Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Omega Alpha Academy
School Name: Omega Alpha Academy
Site Visit Date: April 8, 2015

Required for: Renewal
Evaluation Criteria Area: Curriculum

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[C.1] **•1: Lesson Plan with standards (highlighted). (Pg.1).** **•2: Curriculum Map. (Pg. 2).** **•3: G. A. Scale (Pg. 3).** **•4: End-of-Year Exit survey (Pg. 4).** **•5: Student and Parent Satisfaction surveys (Pg. 5).** **•6: LoTi Connection evaluations (Pg. 6 & 7).** **•7: Grade Group Meeting Staff Surveys, (Pg. 8).** **•8: PLC highlight curriculum (Pg. 9).** **•9: Backward Design Model (Pg. 10).** **•10: Professional Development regarding Data Marsha Jones (Pg. 11).** **•11: 8 Components for Evaluating Curriculum (Pg. 12).** **•12: The Curriculum and Instruction Teacher Rubric (Pg. 13).** **•13: Galileo Intervention Alert (Pg.16)** **•14: CFAs (pg. 108)** **•15: SRA Data Binder Information (Pg. 27).** **•16: Unit Assessments (pg. 109)** **•17: Analyzing Assessment Data Flow Chart (pg. 133)** **•18: C.W.T. Form (Pg. 25).**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the process for evaluating curriculum and how the Charter Holder evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to meet the standards. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • **The two primary ways that curriculum gaps are identified are through Galileo data disaggregation and weekly PLC meetings. The G.A Tracking form is used to analyze student performance. If student performance does not meet the goal, analysis is used to make recommendations are discussed and recorded on the G.A. Tracking form. Recommendations include changes to instructional strategies, additional resources to be included when re-teaching the lesson.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • **The 8 Component for Evaluating Curriculum Rubric has been created and is being implemented to ensure that the curriculum design is effective in meeting student need and ensuring that academic standards are paced in such a way that all of the standards are taught and mastered prior to end of year testing.** • **we also cross check the evaluation with The Curriculum and Instruction Teacher Rubric** **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because: The Charter Holder has made revisions to its process for evaluating curriculum and has not begun implementation of the newly developed curriculum evaluation tools.**
	Final Evaluation: ☐ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☒ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.

[C.2]
•1: Flow Chart: Analyzing Assessment Data – Identifying Gaps (pg. 133)
•2: Curriculum Map. (Pg. 2).
•3: The Curriculum and Instruction Teacher Rubric (Pg. 13).
•4: Curriculum Map Standards Checklist (Pg. 14).
•5: Revised Curriculum Map (Pg. 15).
•6: Galileo Intervention Alert Report (Pg. 16).
•7: G. A. Scale: Part 2 (Pg. 3).
•8: G. A. Scale: Part 3 (Pg. 3).
•9: PLC Vertical and Horizontal Alignment PLC Triplicate Form (Pg. 17).
•10: Focus Calendars (Pg. 18).
•11: AzMERIT Blueprint (Pg. 19).
•12: Pacing Guide (Pg. 20).
	Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate: how the Charter Holder identifies gaps in the curriculum.
	
	The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:
	• **Curriculum Evaluating Rubrics are implemented to ensure that the Curriculum is strictly aligned to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) or the Arizona College and Career Readiness Standards (ACCRS). The rubric includes the following:**
	  ○ **Strict Adherence to the CCSS/ACCRS**
	  ○ **Vertical Alignment between grade levels**
	  ○ **Horizontal Alignment between content areas**
	  ○ **Assessment implementation and appropriate alignment**
	  ○ **Resources aligned to CCSS**
	  ○ **Accommodations for ELL, SPED, and FRL students**
	  ○ **Corresponding pacing guide.**
	  ○ **Revisions/Refinements**
	• **Once the curriculum maps are evaluated against the Curriculum Map Standard Checklist as well as the Rubric, the teacher, charter holder, Instructional Leadership Team (I.L.T.), and other curriculum support team members meet to discuss the findings.**
	•
	The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because: The Charter Holder has made revisions to its process for evaluating curriculum and has not begun implementation of the newly developed curriculum evaluation tools.

