsite failing school visit.
  - Dr. Sullivan stated during his presentation he has been working with the staff on curriculum for approximately six weeks. Curriculum guides are being placed on teacher computers as some classrooms do not have textbooks.
  - In the written ASIP Progress Report, dated December 7, 2009, the Principal wrote “teachers have worked with Mr. Sullivan and the curriculum is complete as of today”.
    - During the interviews with the teachers, responses indicated the curriculum was not a completed formal written document. No one mentioned a curriculum guide being placed on their computer for access. Teachers disclosed they are responsible for locating teaching materials and ensuring alignment with the standards. They also shared the Arizona Academic Standards are the guide for teaching and lesson planning.
- During the failing school site visit on December 15, 2009, lesson plans from classroom observations were requested, and received on January 14, 2010.
  - The lesson plans for math, basic math, reading, and English are vague and lack details in the areas of standard’s alignment, instruction, activities, assessments, or scoring rubrics.
- Unit plan template samples were placed in a failing school site visit notebook created by the Principal. The unit plans lack details in some essential areas.

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

- The sample curriculum guides in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading, writing, and math provided do not consistently contain instruction, activity suggestions or examples, supplementary resources, a variety of effective assessment strategies, or timelines which are standard elements of such guides.
- A systematic process for annually monitoring, evaluating, and reviewing the curriculum is in place.
- To some extent there is a systematic process for annually monitoring, evaluating, and reviewing the curriculum in place.
- To a minimal extent there is a process for monitoring, evaluating, and reviewing the curriculum in place.
- There is not a process for monitoring, evaluating, and reviewing the curriculum in place.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- No documentation was provided that describes a systematic process for monitoring, evaluating, and reviewing the curriculum.
  - Dr. Sullivan did not discuss a process for monitoring, evaluating, and reviewing the curriculum in his presentation during the failing school site visit.
    - The Principal stated the teachers are learning about this curriculum writing process and working with Dr. Sullivan. It is his intention to review all curriculum once it is developed.

- There is a comprehensive curriculum that fully integrates the fine arts, social studies, and science *for elementary grades served*.
- To some extent there is a comprehensive curriculum that fully integrates the fine arts, social studies, and science *for elementary grades served*.
- To a minimal extent there is a comprehensive curriculum that fully integrates the fine arts, social studies, and science *for elementary grades served*.
- The curriculum does not integrate the fine arts, social studies, and science *for elementary grades served*.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- A review of the unit plan templates provided on the December 15, 2009 failing school site visit did not include fine arts, social studies, and science. The samples provided were 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading, writing, and math.
- The lesson plans received on January 14, 2010 for the December 15, 2009 failing school site visit did not show any evidence of the integration of fine arts, social studies, or science with the core content areas.
  - The Principal stated reading, writing, and math content areas were the focus of curriculum development this year. The goal is to complete all curriculum areas by May, 2010.

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

**OUTCOME 3: Does the school provide teacher training/professional development?**

**Background:** After the school identifies a school improvement goal, one of the questions asked in the plan is, “What professional development will staff need to implement the interventions/reforms?” The information below is directly tied to the information in the school’s ASIP pertaining to identified teacher training/professional development.

Based on a review of the information available it has been determined that:

- Teacher training activities are linked to the ASIP goals.
- To some extent teacher training activities are linked to the ASIP goals. Professional development activities are somewhat evaluated to determine effectiveness and relativity to the ASIP.
- To a minimal extent teacher training activities are linked to the ASIP goals. Professional development activities are minimally evaluated to determine effectiveness and relativity to the ASIP.
- Teacher training activities are not linked to the ASIP goals. Professional development activities are not evaluated to determine effectiveness and relativity to the ASIP.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- No school-wide professional development calendar for 2009-10 was provided to determine if training is aligned with ASIP goals.
- Teachers develop an individual professional development plan based on their interests and needs as evidenced by teacher and leadership interviews and the current ASIP.
- Unable to locate sign-in sheets or agendas for 2009-10 professional development that evidences Marzano strategy training occurred for all staff as written in the 2009-10 Preliminary Professional Development Plan Overview.
- The school submitted a report that shows \$2,851.57 in expenditures from the professional development budget line item. One item on 10/15/09 is documented as Harry Wong training for \$100.00. All other items are not described.

