Demonstration of Sufficient Progress

DSP Report

Charter Holder Name:
School(s):
Date Submitted:
Purpose of Demonstration of Sufficient Progress *(check one):*

☐ Annual Monitoring
☐ Interval Review
☐ Renewal
☐ Failing School
☒ Expansion Request

Academic Dashboard Year *(check all that apply)*:

☒ FY2013
☒ FY2014

Directions:

A. Locate and download "Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Process and Instructions" from the Board's website or the Help files on ASBCS Online. Read the instructions carefully and view the DSP Online Technical Assistance presentation before starting.
   a. To locate the "Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Process and Instructions" on the Board's website:
      i. Go to the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools website (www.asbcs.az.gov)
      ii. Locate the "For Charter School Operators" section in the middle of the page.
      iii. Select the "Performance Expectations & Reviews" link.
      iv. Select the "Academic Interventions" tab.
      v. Scroll down to the "Demonstration of Sufficient Progress" section.
      vi. Locate and download the "Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Process and Instructions".

   b. To locate the "Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Process and Instructions" on ASBCS Online:
      i. Go to ASBCS Online (http://online.asbcs.az.gov)
      ii. Log in using the user name and password of the Charter Representative
      iii. If you do not remember your password, locate the "Forgot Password" icon on the log in page and click it to reset your password. You will receive an email from the ASBCS System Administrator (charterschoolboard@asbcs.az.gov) with instructions.
      iv. Locate the "Help" section of the Dashboard.
      v. Select "Online Help"
      vi. Locate and download the "Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Process and Instructions".

   c. To locate the DSP Online Technical Assistance presentations on the Board's website:

i. Go to the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools website (www.asbcs.az.gov)
ii. Locate the “For Charter School Operators” section in the middle of the page.
iii. Select the “Performance Expectations & Reviews” link.
iv. Select the “Academic Interventions” tab.
v. Scroll down to the “Demonstration of Sufficient Progress” section.
vi. Locate and click the link for the DSP Online Technical Assistance presentation you wish to view.

d.

B. Complete the template by providing a clear and concise written answer for each question. The suggested word count is no more than 400 words per question. In addition, list the names of all documents that serve as evidence of implementation of the process described in the answer. Reference evidence listed in the Charter Holder’s Performance Management Plan when listing evidence of implementation.

Area I: Data

Charter Holders with multiple schools must complete the Data area for each school that received an Overall Rating of "Does Not Meet", "Falls Far Below" or "No Rating" on the current Academic Dashboard.[1] The Charter Holder must copy and paste the entire Data area for each school.

School Name: _The Paideia Academy South Phoenix_____

Dashboard Ratings for All Measures					
Measure	**Prior Year Dashboard**		**Current Year Dashboard**		**Data Required for Report**
	Meets Exceeds	**Does Not Meet Falls Far Below No Rating**	**Meets Exceeds**	**Does Not Meet Falls Far Below No Rating**	
Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Math	☐	☒	☐	☒	☒
Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Reading	☐	☒	☒	☐	☒
Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP), Bottom 25%,- Math	☐	☒	☒	☐	☒
Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP), Bottom 25%,- Reading	☒	☐	☐	☒	☒
Improvement – Math (Alternative High Schools Only)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Improvement – Reading (Alternative High Schools Only)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Percent Passing – Math	☐	☒	☐	☒	☒
Percent Passing – Reading	☐	☒	☐	☒	☒
Subgroup, ELL – Math	☐	☒	☐	☒	☒
Subgroup, ELL – Reading	☐	☒	☐	☒	☒
Subgroup, FRL – Math	☐	☒	☐	☒	☒
Subgroup, FRL – Reading	☐	☒	☐	☒	☒
Subgroup, students with disabilities – Math	☐	☒	☐	☒	☒
Subgroup, students with disabilities – Reading	☐	☒	☒	☐	☒
High School Graduation Rate	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Academic Persistence (Alternative Schools Only)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] If the Charter Holder is completing the DSP process as part of an amendment or notification request, follow the directions provided in the amendment or notification instructions.

Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Math:

1a. SGP Math
MCAP Median Growth (ROI) Fall-Spring

	2013-4	2014-5	Change
3rd	85	65	-20
4th	95	65	-30
5th	45	95	50
6th	75	95	20
Average	75	80	5

This comparison takes the median AIMSweb *Rate of Improvement* (ROI) measure for the Math – Concepts and Applications (MCAP) benchmark assessment for each grade, from the Fall to Spring benchmarks, for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years. While the median ROI declined in grades 3 and 4, the median ROI for 2014-15 in each of those grades (65) was above the national norm of 50. This decline in the lower grades was offset by improved growth in 5th and 6th grades, for an overall improvement of 5.

Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Reading:

1a. SGP Reading
RCBM Median Growth (ROI) Fall-Spring

	2013-4	2014-5	Change
3rd	95	60	-35
4th	65	55	-10
5th	75	65	-10
6th	55	55	0
Average	72.5	58.75	-13.75

This comparison takes the median AIMSweb ROI measure for the Reading - Curriculum Based Measure (R-CBM) benchmark assessment or each grade, from the Fall to Spring benchmarks, for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years. While the median ROI declined in three of four grades, and stayed the same in one, the median ROI for 2014-15 in each grade (55 or 65) was above the national norm of 50. This measure scored a Meets on the ASBCS Dashboard in 2014.

Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP), Bottom 25%- Math:

MCAP Student ID	Grade '14	Score	ROI %ile	Grade '15	Score	ROI %ile	Change
100636	3	11	35	4	19	45	10
100183	3	8	15	4	13	55	40
100746	3	8	35	4	22	95	60
100905	3	7	45	4	12	55	10
100529	3	6	5	4	12	35	30
100784	3	5	15	4	10	25	10
100879	3	2	5	4	4	15	10
100605	4	19	95	5	7	65	-30
100415	4	18	95	5	6	65	-30
100217	4	15	55	5	31	95	40
100290	4	15	85	5	13	85	0
100894	4	14	45	5	32	95	50
100791	4	14	45	5	26	95	50
100523	4	11	15	5	34	95	80
100452	4	6	5	5	4	65	60
100960	5	6	15	6	15	65	50
100777	5	6	25	6	27	95	70
100585	5	6	25	6	18	55	30
100921	5	6	25	6	14	55	30
100913	5	6	35	6	20	95	60
100685	5	5	45	6	17	95	50
100621	5	4	15	6	23	95	80
100966	5	4	5	6	12	45	40
100473	5	3	25	6	10	25	0
100799	5	2	5	6	22	85	80
100653	5	2	5	6	24	95	90
Average			31.5			68.8	37.3

This table presents the nationally normed ROI percentiles of the students identified as the bottom 25% in each grade on the MCAP benchmark assessment in 2013-2014, and the ROI percentiles of the same students in 2014-15. Students without two years of data were not included. The ROI percentile is a good proxy for SGP because it uses a similar methodology. It takes the Fall benchmark score as a starting point and subtracts that from the Spring benchmark score to find a growth score, then ranks in nationally based on students who started at the same Fall score. As you can see, only 2 of 26 students had an ROI percentile decline, and the average increase was 37.3 percentile. This shows that the bottom 25% in 2014-15 dramatically improved in growth.

Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP), Bottom 25%- Reading:

RCBM Student ID	Grade '14	Score	ROI %ile	Grade '15	Score	ROI %ile	Change
100336	3	99	65	4	124	95	30
101011	3	86	15	4	120	65	50
100528	3	64	45	4	101	55	10
100529	3	41	25	4	66	55	30
100415	4	106	75	5	124	15	-60
100359	4	105	65	5	119	25	-40
100409	4	103	25	5	122	15	-10
100290	4	96	25	5	109	35	10
100356	4	93	55	5	134	95	40
100860	4	81	5	5	140	95	90
100414	4	48	15	5	66	75	60
100452	4	43	15	5	35	5	-10
100453	5	133	95	6	160	85	-10
100799	5	123	55	6	142	55	0
100685	5	120	45	6	154	85	40
100960	5	110	45	6	151	45	0
100585	5	110	15	6	199	95	80
100681	5	103	5	6	142	45	40
100777	5	80	15	6	126	25	10
Average			37.1			56.1	18.9

This table presents the nationally normed ROI percentiles of the students identified as the bottom 25% in each grade on the RCBM benchmark assessment in 2013-2014, and the ROI percentiles of the same students in 2014-15. Students without two years of data were not included. The ROI percentile is a good proxy for SGP because it uses a similar methodology. It takes the Fall benchmark score as a starting point and subtracts that from the Spring benchmark score to find a growth score, then ranks in nationally based on students who started at the same Fall score. In this example, only 5 of 19 students had an ROI percentile decline, and the average increase was 18.9 percentile. This shows that the bottom 25% in 2014-15 significantly improved in growth.

Percent Passing – Math:

2a. Percent Passing Math
Spring Comparison MCAP
% in Tier 1

Grade	2013-14	2014-15
3rd	66.0%	69.8%
4th	84.0%	58.9%
5th	31.0%	90.0%
6th	63.0%	84.8%
TOTAL	61.0%	74.9%

This comparison shows the percentage of students in each grade who were categorized by the AIMSweb program as Tier 1 based on a target score for the grade on the spring MCAP benchmark assessment. While the percentage dropped somewhat in grade 4, the increases in grade 3, 6 and especially grade 5 led to an overall improvement in the percent of students likely to pass. Analysis of data from 2013-14 shows that students who met the target on the Spring RCBM were 66.1% likely to pass AIMS. While this is not as close a correlation as in Reading, it does support the likelihood of an overall improvement in this measure for 2015.