	Final Evaluation: ☐ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☒ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.

[C.3]
•1: Adopting/Revising Curriculum Flow Chart (Pg. 112)
•2: Letters from teachers regarding curriculum (Pg. 21).
•3: AV Rover documentation being brought to the Board for approval. (Pg. 22).
•4: Curriculum Map. (Pg. 2).
•5: The Curriculum and
	Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate: the Charter Holder's process for adopting or revising curriculum based on its evaluation processes.
	
	The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:
	• **The curriculum process is outlined in the curriculum adoption flow chart. Documentation was provided that supported the implementation of the following components for an adoption that is currently in process:**
	  ○ **The curriculum specialist identified the Collections curriculum resources for consideration for middle school and high school.**
	  ○ **Lead teachers for middle school and high school reviewed the resources and provided initial feedback**

Instruction Teacher Rubric (Pg. 13). **•6: Curriculum Map Standards Checklist (Pg. 14).** **•7: Revised Curriculum Map (Pg. 15).** **•8: Galileo Intervention Alert Report (Pg. 16).** **•9: G. A. Scale: Part 2 (Pg. 3).** **•10: G. A. Scale: Part 3 (Pg. 3).** **•11: PLC Vertical and Horizontal Alignment PLC Triplicate Form (Pg. 17).** **•12: Focus Calendars (Pg. 18).** **•13: AzMERIT Blueprint (Pg. 19).** **•14: Pacing Guide (Pg. 20).** **•15: Flow Chart: Analyzing Assessment Data – Identifying Gaps (pg. 133)**	**regarding the curriculum resources.** ○ **In FY15 the teachers are piloting the resources in their classrooms.** ○ **The final step for curriculum adoption is approval of purchase by the board. Board Meeting minutes were provided to document board approval of purchases of other instructional resources as evidence that purchases of curricular resources are approved by the board.** **Final Evaluation:** ☒ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.
[C.4] **•1: Adopting/Revising Curriculum Flow Chart (Pg. 112)** **•2: Letters from teachers regarding curriculum (Pg. 21).** **•3: AV Rover documentation being brought to the Board for approval. (Pg. 22).** **•4: Curriculum Map. (Pg. 2).** **•5: The Curriculum and Instruction Teacher Rubric (Pg. 13).** **•6: Curriculum Map Standards Checklist (Pg. 14).** **•7: Revised Curriculum Map (Pg. 15).** **•8: Galileo Intervention Alert Report (Pg. 16).**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** who is involved in the process for adopting or revising curriculum. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • **The curriculum process is outlined in the curriculum adoption flow chart. Documentation was provided that supported the implementation of the following components for an adoption that is currently in process:** ○ **The curriculum specialist identified the Collections curriculum resources for consideration for middle school and high school.** ○ **Lead teachers for middle school and high school reviewed the resources and provided initial feedback regarding the curriculum resources.** ○ **In FY15 the teachers are piloting the resources in their classrooms.** • **The final step for curriculum adoption is approval of purchase by the board. Board Meeting minutes were provided to document board approval of purchases of other instructional resources as evidence that purchases of curricular resources are approved by the board.**