- Professional development activities are evaluated to determine effectiveness and relativity to the ASIP.
- To some extent professional development activities are somewhat evaluated to determine effectiveness and relativity to the ASIP.
- To a minimal extent professional development activities are minimally evaluated to determine effectiveness and relativity to the ASIP.
- Professional development activities are not evaluated to determine effectiveness and relativity to the ASIP.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- No documentation was provided that evaluation of professional development activities is taking place.

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

- Follow-up occurs after training sessions to provide feedback and to ensure that training is applied in the classroom.
- To some extent follow-up occurs after training sessions to provide feedback and to ensure that training is applied in the classroom.
- To a minimal extent follow-up occurs after training sessions to provide feedback and to ensure that training is applied in the classroom.
- Follow-up does not occur after training sessions to provide feedback and to ensure that training is applied in the classroom.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- Two examples of staff evaluations (math and science content) were presented that evidenced observation (November – December, 2009) of the nine Marzano strategies being documented by the Principal. The Marzano strategies are linked to the ASIP plan to increase student math achievement.
- The Principal stated he needs to visit classrooms on a regular basis and provide feedback, however, this is challenging as he teaches four (4) periods per day in the high school. The Principal's goal, as stated by him, is to walk-thru classrooms one time per month.

- There is an effective plan to evaluate on-going, job-embedded professional development. (teacher training programs)
- To some extent there is a plan to evaluate on-going, job-embedded professional development. (teacher training programs)
- To a minimal extent there is a plan to evaluate on-going, job-embedded professional development. (teacher training programs)
- There is no plan to evaluate on-going, job-embedded professional development. (teacher training programs)

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- There is no formalized process for evaluating on-going, job-embedded professional development as evidenced by the teacher and leadership interview responses or proof in a written document.

**OUTCOME 4: Has the school prioritized its budget?**

**Background:** Whether it is the review, development or purchase of instructional materials, providing teacher training/professional development, purchase of technology, or contracting with consultants, the identified interventions in the ASIP will generally require additional funds or the reallocation of existing funds. Multiple funding sources are available for charters that could be used for school improvement. Sources are, but are not limited to, Classroom Site Funds, Instructional Improvement Funds (Indian Gaming Revenues), Title I School Improvement grants, and State Equalization payments.

Based on a review of the information available it has been determined that:

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

- Resources are allocated to match the identified student needs outlined in the ASIP.
- To some extent resources are allocated to match the identified student needs outlined in the ASIP.
- To a minimal extent resources are allocated to match the identified student needs outlined in the ASIP.
- Resources are not allocated to match the identified student needs outlined in the ASIP.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- The Principal stated in the leadership team interview the budget is not aligned with the ASIP so it is challenging to implement revised goals.
  - The Galileo assessment system is scheduled to be purchased in January 2010. The funding has to be identified in the budget.
- When the Principal was questioned in the leadership interview about the need for textbooks, he stated the school could purchase more, but had not due to concerns with specific curriculum that needed to be addressed first.
- Unable to identify specific funding details for ASIP goals, such as professional development.
- The Leadership Team shared tutoring is offered to address student needs.
  - According to the Arizona Department of Education's grant management system, Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School has not applied to receive grant funding for tutoring.

- Procurement of instructional materials and resources is consistently compliant with school calendar and instructional timelines.
- To some extent procurement of instructional materials and resources is consistently compliant with school calendar and instructional timelines.
- To a minimal extent procurement of instructional materials and resources is consistently compliant with school calendar and instructional timelines.
- Procurement of instructional materials and resources is not consistently compliant with school calendar and instructional timelines.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- During the leadership interview, the Galileo assessment system was reported as an upcoming purchase in January 2010.
- At the end of each school year future classroom material requests are submitted.
  - The principal stated ongoing classroom supply purchases are made when teachers identify a need.
    - Teachers commented in the interview there was a lack of money and textbooks and instructional materials are limited.
- Library books were available on site but access is limited due to there is no designated library space or librarian. This was observed during the site tour and classroom observations.