Percent Passing – Reading:

2a. Percent Passing Reading
Spring Comparison RCBM %
in Tier 1

Grade	2013-14	2014-15
3rd	63.6%	57.1%
4th	52.1%	50.0%
5th	63.0%	67.3%
6th	34.7%	70.2%
TOTAL	53.9%	60.5%

This comparison shows the percentage of students in each grade who were categorized by the AIMSweb program as Tier 1 based on a target score for the grade on the spring RCBM benchmark assessment. While the percentage dropped somewhat in grades 3 and 4, the increases in grade 5 and especially grade 6 led to an overall improvement in the percent of students likely to pass. Analysis of data from 2013-14 shows that students who met the target on the Spring RCBM were 94.6% likely to pass AIMS. This strongly supports an overall improvement in this measure for 2015.

Subgroup, ELL – Math data:

2c. Percent Passing ELL Math
Spring Comparison MCAP %
in Tier 1

Grade	2013-14	2014-15
3rd	37.5%	61.5%
4th	100.0%	45.5%
5th	0.0%	50.0%
6th		100.0%
TOTAL	57.1%	55.6%

Spring Comparison MCAP %
in Tier 3

Grade	2013-14	2014-15
3rd	50.0%	7.7%
4th	0.0%	9.1%
5th	100.0%	0.0%
6th		0.0%
TOTAL	35.7%	7.4%

These two tables show the percentage of ELL students categorized by the AIMSweb Spring MCAP assessment as Tier 1 and Tier 3. While the overall percentage of students in Tier 1 dropped from 2013-14 to 2014-15, two grades showed improvement. Note that the number of ELL students doubled in 2014-15 (from 14 to 27). As a way of showing improvement, we also present the decline in percentage of students in Tier 3, which dropped significantly despite the increase in number of ELL students.

Subgroup, ELL – Reading:

2c. Percent Passing ELL Reading
Spring Comparison RCBM
% in Tier 1

Grade	2013-14	2014-15
3rd	28.6%	30.8%
4th	0.0%	36.4%
5th	0.0%	50.0%
6th	----	100.0%
TOTAL	17.0%	54.0%

These two tables show the percentage of ELL students categorized by the AIMSweb Spring RCBM assessment as Tier 1. The overall percentage of students in Tier 1 increased from 2013-14 to 2014-15, with all grades showing improvement. Note that the number of ELL students doubled in 2014-15 (from 14 to 27).

Subgroup, FRL – Math:

2c. Percent Passing FRL Math
Spring Comparison MCAP %
in Tier 1

Grade	2013-14	2014-15
3rd	62.5%	72.5%
4th	86.1%	59.0%
5th	35.9%	92.3%
6th	63.2%	90.3%
TOTAL	61.4%	76.5%

This table shows the percentage of FRL-eligible students categorized by the AIMSweb Spring MCAP assessment as Tier 1. The overall percentage of students in Tier 1 increased from 2013-14 to 2014-15, with all grades except 4 showing improvement.

Subgroup, FRL – Reading:

2c. Percent Passing FRL Reading
Spring Comparison RCBM
% in Tier 1

Grade	2013-14	2014-15
3rd	59.0%	55.0%
4th	50.0%	48.7%
5th	64.1%	64.0%
6th	30.6%	71.9%
TOTAL	51.4%	58.8%

This table shows the percentage of FRL-eligible students categorized by the AIMSweb Spring RCBM assessment as Tier 1. While the percentage dropped somewhat in grades 3 and 4, the increases in grade 5 and especially grade 6 led to an overall improvement in the percent of students likely to pass.

Subgroup, students with disabilities – Math:

2c. Percent Passing SPED Math
Spring Comparison MCAP
% in Tier 1

Grade	2013-14	2014-15
3rd	20.0%	50.0%
4th	60.0%	25.0%
5th	0.0%	25.0%
6th	30.0%	50.0%
TOTAL	31.8%	37.5%

This table shows the percentage of students with disabilities categorized by the AIMSweb Spring MCAP assessment as Tier 1. The overall percentage of students in Tier 1 increased from 2013-14 to 2014-15, with all grades except 4 showing improvement.

Subgroup, students with disabilities – Reading:

2c. Percent Passing SPED Reading

Spring Comparison RCBM

Grade	2013-14	2014-15
3rd	25.0%	33.3%
4th	0.0%	50.0%
5th	100.0%	0.0%
6th	0.0%	50.0%
TOTAL	15.8%	31.3%

This table shows the percentage of students with disabilities categorized by the AIMSweb Spring RCBM assessment as Tier 1. The overall percentage of students in Tier 1 increased from 2013-14 to 2014-15, with all grades except 5 showing improvement.

Valid and Reliable Data

1. How does the Charter Holder know that the data described above is valid and reliable?

Analysis of Validity and Reliability

Percent Passing

MCAP	>=Target/ Meets	>=Target/ App	<Target/ Meet	<Target/ App	Pass Predict	Fail Predict	Accuracy
3rd	35	2	3	16	94.6%	84%	91.1%
4th	21	21	4	4	50.0%	50%	50.0%
5th	13	4	8	29	76.5%	78%	77.8%
6th	15	16	2	16	48.4%	89%	63.3%
TOTAL	84	43	17	65	66.1%	79%	71.3%

This table compares the number of students who were below, at, or above target in 2013-14 on Spring AIMSweb MCAP (Math) crosswalked with whether they passed the 2014 AIMS in Math. This shows that, overall, a student meeting the target had a 66% chance of passing AIMS, and a student below target had a 21% chance of passing AIMS. Overall, MCAP showed a 71% accuracy rate in identifying AIMS outcomes. This rate of correlation indicates that MCAP is a reasonably valid tool for identifying students in need of intervention.

RCBM	>=Target/ Meets	>=Target/ App	<Target/ Meet	<Target/ App	Pass Predict	Fail Predict	Accuracy
3rd	33	2	7	13	94.3%	65.0%	83.6%
4th	24	1	12	11	96.0%	47.8%	72.9%
5th	32	2	12	7	94.1%	36.8%	73.6%
6th	16	1	16	16	94.1%	50.0%	65.3%
TOTAL	105	6	47	47	94.6%	50.0%	74.1%

This table compares the number of students who were below, at, or above target in 2013-14 on Spring AIMSweb RCBM (Reading) crosswalked with whether they passed the 2014 AIMS in Reading. This shows that, overall, a student meeting the target had a 95% chance of passing AIMS, and a student below target had a 50% chance of passing AIMS. Overall, RCBMP showed a 74% accuracy rate in identifying AIMS outcomes. This rate of correlation indicates that RCBM is a reasonably valid tool for identifying students in need of intervention.

Conclusions Drawn From Data

2. What analysis has the Charter Holder conducted for each measure that does not meet the Board's academic performance expectations? What are the results from the analysis?

Answer (suggested word count is 400 words: Conclusions drawn from data

Growth Predictions 2015

	RCBM	MCAP
3rd	60	65
4th	55	65
5th	65	95
6th	55	95
Average	58.75	80
Differential	21.5	33
Predicted SGP 2015	37.25	47
Median SGP 2014	51	42
	Decline	Improvement

This table suggests that, had AIMS been administered, the Reading SGP for the school would show a decline, while the Math SGP would show an improvement. Given the uncertainties inherent in the AzMERIT, however, a valid prediction is not currently possible.

Proficiency Predictions 2015
2014-15
AIMSweb
weighted
predictions

RCBM	>= Target	Predict Rate	# likely Pass	< Target	Inverse Fail Predict Rate	# likely Pass	Total Likely Pass	N	% Likely Pass	2014 # Pass	2014 N	2014 % Pass	Change
3rd	36	94.3%	34	27	35.0%	9.5	43	63	68.9%	41	58	70.7%	-1.8%
4th	27	96.0%	26	29	52.2%	15.1	41	56	73.3%	36	50	72.0%	1.3%
5th	33	94.1%	31	16	63.2%	10.1	41	49	84.0%	44	55	80.0%	4.0%
6th	33	94.1%	31	14	50.0%	7.0	38	47	81.0%	32	49	65.3%	15.7%
TOTAL	129	94.6%	122	86	50.0%	43.0	165	215	76.8%	152	205	74.1%	2.6%

MCAP	>= Target	Predict Rate	# likely Pass	< Target	Inverse Fail redict Rate	# likely Pass	Total Likely Pass	N	% Likely Pass	2014 # Pass	2014 N	2014 % Pass	Change
3rd	44	94.6%	42	19	15.8%	3.0	45	63	70.8%	38	58	65.5%	5.3%
4th	34	50.0%	17	22	50.0%	11.0	28	56	50.0%	25	50	50.0%	0.0%
5th	45	76.5%	34	5	21.6%	1.1	35	50	71.0%	21	55	38.2%	32.8%
6th	39	48.4%	19	7	11.1%	0.8	20	46	42.7%	17	49	34.7%	8.0%
TOTAL	162	66.1%	107	53	20.7%	11.0	118	215	54.9%	101	209	48.3%	6.6%

This table takes the results of the RCBM and MCAP benchmark assessments from 2014-15, and using the accuracy ratios determined from the 2013-14 crosswalk with AIMS results, establishes predicted changes in outcomes had the students been assessed by AIMS in 2015. This table suggests that there would have been an improvement in both Math and Reading proficiency scores on the dashboard, and confirms our internal data indicating improvement.