•9: G. A. Scale: Part 2 (Pg. 3). **•10: G. A. Scale: Part 3 (Pg. 3).** **•11: PLC Vertical and Horizontal Alignment PLC Triplicate Form (Pg. 17).** **•12: Focus Calendars (Pg. 18).** **•13: AzMERIT Blueprint (Pg. 19).** **•14: Pacing Guide (Pg. 20).** **•15: Flow Chart: Analyzing Assessment Data – Identifying Gaps (pg. 133)**	**Final Evaluation:** ☒ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.
[C.5] **•1: Adopting/Revising Curriculum Flow Chart (Pg. 112)** **•2: Letters from teachers regarding curriculum (Pg. 21).** **•3: AV Rover documentation being brought to the Board for approval. (Pg. 22).** **•4: Curriculum Map. (Pg. 2).** **•5: The Curriculum and Instruction Teacher Rubric (Pg. 13).** **•6: Curriculum Map Standards Checklist (Pg. 14).** **•7: Revised Curriculum Map (Pg. 15).** **•8: Galileo Intervention Alert Report (Pg. 16).** **•9: G. A. Scale: Part 2 (Pg. 3).** **•10: G. A. Scale: Part 3 (Pg. 3).** **•11: PLC Vertical and Horizontal Alignment PLC Triplicate Form (Pg. 17).** **•12: Focus Calendars (Pg. 18).** **•13: AzMERIT Blueprint (Pg. 19).** **•14: Pacing Guide (Pg. 20).**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** when adopting curriculum, how the Charter Holder evaluates curriculum options to determine which curriculum to adopt. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • **The first step in the adoption process starts with an initial inspection of at least 3 curriculum options by OAA administration.** • **Administration will look for things such as; standard adherence, text complexity, Lexile levels, higher order thinking questions, identification of highlighted or related vocabulary words, reputable references, realia (or real-world relevance, to name a few.** • **Administration will present its findings to the curriculum specialist and curriculum support team. All parties will then decide on the 2 best curriculum options.** • **During the second phase, the curriculum specialist performs a more in depth inspection of the two curricula. If the curricula pass the second phase, it is then forwarded to the respective lead teacher/s.** • **The lead teacher/s will then have the curriculum for approximately two weeks whereby he/she will perform additional inspections so as to check for adaptability with the existing curriculum.** • **The lead teachers will present their findings to the curriculum specialist, curriculum support team, ILT, and administrative team.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because: The Charter Holder has made revisions to its process for evaluating curriculum and has not begun implementation of the newly developed curriculum evaluation tools. The Charter Holder has not recently adopted curriculum and as a result did not have documentation of the revised curriculum adoption process to be used for future curriculum adoptions.**

	Final Evaluation: ☐ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☒ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.
[C.6] **•1: Implementing Curriculum Flow Chart (pg. 152)** **•2: Grade Group Meeting Agenda with the Discovery Leaning process (Pg. 23).** **•3: ITL Discovery Learning Professional Development (Pg. 24).** **•4: Letters from teachers regarding curriculum (Pg. 21).** **•5: AV Rover documentation being brought to the Board for approval. (Pg. 22).** **•6: Curriculum Map. (Pg. 2).** **•7: Lesson Plan with standards (highlighted). (Pg.1).** **•8: G. A. Scale (Pg. 3).** **•9: PLC Triplicate Form (Pg. 9).** **•10: C.W.T. Form (Pg. 25).** **•11: Instructional Coaching Form (Pg. 26).** **•12: SRA Data Binder Information (Pg. 27).** **•13: SRA Coaching Form (Pg. 28).** **•14: PLC Tool belt Student Data Tracking Form (Pg. 30).** **•15: Teacher Professional Development Plan (Pg. 31).** **•16: LoTi Connection evaluations (Pg. 6 & 7).**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the Charter Holder's process for ensuring consistent implementation of the curriculum across the school(s) operated by the Charter Holder. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • **Lesson plans are submitted weekly on Mondays.** • **Classroom Observations are conducted to monitor whether classroom instruction occurring aligns with the lesson plan submitted.** • **Weekly Meeting Minutes record teacher discussions and planning for the creation of lesson plans. The minutes include discussion of curriculum, instruction, assessments, and data review. Meeting minutes are submitted to the school administrator.** • **The PLC is designed precisely to ensure consistent implementation of the curriculum and priority/anchor standards throughout the school. PLC triplicate forms are turned in weekly and are reviewed by the administrative team.** • **Grade level teams submit curriculum maps together as they have made revisions based on their collaborative findings throughout the school year.** • **The charter holder along with other administrators, attend PLCs to ensure that there is consistent implementation practices in place.** • **Administrative walk through observations, including LOTI and OAA's CWT form, monitor curriculum implementation by noting standards and objectives covered as well as depicting student mastery.**
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.