- School-wide comprehensive professional learning is adequately funded to support continuous improvement of school staff.

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

- To some extent school-wide comprehensive professional learning is funded to support continuous improvement of school staff learning.
- To a minimal extent school-wide comprehensive professional learning is funded to support continuous improvement of school staff.
- School-wide comprehensive professional learning is not funded to support continuous improvement of school staff learning.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- Teachers shared during the interview session they are encouraged to attend professional development if they identify a session of interest and there is available funding.
- Curriculum consultant is being paid from purchased services.
- Unable to identify a specific funding source for professional development that aligns with the ASIP goal in documents provided.
  - July – December 2009 Transaction Detail by Account documents provided do not include specific details on professional development. On 10/15/09, in the instructional staff professional development expenditure line item, there is an entry for \$100 paid to Harry Wong.

**OUTCOME 5:** Does the school provide other proven strategies to improve academic performance?

**Background:** Analyzing the data generated through student performance assessments and utilizing that data to plan for additional teaching and learning activities may result in improved academic performance. Additionally, having a safe and positive climate conducive to learning may also improve academic performance. Included in the needs assessment portion of the ASIP are guiding questions for both evaluating classroom and school assessments and the school's climate and culture. The School's historical compliance with fingerprint clearance card requirements for teachers may provide additional evidence of efforts to provide a safe learning environment.

Based on a review of the information available it has been determined that:

- Systems and procedures are in place to create and maintain a safe school environment, a positive climate, and a productive culture that sustains the instructional and school improvement process.
- To some extent systems and procedures are in place to create and maintain a safe school environment, a positive climate and productive culture that sustains the instructional and school improvement process.
- To a minimal extent systems and procedures are in place to create and maintain a safe school environment, a positive climate and productive culture that sustains the instructional and school improvement process.

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

- There are no systems and procedures are in place to create and maintain a safe school environment, a positive climate and productive culture that sustains the instructional and school improvement process.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- A school-wide student behavior incentive program, Choices and Consequences Help Inspire Proactive Students (CHIPS), has been implemented this year.
- A copy of the 2009-10 Student/Parent Handbook includes information, procedures, and policies related to dress code, truancy, discipline, and behavior expectations.
- Attendance procedures have been tightened and require any student absences to be made up through an alternative schedule. This is confirmed in the Student/Parent Handbook.
- All classroom doors are locked from the exterior as a safety measure as observed during the failing school site visit tour and classroom observations.

- The school has a comprehensive assessment plan that utilizes data in a variety of ways to measure student performance and plan for teaching and learning.
- To some extent the school has a comprehensive assessment plan that utilizes data in a variety of ways to measure student performance and plan for teaching and learning.
- To a minimal extent the school has a comprehensive assessment plan that utilizes data in a variety of ways to measure student performance and plan for teaching and learning.
- The school does not have a comprehensive assessment plan that utilizes data in a variety of ways to measure student performance and plan for teaching and learning.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- The Assessment Calendar for 2009-10 is vague. There are no specific assessments or timelines included in the calendar.
- The Principal stated it was difficult to track student data as a high number of student withdrawals impact data collection, tracking, and analysis.
  - Student AIMS data is provided to teachers at the beginning of the year to use for planning of instruction as reported in the teacher and leadership team interviews.
- In January, 2010 there is an anticipated purchase of the Galileo assessment system to assist with benchmarking and tracking data as shared in the leadership interview.
  - Teachers and leadership confirmed benchmark assessments are in the developing stage this year. Two assessments had been administered prior to the failing school site visit.
  - Samples of benchmark assessments for the first two quarters were provided during the failing school site visit; however performance objectives and proficiency levels were not identified.