Area II: Curriculum

Evaluating Curriculum	
1. What is the Charter Holder's process for evaluating curriculum? How does the Charter Holder evaluate how effectively the curriculum enables students to meet the standards?	
Curriculum Maps: 1. Curriculum evaluation process was develope based on the definition of a "Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum": • Curriculum maps must be **viable**- indicating that standards are addressed in an accurate timeline (pacing); and **guaranteed**- indicating that curriculum addresses key standards for achievement (Marzano Levels of School Effectiveness, 2012). • This conclusion is based on a Curriculum Map review conducted by educational consultant Dr. Mike Schmoker. Evaluation of curriculum maps includes an analysis of the following components present in curriculum maps: o Coherent Timeline o Key Standards and Topics o Texts and Materials o Learning Objective	Documentation of implementation: July 2014 Executive Leadership Team re-wrote the Paideia Academy Curriculum Guide to clearly articulate the components of a viable and guaranteed curriculum as outlined by Dr. Schmoker's training. Meeting notices and emails with Dr. Mike Schmoker
Process of Evaluation: In November 2014, the Charter Holder assembled a Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) consisting of the curriculum director and a teacher from each grade level to annually review and evaluate curriculum materials for alignment to standards and effectiveness with subgroups – Bottom Quartile, FRL, ELL, SPED. The stewardship of the curriculum review committee is to: 1. Monitor implementation and fidelity to curriculum maps 2. **Review and evaluate curriculum alignment to standards**, effectiveness for growth and proficiency for all students to include subgroups – Bottom Quartile, FRL, ELL, SPED. The process for evaluation curriculum and determining how effectively the curriculum enable students to meet the standards is outlined below: I. Following a curriculum review calendar, the	November Executive Leadership Team meeting notes assembling CRC Paideia Curriculum Plan document Curriculum Review Committee folders/agendas

Curriculum Review Committee meets to evaluate the curriculum for effectiveness in enabling students to meet the standards:
• Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) meets to review internal benchmark data and state assessment data.
• The Curriculum Review Committee meets to complete the Curriculum Effectiveness Tool which is comprised of the AzCCRS Curriculum Map Guidelines checklist and the CCSS Evaluation Rubric. Both of these documents used in our curriculum evaluation process are reliable documents from established sources.
  ○ The AzCCRS Curriculum Map Guidelines come from the Arizona Department of Education.
  ○ The CCSS Evaluation Rubric comes from the Core Knowledge Foundation. We chose it because our Kinder-3rd grade uses the Core Knowledge Language Arts program, and the rubric can apply to any ELA curriculum.
	Paideia's Curriculum Effectiveness Rubric

II. On a monthly basis, grade levels meet in a monthly Curriculum Review Meeting to discuss and evaluate the curriculum's effectiveness in enabling students to meet the standards. Teachers bring their curriculum binders/maps and Data Dialogs with common assessment data. The typical questions asked and discussed in a grade-level curriculum review meeting are:
  ○ What does your data say? How are your students meeting the standards you have taught?
  ○ If not, why not? (an analysis of why they are not mastering the standard: is it a need for reteach and reassess, professional development need, or a curriculum problem?
  ○ Is your team where your curriculum says you should be?
  ○ If not, why not? (an analysis of why they are either behind of ahead of the curriculum.)
	Curriculum Review meeting (between teachers, curriculum director, and principal) agendas

○ How is the curriculum addressing the needs of sub-group populations in your classroom such as SPED, ELL, FRL, and bottom 25%?	
2. How does the Charter Holder identify gaps in the curriculum?	
The Charter Holder has charged the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) to facilitate the process of identifying gaps in the curriculum. The CRC conducts curriculum gap analysis through the process of meeting with grade level teams to complete the curriculum gap analysis protocol. I. In January 2015 grade level teams under the facilitation of the CRC completed a curriculum gap analysis by cross-checking grade level standards with those standards identified in their curriculum maps. Grade level teams then identified places where standards were not addressed in the curriculum and immediately filled in any holes that were discovered.	Documentation of implementation: Curriculum Gap Analysis documentation ○ CRC/Grade Level meeting agendas—with reference to gap analysis and curriculum effectiveness meetings. ○ Standards Checklists by grade level
II. In May 2015, the curriculum director met individually with each grade level team and their CLC representative to discuss gaps in curriculum programs according to: ○ Standards being met as indicated on curriculum maps. ○ Common assessments in curriculum accurately addressing standards. ○ Support resources and curriculum's ability to reach sub-groups.	May 2015 Grade-level meeting notes indicating gap analysis discussion between CRC representative and curriculum director
III. Based on recommendations from the grade level and the CRC representative, the Spalding program and the Singapore Math program have been identified as having certain gaps that grade level teams filled according to their standards. During their summer 2015 meeting, the curriculum review committee addressed those gaps/concerns by deciding to place the Spalding program under review for a possible revision to its place in our	Grade-level gap analysis table (identifying standards

curriculum. Singapore Math is under review by the CRC for the 2015-2016 school year to evaluate its effectiveness in helping our scholars master the AzCCRS Math standards. A curriculum review calendar was created to review math data throughout the 2015-2016 school year in order to evaluate gaps or effectiveness.	2015-2016 curriculum review calendar
Adopting/Revising Curriculum	
3. What is the Charter Holder's process for adopting or revising curriculum based on its evaluation processes?	
Paideia Academy has not yet needed to follow this process of adopting or revising a new curriculum. Below is the process that has been approved by the Executive Leadership Team for any future processes of adopting or revising curriculum:	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: EL Meeting Agendas (creating and approving this process)
1. Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) Identifies curriculum changes/revision needs based on assessment data to determine if gaps in proficiency and growth are due to curriculum or instructional effectiveness by reviewing previous two year data to include: i. GAP analysis from the evaluation process ii. ADE state assessment data iii. ASBCS Dashboard data to include subgroup proficiency and growth iv. Benchmark data (Galileo/MAP) v. Grade-level data binders to include common assessments vi. Instructional Effectiveness Rubric summary data	CRC meeting agendas (reviewing this process) Curriculum Effectiveness Rubric Instructional Effectiveness Rubric summary data
2. CRC uses the above data to complete the Curriculum Effectiveness Rubric CRC compares Curriculum Effectiveness Rubric with Instructional Effectiveness Rubric summary data	Instructional Effectiveness Rubric
3. CRC presents summary of findings and options to Executive Leadership Team (EL) – new curriculum adoption, current curriculum revision, no curriculum change, or recommendations for instructional coaching	

If EL Team approves curriculum change: 1. CRC Research curriculum options 2. CRC Conduct vendor analysis checklist 3. Propose 3 bid options to EL 4. EL selects curriculum and vendor 5. EL presents curriculum and vendor to Paideia Governing Board 6. Paideia Governing Board votes to adopt or revise selection	
4. Who is involved in the process for adopting or revising curriculum?	
Curriculum Review Committee consisting of Principal, Curriculum Director, teacher representative from each grade level	Curriculum Review Committee meeting minutes and sign-in sheets.
5. When adopting curriculum, how does the Charter Holder evaluate curriculum options to determine which curriculum to adopt?	
Paideia Academy has not yet needed to follow this process of adopting a new curriculum. Below is the process that has been approved by the Executive Leadership Team for any future processes of adopting curriculum:	
1. Executive Leadership Team (Principal, Vice Principal, Curriculum Director, Director of Finance/Operations) and Campus Leadership Council analyze best practices from other successful charter schools with similar population subgroups	Curriculum samples evaluated by teachers using evaluation checklist.
2. Obtain and review curriculum samples based on recommendations from Executive Leadership Team and Campus Leadership Council.	Curriculum Review Committee Binders/Agendas
3. Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) analyzes and researches curriculum samples/options	
4. CRC Conduct vendor analysis checklist	Vendor Analysis Checklist
6. Propose 3 bid options to EL	Financial Policies and Procedures Handbook
7. EL selects curriculum and vendor	Financial Policies and Procedures Handbook
8. EL presents curriculum and vendor to Paideia Governing Board 9. Paideia Governing Board votes to adopt or revise selection	

Implementing Curriculum	
6. What is the Charter Holder's process for ensuring consistent implementation of the curriculum across the school(s) operated by the Charter Holder?	
1. Monthly Curriculum Review meetings to ensure consistent implementation of the curriculum: Grade-level Curriculum Review Meetings with Principal and Curriculum Director held monthly to review the following: • Curriculum Map pacing and viability, and alignment to standards • Common assessments Data Dialogs to check for growth and proficiency in the subgroups. 2. Conduct Walk-Abouts: Principal and Curriculum Director conduct walk-abouts to check consistency between teacher's Curriculum Binder/curriculum map and lessons/objectives being taught.	1. Curriculum Review Meeting agendas • Curriculum Maps marked with notes for pacing, viability, and alignment to standards. • Common assessments analyzed in Curriculum Review Meetings • Data Dialogs reviewed for growth and proficiency in sub-groups 2. Coaching Binder • Walk-About checklists/informal observations
7. What tools exist that identify what must be taught and when it must be delivered? How does the Charter Holder ensure that all grade-level standards are covered within the academic year?	
(1) We have created and revised curriculum maps for reading, math, science, and social studies at each grade level. Curriculum maps include all grade level standards. During writing and revising the curriculum maps, teachers received a checklist of standards and checked them off as they edited and revised their curriculum maps to ensure all AzCCRS standards for each grade level were included in the curriculum maps. The curriculum maps are quarterly and identify weekly standards, topics, objectives, and assessments. (2) The Curriculum Review Committee monitors curriculum maps/scope and sequence that contain the following: • Alignment to AZCCRS (a)Coherent timeline - Pacing and viability • Key standards and topics (b)	(1) Curriculum Maps • Standards Checklist • Evidence of curriculum map review and revision to ensure all grade-level standards are covered (notes and revisions directly on drafts of curriculum maps). (2) Curriculum Review Committee Meeting agendas a. Crosswalk Binders/Alignment Guides b. Standards Checklists c. Curriculum Guide