[C.7] •1: Implementing Curriculum Flow Chart (pg. 152) •2: Grade Group Meeting Agenda with the Discovery Leaning process (Pg. 23). •3: ITL Discovery Learning Professional Development (Pg. 24). •4: Letters from teachers regarding curriculum (Pg. 21). •5: AV Rover documentation being brought to the Board for approval. (Pg. 22). •6: Curriculum Map. (Pg. 2). •7: Lesson Plan with standards (highlighted). (Pg.1). •8: G. A. Scale (Pg. 3). •9: PLC Triplicate Form (Pg. 9). •10: C.W.T. Form (Pg. 25). •11: Instructional Coaching Form (Pg. 26). •12: SRA Data Binder Information (Pg. 27). •13: SRA Coaching Form (Pg. 28). •14: PLC Tool belt Student Data Tracking Form (Pg. 30). •15: Teacher Professional Development Plan (Pg. 31). •16: LoTi Connection evaluations (Pg. 6 & 7). •17: Standards Progressions (Pg. 32, 33). •18: Focus Calendars (Pg. 18). •19: AzMERIT Blueprint (Pg. 19). •20: Pacing Guide (Pg. 20).	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** that tools exist that identify what must be taught and when it must be delivered and how the Charter Holder ensures that all grade-level standards are covered within the academic year. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • **The first tool which exists that will identify what must be taught and when it must be delivered is grade level curriculum map. Based on the pacing of the curriculum map, the weekly lesson plans are created.** • **The second tool used is weekly lesson plans. At Omega Alpha Academy, all teachers are required to submit their lesson plans every Monday for the week to follow.** • **The third tool used to ensure that all standards are covered within the academic year is the pacing guides.** • **The Standard Implementation checklist form is used to record each instance of instruction addressing each standard to monitor the instructional pace to ensure all grade-level standards are covered within the academic year. In the previous year the checklist was completed by the curriculum specialist. That responsibility has now transitioned to the Instructional Leadership Team.**
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.

[C.8] •1: Implementing Curriculum Flow Chart (pg. 152) •2: Focus Calendar (Pg. 18). •3: AZ Merit Blueprint (Pg. 19). •4: Pacing Guide (Pg. 20). •5: Grade group meetings (Pg. 8). •6: Staff emails reminder of due dates (Pg. 34). •7: Memos to staff (Pg. 35). •8: Lead teacher dissemination (Pg. 36). •9: PLC Meetings (Pg. 9). •10: Professional Development Trainings-Dr. Adler's PD on PLC's (Pg. 37). •11: Pre- Loti Connection evaluations (Pg. 6) •12: Post-Loti Connection Evaluations (pg. 7) •13: Lesson Plan/PLC Tracking Spreadsheet (Pg. 38).	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the expectation for consistent use of these tools and how these expectations are communicated. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • **Grade group meetings** • **Staff emails reminder of due dates** • **PLC Meetings record discussion of standards and instructional strategies to be incorporated in lesson plans. Administrators rotate attending PLC meetings for grade level and content area groups.** • **CWT/LOTI Walk Through Observation Feedback Reflection Forms** • **Consistent responses/guidance from varying administrators or instructional leaders, an example of a professional development plan regarding teacher implementation of curriculum was provided as an examples of communicating the expectations for the use of curricular and instructional tools. The teacher was put on an improvement plan with specific deadlines to demonstrate**
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.
[C.9] •1: Implementing Curriculum Flow Chart (pg. 152) •2: Focus Calendar (Pg. 18). •3: AZ Merit Blueprint (Pg. 19). •4: Pacing Guide (Pg. 20). •5: Grade group meetings (Pg. 8). •6: Staff emails reminder of due dates (Pg. 34). •7: Memos to staff (Pg. 35). •8: Lead teacher dissemination (Pg. 36). •9: PLC Meetings (Pg. 9). •10: Professional Development Trainings-Dr. Adler's PD on PLC's (Pg. 37).	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** evidence to demonstrate usage of these tools in the classroom and alignment with instruction. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • **Lesson plans have to be turned in weekly and readily available for any administrator.** • **The PLC triplicate documentation from Professional Learning Community (PLC) Meetings is turned in on a weekly basis. The forms are reviewed to ensure that the tools provided are being used and used efficiently.** • **After verifying that the tools used are aligned to the instruction as well as the CCSSS/ACCRS, and the pacing of the lesson delivery is on course, the lesson is again verified by ensuring that the objective is posted and is in a student friendly language. This is verified when an administrator completes a Classroom Walk-through, Loti Walk through, or informal feedback/coaching session.** • **For our reading program, teachers are required to keep specific data about curriculum implementation, student mastery and lesson gains. This is verified by administrator data binder checks.**

