Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Legacy Education Group
School Name: East Valley High School
Site Visit Date: March 2, 2015

Required for: Annual Report
Evaluation Criteria Area: Monitoring Instruction

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[M.1] **A Long Way Gone quiz** **Algebra Chapter Tests** **Algebra 2 Chapter Tests** **Am Lit Quarter 3 quiz** **Am Lit R and R quiz** **Am Lit Semester 1 Final** **Am Lit Semester 1 Post-Test** **Am Lit Quiz** **Beowulf Anglo Saxons Quiz** **Brit Lit Semester 1 Post-Test** **Brit Lit Semester 1 Pre-Test** **British Lit Final** **Cell Division & Mutation Test** **Complex Genetics Test** **DNA & Protein Synthesis Test** **ELA Exam** **EVHS Lit** **Glass Castle quiz** **Macbeth Act 1 quiz** **Macbeth quiz 2** **Macbeth quiz 3** **Mendelian genetics quiz** **S1 Test 1-5** **S2 Test 1-3** **Scarlet Letter quiz** **Social Studies 2** **Social Studies lesson plans 2** **Social Studies lesson plans** **Social Studies syllabus 2** **Social Studies syllabus 3** **Social Studies syllabus** **Social Studies** **Test Scientific Method**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the Charter Holder's process for monitoring the integration of standards into classroom instruction and how the Charter Holder monitors whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The Charter Holder provided an evaluation tool and indicated that the first set of six questions related to the monitoring of instruction. The questions address: 1. Knowledge of content & pedagogy, 2. Demonstrating knowledge of students, 3. Setting instructional outcomes, 4. Demonstrating knowledge of resources, 5. Designing coherent instruction, and 6. Designing student assessments. Within the evaluation tool is the rubric used for this evaluation, titled Planning & Preparation. Although the rubric does not contain any statements that address evaluating the integration of standards, the principal has documented the standard that was in place at the time of the observation. The curriculum map/pacing guide indicate this standard should have taken place in weeks 6-9 for Math. For ELA the evaluation and map/guide aligned for standards taking place in week 3. • Also, frequent informal walkthrough evaluations allows for evaluation for the fidelity of teacher lesson plans. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Copy of tests for a variety of high school courses were provided by the Charter Holder. Each test provides the question and the skill that is being assessed. The Charter Holder indicated that these tests demonstrate that students are being administered summative assessments and that evidence may be provided to demonstrate the scores received in those tests. • A copy of a "Systems Self-Assessment" was provided by the Charter Holder that includes elements for Classroom Observation and Walk-throughs and Targeted Teacher Assistance/Supervision/Evaluation. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • The tests provided by the Charter Holder do not demonstrate a process for monitoring the integration of standards into classroom instruction or whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. • The self-assessment form was provided as a blank template and the Charter Holder did not provide a completed form.

Tutor Forms **Legacy Schools Evaluation System** **Pacing guide – Bio** **Pacing guide – Science** **RTI Lesson Plan RAD** **Teacher Perf Eval Tool** **Systems Self-Assessment**	
[M.2] **Svedin_datatalkQ2** **Danderson_datatalkQ2** **Walkthrough forms** **Teacher Perf Eval Tool**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how does the Charter Holder monitor the effectiveness of standards-based instruction throughout the year. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The Charter Holder monitors the effectiveness of standards-based instruction annually by analyzing assessment data and determines whether it be teacher criterion created or the norm-referenced quarterly benchmark. The Charter Holder provided a form titled, Data Meeting Steps and Structure. Specifically, Step 2 addresses analyzing strengths and obstacles. This form addresses the strengths and obstacles for the students in the class and is used to establish goals based on assessment data. This is completed twice per year and identifies if the goals have been met based on incorporating specific instructional strategies that address the class' obstacles. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Walkthrough forms are conducted by the principal at least twice per week per teacher. The school currently has seven FT teachers. The walkthrough is a 5 minute observation and evaluate a teacher's skill on the use of critical questions, anticipatory set, vocabulary terms posted, associations made between words, and use of mind maps. In addition, the principal checks to see what standard is being used. However, the walkthrough form does not indicate the principal checks for standard alignment. The Charter Holder indicated that he does check for it but that it is not documented. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** Although the walkthrough forms address whether a teacher is performing a skill correctly or not it does not provide evidence that the instruction is standards-based.
[M.3] **Legacy Schools Evaluation System** **Walkthrough forms** **Teacher Perf Eval Tool**	**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:** • The Charter Holder provided a form titled, Data Meeting Steps and Structure. Specifically, Step 2 addresses