• Texts and materials © • Learning objectives • Common assessments (3) Monthly Curriculum Review meetings to ensure consistent implementation of the curriculum: Grade-level Curriculum Review Meetings with Principal and Curriculum Director held monthly to review the following: • Curriculum Map pacing and viability, and alignment to standards • Common assessments	(3) Curriculum Review Meeting agendas ○ Alignment to standards according to standards crosswalk binder
8. What is the expectation for consistent use of these tools? How are these expectations communicated?	
It is expected that teachers make consistent use of the curriculum map and pacing calendar weekly. During weekly grade level meetings, teams are expected to review their curriculum maps for viability and alignment, and to verify that each team member is following the map consistently. The expectations for consistent use are communicated by: • Summer review of Curriculum Guide (1) • Curriculum Review Meetings: (2) accountability meetings with the curriculum map and data dialog binder. • Mentoring protocol (3) for communicating with mentees about consistent use of curriculum tools • Monthly professional development sessions, (4)	1. Summer Training Calendar • Curriculum Guide/Handbook • Curriculum PowerPoint presentation 2. Monthly Curriculum Review Meeting agendas and notes 3. Mentoring Binder and communication notes with mentees about curriculum use/implementation 4. Professional Development Calendar 5. Grade Level Meeting (SLC) Meeting Calendar and agendas/meeting notes

9. What evidence is there to demonstrate usage of these tools in the classroom and alignment with instruction?	
• Teacher curriculum maps should have reflective notes throughout indicating weekly reflection in grade level teams and daily usage.	Curriculum Map grade-level revisions—agendas/meeting notes/revision notes
• Monthly Curriculum Review meetings to ensure consistent implementation of the curriculum: Grade-level Curriculum Review Meetings with Principal and Curriculum Director held monthly to review the following: ○ Curriculum Map pacing and viability, and alignment to standards ○ Common assessments • Data Dialogs to demonstrate growth and proficiency in the subgroups, and to prove/track instructional alignment to standards and growth.	Curriculum Review Meeting notes and reflections- monthly by grade level
• Informal Walk-abouts and classroom observations by principal and curriculum director.	Coaching Binder—informal walk-abouts include a peek at teacher's curriculum binder and/or lesson plans.

Alignment of Curriculum

10. How does the Charter Holder know the curriculum is aligned to standards?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): • Analysis of curriculum crosswalk documents • Curriculum maps labeled with standards codes • Gap Analysis completed by grade levels and Curriculum Review Committee to assess alignment to standards.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: • Crosswalk Binders • K-6th grade Curriculum Maps • Gap Analysis Folder/Curriculum Review Committee Binder

Adapted to Meet the Needs of Subgroups*(Address all relevant measures)*	
11. How has the Charter Holder ensured that the curriculum addresses the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students?	
• The ELA Core Knowledge Language Arts curriculum has a Supplemental Guide and Remediation Guide that is used to address the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%. • Singapore Math has "Extra Practice" guides that are used for intervention to address the students in the bottom 25%.	Core Knowledge Language Arts Remediation Guide Core Knowledge Language Arts Supplemental Guide Singapore Math "Extra Practice" guides **Interventionist schedules** **Intervention Plan**
12. How has the Charter Holder ensured that the curriculum addresses the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?	
• Teachers are trained in authentic literacy - Unprecedented amounts of reading, writing, and discussion grounded in evidence from complex fiction/non-fiction texts across the disciplines. • Embedded vocabulary for all content areas • Guided practice with large amounts of think pair share in partners	Curriculum Evaluation rubric (assessing the curricular effectiveness of instruction for ELLs). SEI Team Meeting notes SEI teacher lesson plans

2. The Charter Holder has increased SEI classroom math block to 90 minutes:
• After careful analysis by EL Team of instruction and curriculum over the previous two years it was discovered that less attention was being given to math than language arts by the Structured English Immersion teachers. The SEI trainers that we spoke with recommended that we redistribute portions of the ELL 4-hour block to include math word problems and close reading of math problems in order to increase instructional math time to 90 minutes without giving up any of the required 4-hour SEI block. The increased math block includes:
  • Math vocabulary
  • Math problem solving-close reading in math word problem
  • Think-pair-share
	Executive Leadership Team notes/analysis
	
	September 2014 AZED ELL Coordinator Bootcamp notes

• Use of manipulatives	
13. How has the Charter Holder ensured that the curriculum addresses the needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students?	
79% of Paideia students are eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch, so our primary program of instruction is already targeted at these students.	N/A
14. How has the Charter Holder ensured that the curriculum addresses the needs of students with disabilities?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): The Charter Holder has evaluated the curriculum for effectiveness in reaching students with disabilities: Along with SPED Coordinator, the Charter Holder and the Curriculum Director (as well as the CLC team) have evaluated the curriculum for its adaptability and differentiation in order to meet the needs of students with disabilities.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: Curriculum Evaluation rubric—assessing curricular effectiveness for adaptation and differentiation to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

Area III: Assessment

Assessment System	
1. What types of assessments does the Charter Holder use?	
1. State-wide summative assessments: • AZELLA We administer the AZELLA according to the assessment protocols for administering the test. ○ Placement Test for students who have never taken the assessment who have been identified by the PHLOTE. ○ Spring AZELLA for students who have been identified as ELL and have not tested proficient. • AzMERIT/state assessment data Administer the AzMERIT and any state assessment as prescribed by the Arizona Department of Education. **2. Benchmark assessments** • MAP Assessment Domains • Kindergarten – First Grade • Math • Reading • Second – Sixth	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: School-wide Data Binder AZELLA reports (Proficiency Roster Report) School-wide Data Binder Teacher Data Binder

• Math
• Reading
• Language Arts
• AIMSweb assessment probes used to measure reading fluency and comprehension, and math computation and analysis:
  • Kindergarten:
  • Test of Early Literacy
  ▪ Letter Names
  ▪ Letter Sounds
  ▪ Phoneme Segmentation
  ▪ Nonsense Word Fluency
  • Test of Early Numeracy
  ▪ Oral Counting
  ▪ Number Identification
  ▪ Quantity Discrimination
  ▪ Missing Number
  • 1st Grade:
  • Test of Early Literacy
  ▪ Letter Sounds
  ▪ Phoneme Segmentation
  ▪ Nonsense Word Fluency
  • Test of Early Numeracy
  ▪ Number Identification
  ▪ Quantity Discrimination
  ▪ Missing Number
  • RCBM- Reading Curriculum Based Measure (reading fluency) *starting in the winter benchmark
  • M-COMP- Math Computation *starting in the winter benchmark
  • 2nd-6th Grades
  • RCBM- Reading Curriculum Based Measure (reading fluency)
  • MAZE (reading comprehension)
  • M-COMP- Math Computation
  • M-CAP (Math Concepts and Applications)
	School-wide Data Binder
	Teacher Data Binder
	Interventionists Binder

3. <u>Strategic and progress monitoring assessments</u> The assessment probes above are used for: • Progress monitoring every two weeks	Teacher Data Binder Curriculum Map Binder

for students receiving Tier 3 intervention. • Strategic monitoring every month for students falling in the bottom 25%. **4. <u>Common assessments in reading, math, and writing across grade level teams.</u>** In grade-level team meetings, teachers create and/or identify common assessments in reading, math, and writing. • Reading: Common assessments encompass evidence-based questions and a writing component. • Math: Common assessments are from the Singapore Math Unit tests. • Writing: The 6 Traits Writing Rubric is used to score common writing assessments. End-of-unit assessments are housed in the teacher Data Binder.	
5. What was the process for designing or selecting the assessment system?	
Ongoing and careful analysis of assessment system to ensure assessment data meets our criteria for assessment system. Criteria for assessment system: 1. Ensure the assessment system is research proven for reliability and validity. 2. Timely Results that identify students who need intervention and accurately point to instructional learning objectives. 3. Multipurpose scores that are reported as norm-referenced, proficiency, and growth, providing different perspectives on an individual student's progress from a single test event. 4. A wide array of reports that display data in various formats and grouping options such as whole class, ELL, FRL, SPED, and bottom quartile. Reports can be used to project and set growth goals, predict proficiency on state assessments, to appropriately group students for differentiated instruction, or to engage students in mapping their own growth goals for the year. If the assessment system **does not** meet the criteria: • Consult with other successful charter schools	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: • School-wide Data Binder • Assessment analysis notes/meeting notes • Executive Leadership Team meeting agenda and notes