•11: Pre- Loti Connection evaluations (Pg. 6) •12: Post-Loti Connection Evaluations (pg. 7) •13: Lesson Plan/PLC Tracking Spreadsheet (Pg. 38).	**Final Evaluation:** ☒ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.
[C.10] •1: Implementing Curriculum Flow Chart (pg. 152) •2: Focus Calendar (Pg. 18). •3: AZ Merit Blueprint (Pg. 19). •4: Pacing Guide (Pg. 20). •5: Grade group meetings (Pg. 8). •6: Staff emails reminder of due dates (Pg. 34). •7: Memos to staff (Pg. 35). •8: Lead teacher dissemination (Pg. 36). •9: PLC Meetings (Pg. 9). •10: Professional Development Trainings (Pg. 11, 24, 37, 53). •12: Post-Loti Connection Evaluations (pg. 7) •13: Lesson Plan/PLC Tracking Spreadsheet (Pg. 38).	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder knows the curriculum is aligned to standards. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • **the Charter Holder begins the curriculum revision, adoption and evaluation processes by first aligning the curriculum to the CCSS/ACCRS.** • **This is also verified through lesson plan submissions and evaluation in which the CCSS/ACCRS are the primary focus** • **This is also verified to curriculum mapping submissions and evaluation in which the CCSS/ACCRS are the primary focus. This is evaluated through the standards implementation checklist as well as curriculum evaluation.** • **This is also verified through pacing guides and focus calendars which are directly aligned to the CCSS/ACCRS and is based on proficiency of students and how they demonstrate mastery.**
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.

[C.11] •1: Analyzing Assessment Data Flow Chart (Pg. 133) •2: Bottom 25% Student Spreadsheet (Pg. 39). •3: Tier 1-3 Intervention Model (Pg. 40). •4: Galileo -"Quiz Builders" (Pg. 41) •5: Professional Development Trainings (Pg. 11, 24, 37, 53). •6: Douglas Demographics (pg. 94) •7: Student Academic Contracts (Pg. 89). •8: Lesson Plan/PLC Tracking Spreadsheet (Pg. 38). •9: Focus Calendar (Pg. 18). •10: AZ Merit Blueprint (Pg. 19). •11: Pacing Guide (Pg. 20). •12: Grade group meetings (Pg. 8). •13: Staff emails reminder of due dates (Pg. 34). •14: Memos to staff (Pg. 35). •15: Lead teacher dissemination (Pg. 36). •16: PLC Meetings (Pg. 9). •17: Post-Loti Connection Evaluations (pg. 7)	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder ensures that the curriculum addresses the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • **Students who are in the bottom 25% have also been put in the Tier 1-3 Intervention model at the school. Based on analysis of assessment results, specific lessons are generated using Galileo instructional resources that target the specific standards that students are deficient that delivered during the instructional day through small group instruction delivered.** • **The G.A. Scale Student data form is used to identify students not mastering standards. The G.A. PLC form records recommendations for research based methodology to be used to increase student achievement.** • **After school intervention and Saturday school is available for students to receive additional instruction.** • **Pupil progression forms are used to monitor student progress and identify students in need of additional remediation.** **Final Evaluation:** ☒ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.
[C.12] 1: Analyzing Assessment Data – ELL Flow Chart (Pg. 149) 2: List of Tier I-III Intervention Program. (pg. 43). 3: Composite List of ELL Students (Pg. 44). 4: ILLP PD Power Point (Pg. 45). 5: ILLP Progress Report Attachment B (Pg. 46). 6: OAA's ELL Program Summary	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder ensures that the curriculum addresses the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs). **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • **All lessons are designed based on the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model.** • **The Charter Holder has also ensured that the needs of the ELL students are being met by providing all staff with an ELL coordinator and ELL Coaches.** • **The ELL Coordinator and coaches meet quarterly to analyze ELL student data, progression, student work, possible strategies, and also recommendations for the teachers to use when working with ELL students.**