- The school provides intensive scientific research-based intervention strategies for those students who are identified as *Falls Far Below* or *Approaches the Standard* in Reading, Mathematics, or Writing.

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

- To some extent the school provides scientific research-based, intensive intervention strategies for those students who are identified as *Falls Far Below* or *Approaches the Standard* in Reading, Mathematics, or Writing.
- To a minimal extent the school provides scientific research-based, intensive intervention strategies for those students who are identified as *Falls Far Below* or *Approaches the Standard* in Reading, Mathematics, or Writing.
- The school does not provide scientific research-based, intensive intervention strategies for those students who are identified as *Falls Far Below* or *Approaches the Standard* in Reading, Mathematics, or Writing.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- No scientific research-based intervention school-wide plan was presented during the failing school site visit.
- The Leadership Team stated peer assistance and peer buddies in the math class provide support for struggling students this year.
  - The instructional staff shared in the teacher interviews they are available to tutor any student at the end of the school day.
- The instructional team formally meets to address student needs when identified. There is a large percentage of the study body that is classified as requiring special education services as reported by the Leadership Team.

**OUTCOME 6:** Has the school demonstrated improvement in its ability to meet grade level academic standards in Mathematics and/or Reading, and increase student academic achievement based on a review of the measures used to calculate AZ LEARNS achievement profiles?

**Background:** Although a school may not meet the requisite criteria to be identified as a Performing, Performing Plus, Highly Performing or Excelling school, a review of the data elements and academic measures (independent of the AZ LEARNS formula) may demonstrate that the school has improved its ability to meet State standards in specific subjects and grades and demonstrated specific changes in academic achievement at the school, grade and/or student level.

The following review of academic data is provided:

- AIMS reading scores in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade decreased from 2008 to 2009.
- AIMS math scores in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade increased from 2008 to 2009.
- 2009 AIMS reading and mathematics student scores were less (anywhere from 42% to 66%) than the State average as displayed in the table below:

Middle School	Reading (State Avg.) 2009	Reading Gila 2009	Math (State Avg.) 2009	Math Gila 2009
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	69%	29%	63%	21%
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	73%	7%	73%	21%
% students scoring at the meets or exceeds levels on AIMS in 2009.				

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

- 2007, 2008, and 2009 AIMS reading and mathematics student scores:

Middle School	Reading 2007	Reading 2008	Reading 2009	Math 2007	Math 2008	Math 2009
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	29%	33%	29%	7%	6%	21%
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	21%	25%	7%	14%	19%	21%
% students scoring at the meets or exceeds levels on AIMS in 2009.						

**OUTCOME 7: Does the charter and school have the capacity/sustainability for continued improvement?**

**Background:** School improvement is not a quick fix, but rather a process. When a school identifies areas of school improvement (establishes goals) and determines the best means to implement change (action plan), it must also look at its ability to maintain the processes/procedures that have been determined appropriate to cause change (school improvement). No matter what the goal(s), the school must have the capacity (i.e. leadership, staff, financial resources, facility, and expertise) to monitor the effectiveness of the action plan and continue the improvement process.

Based on a review of the information available it has been determined that:

- Roles and responsibilities of corporate entity, governing body and school leadership are consistently and appropriately implemented.
- To some extent the roles and responsibilities of corporate entity, governing body and school leadership are consistently and appropriately implemented.
- To a minimal extent the roles and responsibilities of corporate entity, governing body and school leadership are consistently and appropriately implemented.
- There is no evidence of the roles and responsibilities of corporate entity, governing body and school leadership being appropriately implemented.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- During the five-year site visit (05/15/08), conducted by ASBCS staff, the former Middle School Principal stated there were no changes in methodology or instructional delivery being made, although the school was designated as Underperforming Year Two.
- Crae Wilson is the Charter Representative, Corporate President, Governing Body member, Middle School Principal, and High School Teacher.
- The Principal expressed the team did not understand last year how much effort it was going to take to pull out of underperforming and failing school status.
- For the second year in a row, the fiscal year 2009 audit indicated that duties were not adequately segregated for several operating and accounting functions.