• Consult with Charter School Association • Conduct research for reliability, validity, and ability to measure proficiency and growth in subgroups • Meet with testing company representatives. • Discuss findings at Executive Leadership Team meeting to make final decision.	
6. How is the assessment system aligned to the curriculum and instructional methodology?	
• The NWEA MAP assessment is aligned to the Common Core Standards. The Curriculum Director and Curriculum Review Committee has aligned all curriculum maps with the Arizona College and Career Ready standards. The MAP test results then inform instructional progress towards meeting those standards. Review of data gives teachers an understanding of each student's current academic level and where they need focused instruction and the extent of their progress. Reports can be used by teachers to project and set growth goals for their class and individual students as well appropriately group students for differentiated instruction and intervention. • AIMSweb data is used to inform teachers of the basic reading and math skill level of students. From these data, teachers work with interventionists to design and implement Tier 2 and 3 interventions for students failing to make sufficient progress. • The school has aligned all curriculum maps with the College and Career Readiness standards. Common assessments are aligned to the learning objectives, which are aligned to the College and Career Readiness Standards.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: Curriculum Binders Teacher Data Binders Instructional Effectiveness Rubric Interventionists Binder AIMSweb reports by grade level Interventionists Binder Common assessments indicated on curriculum maps
7. What intervals are used to assess student progress? How does the assessment plan include data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments?	
<u>Testing Intervals</u> Benchmark Assessments: • NWEA 3 times per year • AIMSWeb 4 times per year Strategic Monitoring (students below the 25th percentile) • AIMSWeb once per month **<u>Common Assessments</u>** • Weekly assessing standard	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: School-wide binder Teacher data binder Grade-level data binder Common assessment notes in curriculum

mastery/proficiency Data collected includes the following formative assessments: • MAP assessment is a standards-based data for student proficiency and growth. The data can be disaggregated into the subgroups ELL, FRL, SPED, and bottom quartile. Data is given to teachers and housed in multiple data binders (teacher, grade level, and school). • AIMSweb measures indicate specific skill strengths and those areas that need improvement. Results may indicate skill areas that need intervention and instruction. Data Collected includes the following summative assessments: • Common assessments • Statewide assessment The above data is collected and housed in multiple data binders for analysis at different levels. Data binders are used by teachers and grade level teams to inform instruction and design and implement intervention for those students in the bottom quartile.	binders/maps School-wide Binder Teacher Data Binder SLC/Grade-level Data Binder
Analyzing Assessment Data	
8. How does the assessment system provide for analysis of assessment data? What intervals are used to analyze assessment data?	

Analysis of assessment data for instructional and curricular effectiveness:
• *Student Academic and Growth Proficiency Assessment Data Review:*
  • Teachers are provided with classroom MAP data 3 times per year. These data are housed in their data binders and analyzed during grade level data-dialog meetings.
  • Teachers are provided with AIMSweb benchmark data 3 times per year and strategic monitoring data on a monthly basis. These data are housed in the data binder and analyzed during grade level data-dialog meetings
	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:
	
	Teacher Data Binder
	Grade-level Meeting agenda/notes
	
	Teacher Data Binder
	Grade-level Meeting agenda/notes

• Teachers generate common assessment data at the end of curriculum units. These data are analyzed during grade-level meetings. • *Grade Level Data Review:* • Data binders are reviewed by the principal, curriculum director, and grade-level teams at the monthly curriculum review meeting. Data Binders must include: ○ AzCCRS standards addressed ○ Address specific interventions/re-teach strategies ○ Re-assessment tools, ○ List specific students identifying differentiation for: ○ ELL students ○ ~~FRL students~~ (not disclosed to teachers due to FERPA) ○ Students with disabilities ○ Non-proficient, bottom quartile students ○ Give the **dates** and **scores** of reassessments.	Curriculum Review meeting notes and agenda
School Level Data Review: • Executive Leadership Team: School-wide data dialog binders contain all teacher monthly data dialogs. These data are reviewed at the Executive Leadership on every 3rd Monday. School-wide Data Binder includes: ○ AzCCRS standards addressed across grade levels. ○ Specific interventions and re-teach strategies across grade levels. ○ Re-assessment tools across grade levels. ○ List specific students across grade levels listed identifying differentiation for: ○ ELL students ○ FRL students (not disclosed to teachers due to FERPA) ○ Students with disabilities ○ Non-proficient, bottom quartile students ○ Dates and scores of each grade level reassessments	Executive Leadership Team Meeting Notes and agenda School-wide Data Dialog Binder

• Governing Board: School-wide data containing MAP and AIMSweb data is housed in a school-wide data binder. These data are reviewed with the Governing Board October, February, and June.	Governing Board Agenda/Meeting notes
9. How is the analysis used to evaluate instructional and curricular effectiveness?	
1. Each team holds monthly Grade-Level evaluation of instructional and curricular effectiveness:	SLC/Grade level notes
• Teachers use common assessment data to evaluate and adjust curriculum maps. While engaging in a data dialog, teachers determine the percentage of students who did not master a standard/objective. Based on this analysis, teachers determine if the failure to master the standard is due to student skill level or instructional effectiveness. Adjustments are made accordingly. ○ 0-74% mastery: lack of mastery is attributed to instructional effectiveness. Modify instruction and reteach. Analyze data for subgroup mastery. ○ 75% or above: lack of mastery is due to student skill level-interventions needed. Analyze data for subgroup mastery (such as bottom 25%, FRL, ELL, SPED)	Curriculum Maps adjusted according to assessment data (in the form of reflection notes on the maps) Teacher Data Binders/monthly Data Dialogues
• Teachers use MAP data to determine mastery of standards and evaluate growth towards proficiency. Analysis of grade-level summative data is used to determine the effectiveness of curricular programs and prompt decisions about curriculum based on: ○ MAP DesCartes Continuum of Learning- skills and concepts that need to be enhanced, developed, and	Grade level MAP data analysis notes MAP Descartes Continuum of Learning
Analysis of the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric gives information about teacher instructional effectiveness. Analysis of curriculum maps and data binders informs curricular effectiveness and pacing. Curriculum maps and data binders	Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Summary

are analyzed through Curriculum Review Meetings (monthly by grade level) and during post observation meetings in which the teacher and principal go over curriculum maps and data binders for effectiveness. The typical questions asked during these types of analysis are: ○ What does your data say? How are your students meeting the standards you have taught? ○ If not, why not? (an analysis of why they are not mastering the standard: is it a need for reteach and reassess, professional development need, or a curriculum problem? ○ Is your team where your curriculum says you should be? ○ If not, why not? (an analysis of why they are either behind of ahead of the curriculum.) ○ How are your curriculum and common assessments addressing the needs of sub-group populations in your classroom such as SPED, ELL, FRL, and bottom 25%?	Teacher Data Binder/monthly data dialogues
<u>Grade-Level Meeting Schedule</u> Grade-level teams use the data dialog binder process in meetings to adjust curriculum and instruction: • **First Monday 3:30-4:30**: Turn in previous month's data dialog and begin new monthly data dialog. Data Binders must include: ○ AzCCRS standards addressed ○ Address specific interventions/re-teach strategies ○ Re-assessment tools, ○ List specific students ○ Give the **dates** and **scores** of reassessments. • **Second Monday 3:30-4:30** : Teachers ○ Review and adjust curriculum maps according to common assessment data, ○ Discuss data and interventions, ○ Review Campus Leadership Council (CLC) topics, ○ Discuss and analyze common assessments. • **Third Monday 3:30-4:30** : Teachers ○ Review and adjust curriculum maps according to data, ○ Discuss data and interventions, ○ Review CLC topics, ○ Discuss and analyze common assessments, ○ Discuss students for Child Study Find if needed.	Grade-Level Team Meetings and agendas with notes SLC/Grade Level Meeting agendas and notes Curriculum maps (with notes on adjustments to assessments according to data) Data Dialogs (with notes on reteaching according to assessment data)

• **Fourth Monday 3:30-4:30** : Teachers
  ○ Review CLC topics
  ○ Wrap up data dialogs for the month
  ○ Review and adjust curriculum maps according to data.	

10. How is the analysis used to adjust curriculum and instruction in a timely manner? What intervals are used to adjust curriculum and instruction?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): Data Is analyzed immediately following availability. 1. For Benchmark assessments in NWEA Map and AIMSWeb, analysis of data is used to adjust curriculum and instruction in: • September (for immediate quarter 2 adjustments), • January (for immediate quarter 3 adjustments), • March (for immediate quarter 4 adjustments, and • May (for adjustments that can be implemented in the following school year.) 2. For Strategic monitoring (AIMSWeb once a month), data is analyzed by the last week of the month to adjust instruction for those scholars in strategic monitoring. 3. For common grade-level assessments, analysis of data is used to adjust curriculum and instruction weekly. Teachers meet during grade level meetings on Mondays (SLC Meetings). A portion of their agenda is to look at common assessment data, analyze the data according to their curriculum maps and data dialogs, and make instructional and curricular decisions that can be implemented immediately in the classroom for reassessment or observation of scholar progress.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: SLC Agendas—Data Dialogs and analysis Executive leadership Team agendas School-wide data dialog binder/analysis Common assessments/data analysis in SLC meetings. Evidence of instructional adjustments through teacher Data Dialogs and adjustments to curriculum map or pacing. SLC Meetings agendas and notes discussing instructional adjustments and analysis of data dialogs.
Adapted to Meet the Needs of Subgroups *(Address all relevant measures)*	
11. How is the assessment system adapted to meet the assessment needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students?	
1. The Charter Holder addresses assessment needs of the bottom 25%: **<u>Bottom 25%/non-proficient students</u>**: The data dialog format specifically targets an	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: School-wide Data Binder

intervention addressing the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%. • Data Dialog form: standards-based, addresses specific intervention/re-teach strategies and re-assessment tools, lists specific students, and gives the dates and scores of their reassessments. • All 2013-2014 assessment data, including AIMS, AIMSweb, Galileo, and MAP, indicated math as the lowest area of growth, specifically in our bottom 25%. Consequently, an interventionist was designated to work strictly on math in grades 3-6, addressing the needs of the bottom 25%. • To address the assessment needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25% we strategically monitor their progress monthly using the AIMSweb curriculum-based measurement. ○ Students falling below the 25th percentile on any of the AIMSweb indicators	Data Dialogs AIMSWeb strategic monitoring Interventionist schedule Assessment data disaggregated by bottom 25% sub-group
12. How is the assessment system adapted to meet the assessment needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?	
1. The Charter Holder addresses assessment needs of the ELL students: To address the assessment needs of ELL students- • Strategically monitor their progress monthly using the AIMSweb curriculum-based measurement. • ELL students are also progress monitored bi-weekly by the ELL Interventionist in small groups.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: ELL Interventionist Binder Assessment data disaggregated by ELL sub-group
13. How is the assessment system adapted to meet the assessment needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students?	
79% of Paideia students are eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch, so our primary program of instruction is already targeted at these students.	N/A
14. How is the assessment system adapted to meet the assessment needs of students with disabilities?	
Students with disabilities are assessed according to the accommodations and modifications listed in their IEP. Furthermore, students who fall in any other subgroup such as	SPED Coordinator binder/teacher meetings IEP implementation for assessments Assessment data disaggregated by SPED sub-