Svedin_datatalkQ2 **Danderson_datatalkQ2**	analyzing strengths and obstacles. This form addresses the strengths and obstacles for the students in the class and is used to establish goals based on assessment data. This is completed twice per year and identifies if the goals have been met based on incorporating specific instructional strategies that address the class' obstacles. • Walkthrough forms are conducted by the principal at least twice per week per teacher. The school currently has seven FT teachers. The walkthrough is a 5 minute observation and evaluates a teacher's skill on the use of critical questions, anticipatory set, vocabulary terms posted, associations made between words, and use of mind maps. • The Charter Holder provided an evaluation tool and indicated that areas II. Classroom Environment and III. Instruction include elements that address creating an environment, establishing culture, managing classroom procedures, managing student behavior, communicating with students, question and discussion technique, engagement, using assessment, and demonstrating flexibility and responsive ness. Within the evaluation tool is the rubric used for this evaluation, titled Planning & Preparation. This evaluation is conducted twice per year.
[M.4] **Legacy Schools Evaluation System** **Walkthrough forms** **Teacher Perf Eval Tool**	**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 Evaluation Tool document describes the process utilized for evaluating teachers. It is broken down in three components. The first component is a summative evaluation form and utilizes the four domains for evaluating. The second component is the walk-through that is conducted on a continuous basis, and the third is documentation of the quantitative classroom data on student academic progress. The evaluation tool utilizes a scoring range from 0-3 and has a column for "Strengths and Recommendations". It is in this column that the principal identifies strengths and weaknesses. Needs are identified if a teacher receives a low rating of 0 or 1. • The Charter Holder provided walkthrough forms that identified a weakness in the instructional strategy of a teacher. The total maximum points that can be received are 15 and this teacher received 11 points. The form identified the strategy of "students paraphrasing previous student followed by own opinion". The Charter Holder indicated that a need is identified when a teacher receives 10-12 and if that need is identified at least three to four more times, which indicates a pattern.

[M.5] **Walkthrough forms** **Teacher Perf Eval Tool**	**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:** • The teacher evaluations are provided to teachers annually and they sign off on those evaluations. Documentation was provided to demonstrate evidence that teachers have reviewed their teacher evaluations. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Walkthrough forms are provided to teachers after their observation have been conducted. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** The Charter Holder indicated that weekly and daily meetings are conducted to provide teachers feedback on their walkthrough observations and usually they are conducted in the mornings as the principal is greeting teachers or individually after an observation. The Charter Holder was unable to provide any evidence of those communications with teacher regarding providing them feedback on strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs based on the evaluation of instructional practices.
[M.6] **Walkthrough forms** **Teacher Perf Eval Tool**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder analyzes this information, what the data about quality of instruction tells the Charter Holder and what the Charter Holder has done in response. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Information is analyzed through the scores that teachers receive on their evaluations. The rating in the scores range from 0 to 3. The Charter Holder indicated that the evaluations are analyzed by looking at the scoring of each individual teacher and determining what the needs are. Meetings are conducted based on the analysis of the information in the evaluation. • Walkthrough forms are analyzed continuously and addressed with each teacher individually or as a whole PD session. The principal keeps a binder with all the completed walkthrough forms **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** Both documents do not demonstrate evidence of how the Charter Holder analyzes the information from the teacher evaluation and walkthroughs, what data indicates about the quality of instruction and what the Charter Holder does in response.

[M.7] **RTI Quarter 1 Narrative**	**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:** • Charter Holder provided RTI Quarter 1 Narrative to show evidence of how teachers working with the subgroups are being monitored. The RTI staff member indicated that these narratives are compiled by sitting with the teacher at the end of a quarter to discuss how the students are doing. She indicated that walkthroughs are conducted periodically but not documented. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** The RTI narrative does not demonstrate that teachers are monitored for their instruction with students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non proficient because the discussions are not conducted while the teacher is instructing, rather the narrative provides the RTI staff member with anecdotal information from the teacher based on the past quarter.
[M.8]	**N/A**
[M.9] **RTI Quarter 1 Narrative**	**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 Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Charter Holder provided RTI Quarter 1 Narrative to show evidence of how teachers working with the subgroups are being monitored. The RTI staff member indicated that these narratives are compiled by sitting with the teacher at the end of a quarter to discuss how the students are doing. She indicated that walkthroughs are conducted periodically but not documented. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** The RTI narrative does not demonstrate that teachers are monitored on their instruction for FRL students because the discussions are not conducted while the teacher is instructing, rather the narrative provides the RTI staff member with anecdotal information from the teacher based on the past quarter. The Charter Holder did indicate that the teachers do not know who their FRL students are; the administration does not disclose that information to the teachers. The school is a school-wide Title I school.

[M.10] **ESS Data Review Form**	**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:** • The Charter Holder provided data review forms for two students with disabilities. The form is filled out by the teacher on every student and addresses modification/accommodations, observations, student strengths and needs, communication, and social/emotional. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** The data review form is not conducted with purpose of monitoring the instruction to ensure a teacher is meeting the needs of students with disabilities, rather the information is provided by the teacher on the observation conducted of the student.

I, Katherine Poulos, completed this Site Visit Inventory during the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on March 2, 2015. [signature]

I, Kathy Tolman, received a copy of this document at the end of the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on March 2, 2015. Kathryn Tolman