(Pg. 47). 7:AZELLA Proficiency Spreadsheet for Middle School ELL Students (Pg. 48). 8: Lesson Plan/PLC Tracking Spreadsheet (Pg. 38). 9: Focus Calendar (Pg. 18). 10: AZ Merit Blueprint (Pg. 19). 11: Pacing Guide (Pg. 20). 12: Grade group meetings (Pg. 8). 13: Staff emails reminder of due dates (Pg. 34). 14: Memos to staff (Pg. 35). 15: Lead teacher dissemination (Pg. 36). 16: PLC Meetings (Pg. 9). 17: Post-Loti Connection Evaluations (pg. 7) 18: Professional Development Trainings (Pg. 11, 24, 37, 53).	• **Students who are ELL have also been put in the Tier 1-3 Intervention model at the school as necessary and mandated by performance based on data.** • **An SEI classroom for grades K-5 and ILLPs are provided for students in grades 6-12.** • **Galileo intervention alerts are used to identify specific standards to be addressed by instruction. Progress toward mastery is monitored quarterly. Instruction for students with ILLPs is integrated into lesson plans. ELL coaches work with classroom teachers at PLC meetings. Lesson plans record ELP standards and strategies within the content area lesson plans.** **Final Evaluation:** ☒ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.
[C.13] **N/A**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder ensures that the curriculum addresses the needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students. **N/A** **Final Evaluation:** ☐ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.

[C.14] 1: Analyzing Assessment Data - SpED (Pg. 150) 2: Lesson Plan/PLC Tracking Spreadsheet (Pg. 38). 3: Focus Calendar (Pg. 18). 4: AZ Merit Blueprint (Pg. 19). 5: Pacing Guide (Pg. 20). 6 Grade group meetings (Pg. 8). 7: Staff emails reminder of due dates (Pg. 34). 8: Memos to staff (Pg. 35). 9: Lead teacher dissemination (Pg. 36). 10: PLC Meetings (Pg. 9). 11: Post-Loti Connection Evaluations (pg. 7) 12: Professional Development Trainings (Pg. 11, 24, 37, 53). 13: IEP Progress Monitoring Report (pg. 113) 14: Ms. Cormier's report (pg. 114) 15: Intervention report from just Sped (pg. 115) 16: Saturday school sign in (pg. 116) 17: Ms. Hora's composition book (pg. 117) 18: Ms. Ivette's notes from classroom observation (pg. 118) 19: Instructional Blueprint / Plan (pg. 119) 19: IEP Progress monitoring report (pg. 120) 20: IEP goal from tracking sheet (pg. 121)	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder ensures that the curriculum addresses the needs of students with disabilities. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • **All lessons are designed based on the SIOP model which guides the teacher to appropriate differentiation based on student need.** • **data regarding the students who have special needs have been provided to teachers via the student's specific Individual Education Plan as well as meetings to discuss accommodations.** • **Students who have special needs have also been put in the Tier 1-3 Intervention Program in conjunction with their Individual Education Plan (IEP)** • **The G.A. Scale Student data form is used to identify students not mastering standards. The G.A. PLC form records recommendations for research based methodology to be used to increase student achievement.** • **After school intervention and Saturday school is available for students to receive additional instruction.** • **Pupil progression forms are used to monitor student progress and identify students in need of additional remediation.** • **Special Education teacher creates separate weekly lessons. That provides instruction specific to the goals and needs of students with disabilities.** • **Classroom lesson plans are created using the SIOP Lesson Plan template which includes a section to record IEP accommodations.**
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Documents presented serve as detailed evidence of implementation of each of the relevant described processes, and thus are evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Documents presented do not demonstrate evidence of implementation of processes to address the required elements, and thus are evaluated as insufficient.