ELL, bottom quartile, or FRL, are monitored accordingly through AIMSweb.	group

Area IV: Monitoring Instruction

Monitoring the Integration of Standards	
1. What is the Charter Holder's process for monitoring the integration of standards into classroom instruction? How does the Charter Holder monitor whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity?	
• Instructional Effectiveness Rubric is aligned with the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards as well as the Arizona state standards. The rubric includes the following in alignment with Paideia's instructional methodology: ○ Clear learning objective aligned with state standard ○ Embedded vocabulary ○ Anticipatory Set ○ Teach to the objective ○ Guided practice ○ Checks for understanding ○ Independent practice ○ Closure ○ Authentic literacy ○ Viable and guaranteed curriculum maps and lesson plans ○ Data dialog and student leadership binders	Instructional Effectiveness Rubric
• The principal, assistant principal, and curriculum director conduct informal instructional observations and coaching visits to monitor whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. ○ Curriculum Director conducts frequent informal observations and coaching visits in classrooms across grade levels. Implementation with fidelity of ACCRS-aligned curriculum is monitored through: ▪ Classroom observations conducted using the Instructional Effectiveness Rubric. ▪ Evaluation of curriculum binder for obvious use of standards and integration of	Coaching Binder- coaching documents and notes for teachers regarding evaluation of curriculum binders and integration of standards in curriculum maps Data Dialog Binder

standards.
• Conduct formal instructional observations for integration of standards into classroom instruction.
  ○ Principal, Assistant Principal and Curriculum Director conduct formal observations using the Instructional Effectiveness Rubric that includes:
  ▪ Student-friendly learning objective clearly tied to state standards
  ▪ Teach to the objective
  ▪ Curriculum Maps are clearly aligned to AzCCRS Standards
  ▪ Curriculum Maps thoroughly include:
  • Topics, texts, materials
  • Essential Questions
  • Writing Traits
  • Assessment
  • Robust formal writing assignments
  ▪ Curriculum maps are up to date with past curriculum maps (previous quarters) in binder for all subjects.
  ▪ Current instruction aligns with Curriculum Map dates and standards
  ▪ Curriculum maps include clear signs of instructional adjustments based on standards.
	Curriculum maps with reflective teacher notes

• Conduct Curriculum Review Meetings to ensure instructional fidelity and alignment to standards.
  ○ Grade-level Curriculum Review Meetings with Principal and Curriculum Director held monthly to review the following:
  ▪ Curriculum Map pacing and viability
  ▪ Fidelity of instructional implementation
  ▪ Alignment of curriculum to standards
  ▪ Common assessments
  ▪ Data Dialogs to check for
	Curriculum Review Meeting agendas and notes- monthly by grade level

growth and proficiency in the subgroups.	
2. How does the Charter Holder monitor the effectiveness of standards-based instruction throughout the year?	

Process for monitoring the effectiveness of integration of standards into classroom instruction:
• Informal Drop-in Observations
  ○ Is the teacher teaching according to the curriculum map/ lesson plan/ standards listed for that day?
  ○ Is the teacher's instruction aligned with the Instructional Effectiveness Rubric to ensure effective standards-based instruction?
• Analysis of Data Dialogs and common assessments- to verify whether students are demonstrating mastery of content based on standards-based instruction
	Instructional Effectiveness Rubric
	
	Coaching Binder
	
	SLC/Grade- level meeting notes analyzing common assessment data and data dialog notes

Evaluating Instructional Practices	
3. What is the Charter Holder's process for evaluating instructional practices? How does this process evaluate the quality of instruction?	
1. Based on classroom observations with Dr. Schmoker in the Spring of 2013 and anecdotal data from Dr. Schmoker's visits, it was concluded that student engagement was low in learning activities and instructional strategies were not leading to achievement. Based on these observations the Leadership Team participated in a review of "Focus"p. 52-67 by Dr. Schmoker (ASCD 2011) reviewing the research on elements of effective lessons most notably coined by Madeline Hunter. The Executive Leadership Team reviewed charter section A.3 concluding Program of Instruction aligns with research. Based on this research, the process for evaluating instructional practices was formulated according to the Essential Elements of Instruction. The Executive Leadership Team rewrote the formal observation rubric (instructional effectiveness rubric) to include "Excellent Lessons" section which evaluates: ○ Student Friendly Learning Objective	July 2014 We redesigned the instructional observation rubric to align with the components of the new curriculum map template. Meeting notices and emails with Dr. Mike Schmoker EEI Learning Materials and research documents Instructional Effectiveness Rubric

○ Embedded Critical Vocabulary ○ Anticipatory Set ○ Teach to the Objective ○ Guided Practice ○ Check for Understanding ○ Independent Practice	Completed Paideia Instructional Effectiveness Rubric scores for each teacher
2. Conduct formal instructional observations to evaluate instructional practices: Principal, Assistant Principal and Curriculum Director conduct formal observations using the Instructional Effectiveness Rubric. The rubric rates each teacher on a 1 – 3 scale of developing, effective, and highly effective. The rubric The rubric addresses instruction in the "Excellent Lessons" section which evaluates teacher instructional effectiveness, and the "Curriculum Maps and Lesson Plans" section which evaluates the integration of standards into lessons and instruction.	One-on-One Interview Binder (for post-observation conferences between principal and teacher).
• Excellent Lessons: ○ Student Friendly Learning Objective ○ Embedded Critical Vocabulary ○ Anticipatory Set ○ Teach to the Objective ○ Guided Practice ○ Check for Understanding ○ Independent Practice • Curriculum Maps and Lesson Plans ○ CMs are clearly aligned with ***Key*** AZ CC Standards ○ CMs thoroughly include ▪ Topics, Texts, Materials ▪ Essential Questions ▪ Writing Traits ▪ Assessment ▪ Robust formal writing assignments as primary ELA assessment ○ CMs include authentic literacy – reading, writing, listening, speaking – in all content areas ○ CMs are up to date with past CMs in binder for all subjects ○ Current instruction aligns with CM date • CMs include clear signs of adjustments for Summative Assessments, BM and	Instruction Effectiveness Rubric summary graphs (formal teacher observations) Instructional Effectiveness Rubric (formal teacher observations) summary graphs disaggregated by skill and sub-skill
	Executive Leadership Team agendas and notes

other data in data dialog binder Each section is further defined by subskills that incorporate the Essential Elements of Instruction, Teach Like A Champion Techniques, and the Paideia Classroom. Formal observations are administered quarterly. 3. Quantify observation data in the "Excellent Lessons" and Curriculum Maps/Lesson Plans section of the Instructional Effectiveness Rubric to evaluate the quality of instruction and integration of standards: Teachers receive scores on a scale of 1-3. 1- Developing 2- Effective 3- Highly Effective Principal enters teacher formal observation scores into Excel spreadsheets according to target skill areas and sub-skill areas. Graphs are generated by teacher and grade level disaggregated by skill and sub-skill. By conducting formal observations and quantifying data into graphs, the administration is able to evaluate overall quality of instruction according to our teacher effectiveness rubric and sub-skills.	using formal observation data and rubric summary graphs to discuss quality of instruction data and identify next steps.
4. How does this process identify individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs?	
The process of teacher evaluation and analysis of scores helps the administration identify overall strengths, weaknesses, and needs of teachers and instructional effectiveness by quantifying the data and analyzing the data. The process helps each teacher identify his or her own individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs by receiving data in a post observation conference, and discussing with the principal his or her instructional strengths, weaknesses, and areas of further development.	Instructional Effectiveness Rubric- on a scale of 1 (weakness) to 3 (strength) One-on-One Binder (post- observation conferences between teacher and principal)
Providing Analysis and Feedback to Further Develop Instructional Quality	
5. How does the Charter Holder provide feedback on strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs based on the evaluation of instructional practices?	
1. Conduct post-observation feedback interviews: Feedback interviews are held with the principal and assistant principal following each formal observation to determine the teacher's areas of strength, weaknesses, and needs, and to set goals for	Completed Paideia Instructional Effectiveness Rubric Post-Observation Planning Form Completed Paideia Instructional

improvement in the quality of instruction.
 	
2. Analyze observation data
<u>Individual Teacher Level</u>
• Teachers meet with the curriculum director to review the observation and set goals for professional development.
• New teachers meet with their mentor teacher to review the observation and set goals for professional development.
 	
<u>Grade-Level</u>
• Grade-level teams review combined observational data to set team goals for strengths, weaknesses, and needs, and to set goals for improvement.
 	