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

- Further, the fiscal year 2009 audit identified noncompliance with Gila Preparatory Academy High School not providing the minimum number of 123 instructional hours for high school subjects. Specifically, the audit identified this issue for 14 of 24 high school subjects. The instructional time provided by the school for these subjects ranged from approximately 114.5 to 120.5 hours.
- Gila Preparatory Academy High School, operating under the same contract, is in year two of underperforming status. The High School which shares the same building space and some staff members
  - AIMS and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data

2009 High School AIMS reading and mathematics student scores were less than the State average as displayed in the table below:

High School	Reading (State Avg.) 2009	Reading Gila 2009	Math (State Avg.) 2009	Math Gila 2009
	67%	38% (29% less than State)	58%	5% (53% less than State)
% students scoring at the meets or exceeds levels on AIMS in 2009.				

2007, 2008, and 2009 High School AIMS student scores:

High School	Reading 2007	Reading 2008	Reading 2009	Math 2007	Math 2008	Math 2009
	50%	17%	38%	13%	4%	5%
% students scoring at the meets or exceeds levels on AIMS.						

AYP (2003 – 2009)

High School	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

- Leadership is fully capable of supporting the school site in the allocation of resources (fiscal, human, physical and time); and in the ongoing monitoring and technical assistance necessary for the school to progress on their ASIP goals.
- To some extent the leadership is capable of supporting the school site in the allocation of resources (fiscal, human, physical and time); and in the ongoing monitoring and technical assistance necessary for the school to progress on their ASIP goals.
- To a minimal extent the leadership is capable of supporting the school site in the allocation of resources (fiscal, human, physical and time); and in the ongoing monitoring and technical assistance necessary for the school to progress on their ASIP goals.

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

- There is no evidence that the leadership is capable of supporting the school site in the allocation of resources (fiscal, human, physical and time); and in the ongoing monitoring and technical assistance necessary for the school to progress on their ASIP goals.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- The Principal is in his second year in this position that requires multiple roles in a small setting with minimal staff. He serves as the Charter Representative, Corporate Board President, member of the Governing Body, Middle School Principal, and High School teacher.
- The Principal teaches four (4) of seven (7) periods per instructional day.
  - Unable to determine if Principal can fulfill instructional leadership role and responsibilities.
- Non-highly qualified staff was hired for 2009-10 school year.
- Although the Solutions Team identified in March of 2008 a need for instructional practices to be aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards, a curriculum consultant was not hired until November, 2009.
- Teachers shared there were limited resources due to a lack of money.
  - During the classroom observations, the resources in classrooms appeared to be limited; textbooks, supplemental materials, classroom libraries, resource posters.

- School leadership demonstrates the skills necessary to lead a continuous school improvement process focused on increasing student achievement.
- To some extent school leadership demonstrates the skills necessary to lead a continuous school improvement process focused on increasing student achievement.
- To a minimal school leadership demonstrates the skills necessary to lead a continuous school improvement process focused on increasing student achievement.
- There is no evidence that school leadership demonstrates the skills necessary to lead a continuous school improvement process focused on increasing student achievement.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- The Principal is in his second year in this position and performs multiple roles, to include teaching High School courses 4 of 7 periods per instructional day.
  - The Principal stated he would like to reach his goal of being in classrooms one time per month.
  - Classroom observation forms and teacher evaluations provided were dated between November and December of 2009.
    - Minimal written feedback is provided by the Principal on the above forms. Unable to determine alignment with school improvement, increasing student achievement, or ASIP goals.
  - Unable to determine if professional development is aligned with the ASIP goals. Sign-in sheets and/or agendas for 2009-10 professional development provided, with the exception of the July Synergy Summit, do not include details.