<u>Executive Leadership Team</u>
• Analyze grade-level observational summary data for:
  ○ instructional effectiveness by skill and sub-skill across grade levels
  ○ strengths, weaknesses, and needs across grade levels
  ○ informing professional development decisions
	Effectiveness Rubric
	
	Individual Post-Observation Planning Form
	
	Grade-level meeting agenda/notes
	
	School-wide Post Observation Planning Form
	
	EL Meetings notes conducted post observation cycle
	
	Instructional Effectiveness Rubric summary graphs

6. How does the Charter Holder analyze this information? What does the data about quality of instruction tell the Charter Holder? What has the Charter Holder done in response?	

• The Charter Holder analyzes information about strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs based on information derived from monitoring instruction (teacher evaluation information). Each teacher's observation scores are graphed in an Excel document that is analyzed in a post-observation Executive Leadership Team meeting. The information is analyzed according to the "Excellent Lessons" section:
  ○ Student Friendly Learning Objective
  ▪ Clearly tied to state standards and learning activity,
  ▪ Written in student-friendly/Leadership language (Begin with the end in mind)
  ▪ Specific, Measurable, Observable "…by…" statement
  ▪ Plainly posted throughout lesson
	Instructional Effectiveness Rubric summary data/graphs
	
	Executive Leadership Team meetings/notes post observations
	
	Instructional Effectiveness Rubric "Excellent Lesson" section

▪ Frequently referred to within the context of the lesson ▪ Used for closure of the lesson ○ Embedded Critical Vocabulary ▪ Drawn from lesson/text content ▪ Strongly tied to the learning objectives ▪ Plainly posted throughout lesson ▪ Effectively practiced, and ▪ Frequently referred to within the context of the lesson ▪ Scholars use "language of opportunity" vocabulary ○ Anticipatory Set ○ Teach to the Objective ▪ Model ▪ Think aloud ▪ Teacher constantly scans to ensure 100% *SLANT* ▪ Very small chunks of learning at a time ▪ Every brief step must be followed by GP ○ Guided Practice ▪ After each brief T2O step/chunk in the lesson ▪ Many opportunities for think/pair/share ▪ While teacher circulates to C4U ○ Check for Understanding ▪ #18 Teacher checks for understanding before, during, and after each guided practice small step of the lesson ▪ #15 Teacher circulates the room ▪ Teacher observes (observation, cold call, white boards, etc.) for understanding with minimal re-teaching or tutoring ▪ #18 Teacher clearly uses meaningful formative and summative data to check for understanding ▪ Repeat T2O-GP-C4U cycle multiple times for mastery (Teach to the Objective- Guided Practice-Check for Understanding) ▪ Followed by adjustments to instruction if needed ▪ Before going on to "Independent practice" activities ○ Independent Practice	
Teacher scores are disaggregated by sub-skill and an analysis of individual and grade-level strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs is conducted: • Executive Leadership Team analyzed the disaggregated data and determined that the weakest sub-skill was under the check for understanding indicator, specifically "repeat T2O-GP-C4U cycle multiple times for master, followed by adjustments to instruction if needed". This information was verified during our ADE CSP monitoring in which the monitor mentioned that our teachers	Growth Analysis spreadsheet Executive Leadership Team meetings/notes analyzing the Growth Analysis spreadsheets

understood that our teachers understood the EEI (Essential Elements of Instruction) cycle, but did not always know what to do when instruction needed to adjusted during the cycle of T2O-GP-C4U. • Based on this analysis and the data that came out of this analysis, a professional development plan was outlined to address the T2O-GP-C4U instructional cycle and to implement more in-depth study of the essential elements of instruction.	April 1, 2015 ADE CSP Academic Program monitoring debrief notes
Adapted to Meet the Needs of Subgroups*(Address all relevant measures)*	
7. How does the Charter Holder monitor instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): 1. The Charter Holder reviews teacher Data Dialogs to evaluate differentiation and/or intervention to meet the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%.: • Evaluate the use of common assessments in Data Dialogues to adapt/modify instruction. To what extent did the teacher: • identify students who did not master the objective (bottom 25%) • identify methods to reteach and reassess. • utilize remediation strategies to bring the students to mastery. **2.** The instructional effectiveness rubric evaluates the effectiveness of the essential elements of instruction for students in the **bottom 25% or non-proficient.** 3. Essential Elements of Instruction includes a clear learning objective, embedded vocabulary, anticipatory set, teaching to the objective, guided practice, and multiple checks for understanding until the vast majority of all students have mastered the learning objective before going on to independent practice and closure. • **Students who fail to master the learning objective** during the core lesson then receive targeted intervention during independent practice and/or with an interventionist. The instructional effectiveness rubric	Instructional Effectiveness Rubric Teacher Data Dialog Binder Instructional Effectiveness Rubric

evaluates the quality of independent practice and intervention for those students.	
8. How does the Charter Holder monitor instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): 1. The Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of English Language Learners using the AZED OELAS SEI and ILLP Classroom Observation form. Using this form, the ELL Coordinator ensures that: ○ SEI and ILLP classrooms have allocated 4 hours of ELD instruction driven by the ELP Standards, ○ All areas of reading, writing, grammar, oral English/conversation and vocabulary are identified on ILLPs and in SEI lesson plans. ○ "Super SEI Strategies" are in use in classrooms with ELL students: 50/50 rule, students respond in complete sentence, and language objectives posted and taught. 2. The Charter Holder reviews teacher Data Dialogs to evaluate differentiation and/or intervention to meet the needs of English Language Learners. • Evaluate the use of common assessments in Data Dialogues to adapt/modify instruction. • To what extent did the teacher: • identify ELL students on the Data Dialog • identify methods to reteach and reassess. • utilize appropriate SEI strategies to bring the students to mastery. **3.** The instructional effectiveness rubric evaluates the effectiveness of the essential elements of instruction for **non-proficient students.** 4. Essential Elements of Instruction includes a clear learning objective, embedded vocabulary, anticipatory set, teaching to the objective, guided practice, and multiple checks for understanding until the vast majority of all students have mastered the learning objective before going on to	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: SEI Classroom Observation Form ILLP Classroom Observation Form Super SEI Strategies Observation form Teacher Data Dialog binder Instructional Effectiveness Rubric

independent practice and closure. • **Students who fail to master the learning objective** during the core lesson then receive targeted intervention during independent practice and/or with an SEI interventionist. • **SEI interventionist** works with ELL students who are failing to master objectives according to the teacher's Data Dialog forms.	SEI Interventionist Binder
9. How does the Charter Holder monitor instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students?	
79% of Paideia students are eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch, so our primary program of instruction is already targeted at these students.	N/A
10. How does the Charter Holder monitor instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with disabilities?	
The Charter Holder evaluates the school's instruction to determine if it is meeting the needs of students with disabilities: • Evaluate the use of common assessments in Data Dialogues to adapt/modify instruction for students with disabilities. • By observing and using the SPED Inclusion Checklist, monitor the implementation of accommodations and/or modifications as outlined in the student's IEP. • By observing and using the SPED Inclusion Checklist, monitor the instructional inclusion of the student with disabilities with peers to the fullest extent possible.	Special Education Inclusion Checklist

Area V: Professional Development

Professional Development System	
• **What is the Charter Holder's professional development plan?**	
Paideia's Professional Development Plan was developed to clearly articulate the components of the Essential Elements of Instruction model, curriculum map expectations and use, and authentic literacy instruction. • Summer Professional Development Training Calendar: July 15th -31s- Implemented intense focus in the Essential Elements of Instruction (EEI) within all aspects of the Paideia model of instruction to include: a. Learning Objective b. Anticipatory Set c. Teach to the Objective d. Guided Practice e. Check for Understanding f. Independent Practice g. Closure • Delivered initial and frequent training to teachers in the EEI as outlined by Dr. Schmoker to include: • Sep. 2014-May 2015 Provide intensive and direct coaching to teachers performing low on any of the EEI components according to the rubric and informed by coaching logs. • Sep 2014 Used *Teach Like a Champion (*Lemov) to form "clusters" of TLC teaching techniques to work on. **Research indicates high effectiveness with children in poverty (FRLs), as well as ELLs.** • Creation of video professional development library featuring our own master teachers. **3. Authentic Literacy**(Reading Growth and Proficiency) • Teachers participated in professional development on close reading, Daily 5, and the 6 traits of writing. • Daily 5 training and implementation- research indicates that the Daily 5	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: Paideia Professional Development Plan June 2014 Retain services of Dr. Mike Schmoker- nationally renowned educational consultant for school improvement. Executive Leadership Team meeting agendas/notes Meeting notices and emails with Dr. Mike Schmoker Invoices to Professional Development trainings at ADE. Summer Training Calendar

leads to growth in the bottom quartile.
• Chose ELA professional development options from the Arizona Department of Education website to address ELA instruction in the bottom 25%, FRL, and SPED population.
• Chose SEI professional development options from the English Language Learners department of the ADE website to address reading instruction for the ELL population.
  • Close Reading in the 3-12 Classroom
  • Close Reading in the K-2 Classroom
  • Multisensory Grammar
  • Differentiating Instruction for ELLs in the 3-5 Classroom
  • Listening and Speaking in the K-5 SEI Classroom
  • Vocabulary in the K-5 SEI Classroom
  • Writing to Learn for ELL Students Grades 3-5
  • Taking Grammar to Writing: Write Now! Grades 3-12
In addition to the professional development plan designed around the above three main areas, we also developed a plan for math professional development to address the needs indicated on the dashboard and implemented a mentoring program to further solidify the professional development needs of the teachers.
• Ongoing Singapore Math professional development and training.
• Intensive summer training on the philosophy and instructional practices.
• Model lesson delivery and review for implementation and fidelity.
• Intensive grade-level fall training on Singapore math practices and development.
• Math instructional webinars for Singapore model/method.
• Winter 2015 Singapore Math lesson observations and debriefing.	

3. How was the professional development plan developed?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): The process for writing and implementing the Professional Development Plan: 1. The Executive Leadership Team (EL) analyzed the ASBCS Dashboard and subgroups, Galileo, and AIMSweb data from 2013-2014 and realized that we did not make sufficient growth in math for two years in a row for the 4th, 5th, and 6th grade.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: School Improvement Plan document
2. From the ASBCS Dashboard the EL Team realized that the **ELL population** did not make growth in math, and did not meet in reading. The **FRL subgroup** did not meet the board's academic expectations in math or reading. Our **SPED subgroup** did not meet the expectations in math.	Executive Leadership Team meeting agendas/notes
3. The EL Team analyzed the instructional time assumptions from the Paideia Institute, which we had in our original charter and curriculum guide (didactic instruction 15%; Intellectual Coaching 70%; Seminar 15%). We found these time guidelines to be confusing to the teachers. These time constraints led us away from the essential elements of instruction to a more project-based learning approach.	
4. The EL Team reviewed current practices of instructional delivery along with current research data (Marzano, Hunter, Schmoker, Popham, Fisher and Frey, Burns, Wiliam) and realized that we had to get back to the basics of the essential elements of instruction a. clear learning objectives, b. anticipatory set, c. teach to the objective, d. guided practice, e. multiple checks for understanding, f. independent practice g. closure.	
5. Dr. Winsor contacted educational consultant Dr. Mike Schmoker, author of *Focus: Elevating the Essentials to Radically Improve Student Learning* (ASCD, 2011) for assistance.	Meeting notices and emails with Dr. Mike Schmoker
6. From his observations, the EL Team	

determined there was a need to focus on three basic professional learning goals a. a guaranteed and viable curriculum, b. excellent lessons c. authentic literacy. 7. Based on our research and through the recommendations of Dr. Schmoker, the EL Team found that these three areas of professional growth would make the biggest impact upon our school. 8. The final professional development plan was developed by aligning our student achievement data, professional development needs, and professional development opportunities.	
4. How is the professional development plan aligned with instructional staff learning needs?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): 1. In September 2014- EL team reviewed released Spring assessment data to analyze strengths and weaknesses. The analysis indicated a need to increase performance in special populations such as ELLs and low performing sub-groups, as well as overall reading/literacy instruction. A plan to address these areas was formed in the professional development plan. 2. Teachers participated in a professional development survey through ASU Inspire program. An individualized snapshot of professional development needs was taken into consideration through these surveys when the professional development plan was being written.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: September 2014 EL meeting agenda and Spring assessment analysis. Professional Development Plan (documentation of analysis and connection to the plan) ASU Inspire professional development surveys
5. How does this professional development plan address areas of high importance?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): A significant portion of the teaching staff were new to Paideia in the 2014-2015 school year. Much of the professional development plan addressed new staff needs, as well as training in the basic Paideia philosophies and instructional methodology.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: New Teacher Orientation Checklist One-on-One Professional Development Plan with principal

Based on Dashboard data and instructional effectiveness data from the previous year, as well as sessions with consultant Dr. Mike Schmoker, the Executive Leadership Team developed a plan that addressed areas of high importance: ○ Development and use of curriculum maps ○ Lessons powered by the Essential Elements of Instruction (Teach to Objective-Guided Practice-Check for Understanding Cycle) ○ Authentic Literacy (ELA development) ○ Math achievement	ASBCS Dashboard Instructional Effectiveness summary/graphs and teacher growth analysis Professional Development Plan
Supporting High Quality Implementation	
6. How does the Charter Holder support high quality implementation of the strategies learned in professional development sessions?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): Executive Leadership Team created a system to support the implementation of professional development in classrooms: • Coaching The Curriculum Director coaches teachers in implementing the strategies learned in professional development sessions. ○ Instructional Effectiveness Rubric is used as an observation and coaching tool. The instructional practices rubric is used frequently by the curriculum director to monitor and coach teachers on the instructional practices learned in professional development sessions. • Mentoring One of the purposes of the mentoring program is to help new and blossoming educators to implement professional development strategies learned in professional development sessions • Teacher Individual Professional Development Plans: • Teachers have 1-on-1 conversations with the principal on a bimonthly basis to review their individual professional development plans. • Teachers set goals on student achievement in their professional development plans to include strategies learned in professional development	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: Coaching Binder Instructional Effectiveness Rubrics (as a coaching tool) Mentoring Program Binder One-on-One Interview Binder One-on-One Binder

sessions.	
7. How does the Charter Holder provide the resources that are necessary for high quality implementation?	
1. The charter holder supports the creation of common planning times: • The master schedule includes time for common planning among grade-level teams. Grade-level teams also meet on ½ days to plan together. Common planning time is guarded for implementation and discussion of strategies learned in professional development sessions. 2. Professional development budget for training and materials that support instruction, as well as all subgroups: The Executive Leadership Team has set aside money for specific training based on unique needs of teachers. • ELL Training • ELA Training • Singapore Math Training • SPED Training • Instructional strategies training The Executive Leadership Team has set aside money for book studies, professional journals and professional memberships based on the unique needs of teachers. 3. Set aside a curriculum lab/ professional development library: The curriculum lab contains books, manipulatives, and resources that teachers check out for personal professional development growth and resources for classrooms. These materials are used to improve the quality of instruction and implementation of professional development strategies.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: School Calendar Professional Development Calendar Grade-level team meeting agendas and notes Professional Development Budget Invoices Resources: Leader in Me Crucial Conversations Education Leadership subscription Professional Development library resources Curriculum Lab Office in the Faculty Room Materials Check-Out Binder
Monitoring Implementation	
8. How does the Charter Holder monitor the implementation of the strategies learned in professional development sessions?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): The Charter Holder formalized a system for monitoring the implementation of the strategies learned in professional development sessions:	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:

1. Conduct coaching observations to monitor implementation of strategies learned in professional development meetings. 2. Conduct formal classroom observations and have post-observation feedback meetings with teachers to monitor the implementation of strategies learned in professional development sessions. 3. Executive Leadership teams hold monthly accountability meetings to monitor implementation of professional development by reviewing: • Curriculum Review meeting notes • Instructional effectiveness rubric data • MAP, AIMSweb, and state assessment data • School-wide data binder/data dialogs • Curriculum map samples 4. Conduct a professional development survey to analyze the effectiveness of implementation. • Used to inform future professional development • Used to follow up on implementation of strategies learned in professional development sessions.	Coaching Binder Post-observation Feedback Form EL Meeting notes and agenda Professional Development Binder
9. How does the Charter Holder monitor and follow-up with instructional staff to support and develop implementation of the strategies learned in professional development?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): The Charter Holder monitors and follows up with instructional staff to support and develop professional development implementation through: • post PD surveys, • frequent informal drop-in observations to watch learned strategies in action, • one-on-one meetings with teachers on the development of their professional development progress and additional needs.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: Post Professional Development Surveys Informal Observation forms/coaching documents One-on-One Meeting Binder

Adapted to Meet the Needs of Subgroups *(Address all relevant measures)*	
10. How does the professional development plan ensure that instructional staff receives the type of development required to meet the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): Provide training in the essential elements of instruction, specifically • formative assessments: helps teachers identify who is performing in the bottom 25%. • guided practice: gives students multiple opportunities to practice a skill/standard to mastery • checks for understanding: allows the teacher to ensure all students are learning and to monitor any lack of mastery, specifically in students performing at the bottom 25%. The professional development plan includes processes to train teachers to use formative and summative data in Data Dialogs to inform instructional planning. Professional development informs teachers to: • identify students who did not master the objective (**bottom 25%)** • identify methods to reteach, reassess, and modify instruction to fit the needs of the subgroup. • utilize remediation strategies to bring the students to mastery.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: Professional Development Calendar Professional development sign-in sheets
11. How does the professional development plan ensure that instructional staff receives the type of development required to meet the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): Provided SEI professional development options from the English Language Learners department of the ADE website to address reading instruction for the ELL population. ○ Close Reading in the 3-12 Classroom ○ Differentiating Instruction for ELLs in the 3-5 Classroom ○ Multisensory Grammar ○ Listening and Speaking in the K-5 SEI ○ Vocabulary in the K-5 SEI Classroom ○ Close Reading in the K-2	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: Professional Development Calendar Professional development sign-in sheets

Classroom Classroom ○ Writing to Learn for ELL Students Grades 3-5 ○ Taking Grammar to Writing: Write Now! Grades 3-12	
12. How does the professional development plan ensure that instructional staff receives the type of development required to meet the needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): 79% of Paideia students are eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch, so our primary program of instruction is already targeted at these students.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: N/A
13. How does the professional development plan ensure that instructional staff receives the type of development required to meet the needs of students with disabilities?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): The professional development plan ensures instructional staff received development to meet the needs of students with disabilities by providing training through the Department of Education and the SPED department at Paideia on strategies to support SPED populations: • Provides ELA professional development options from the Arizona Department of Education website to address ELA instruction in the **bottom 25%, FRL, and SPED population.** • Professional development in this area includes: ○ Child Find training ○ Speech ○ Occupational Therapy ○ Workshop based working with students with learning disabilities	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: Professional development calendar Agendas/sign in sheets SPED teacher professional development documentation