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

- Instructional staff is fully capable of supporting the school; utilizing sufficient knowledge of subject matter, instructional techniques and assessments.
- To some extent the instructional staff is capable of supporting the school; utilizing sufficient knowledge of subject matter, instructional techniques and assessments.
- To a minimal extent the instructional staff is capable of supporting the school; utilizing sufficient knowledge of subject matter, instructional techniques and assessments.
- There is no evidence that the instructional staff is capable of supporting the school; utilizing sufficient knowledge of subject matter, instructional techniques and assessments.

The determination is supported by the following facts:

- Three of the five teachers are not highly qualified in the content areas (Math, Art, and Spanish) they teach as stated by the Principal, indicated on the 2009-10 Arizona Highly Qualified Attestation Forms, and confirmed by ADE on January 13, 2009.
- The Principal presented a classroom observation schedule for the failing school site visit team on December 15, 2009.
  - During the failing school site visit, observations occurred in 7<sup>th</sup> grade English, 8<sup>th</sup> grade Math and Science, and High School Financial Planning classrooms.
    - The 7<sup>th</sup> grade English class instruction was unclear as the teacher struggled with converting a single sentence to a compound sentence then to a complex sentence using student initiated ideas. Just over half of the students were engaged in the lesson and on-task during the worksheet activity of creating simple, compound, and complex sentences. No checking for understanding occurred by the teacher.
    - The 8<sup>th</sup> grade Math teacher was writing divisibility rules on the board for students to copy. 13 of 16 students were on task and copying the rules to their own paper.
    - The High School Financial Planning classroom began daily instruction 11 minutes after the period started.
    - Lesson plans from classroom observations were requested and not readily available. Lesson plans were received as of January 14, 2010. Not all plans consistently include enough details to determine if instruction, activities, or assessments align with the stated performance objectives.

**Summary of Findings**

- In the fall of 2007, the School was designated as a first year underperforming school in accordance with A.R.S. § 15-241.
- The School was designated as a second year underperforming school in the fall of 2008.
- The School was designated as Failing to Meet Academic Standards in the fall of 2009.
- In FY 2003 through 2009, the Middle School did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) six out of the past seven years.

Year	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AYP	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No

ADE School Effectiveness and ASBCS Staff Joint Report  
for Consideration of Revocation or Restoration to Acceptable Performance

- The joint failing school site visit on December 15, 2009 by ADE and ASBCS reveals a low percentage of outcomes met the criteria on all seven (7) outcomes that include twenty (20) indicators in this report.
  - 50% of the outcomes failed to meet criteria
- 60% of the instructional staff (3 of 5) are non-highly qualified in the core content area they are assigned to teach.
- The School has not developed or implemented an explicit, written curriculum for Reading, Writing, and Math that is aligned with Arizona Academic Standards.

**Board Options**

- Make a determination to refer the matter to hearing for consideration of revocation of the charter.

OR

- Provide an opportunity for the charter operator to enter into a Consent Agreement to restore the charter to acceptable performance by Fall 2010 for the Board's consideration at its next meeting.

**Staff Recommendation**

Refer the matter to hearing for consideration of revocation of the charter.

I move that, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-241(U), the Board refer this matter to hearing for consideration of revocation of the charter of Gila Educational Group. The hearing will be held by this Board in accordance with the uniform administrative hearing procedures contained at A.R.S. §§ 41-1092 through -1092.12. The Board will consider the evidence and testimony and then make Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and issue a Final Order.

I further move that:

- Within 48 hours of receipt of the Notice the charter operator shall notify staff and parents/guardians of registered students of Gila Preparatory Academy Middle School and Gila Preparatory Academy High School the Notice of Intent to Revoke and the Notice of Hearing and provide a school location where the copy may be reviewed;
- Within 20 days of receipt of the Notice the charter operator shall provide copies of all correspondence and communications used to comply with the preceding provision; and
- Within 20 days of receipt of the Notice the charter operator shall provide the Board with the names and mailing addresses of parents/guardians of all students registered with the school.