Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: The Paideia Academies, Inc.
School Name: The Paideia Academy South Phoenix
Site Visit Date: September 21, 2015

Required for: Expansion - Grade Level
Expansion - Enrollment Cap
Evaluation Criteria Area: Assessment

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome	
[A.AS.1] **AIMSweb documents** **AZELLA documents** **Common Assessments** **Curriculum Guides** **MAP documents** **Progress monitoring Grade level** **RTI documentation**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the types of assessments the Charter Holder uses **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • AIMSweb assessment probes measure reading fluency and comprehension, math computation and analysis • Strategic and progress monitoring assessments • MAP Assessment domains • Administer the AZELLA according to the assessment protocols for administering the test. • Common assessments in reading, math, and writing across grade level teams **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.

[A.AS.2]
EL Team Analysis Data
Curriculum Guide 2015-2016 FINAL (p. 43-46)
EL Meeting Notes (p. 12)
	Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate: the process for designing or selecting the assessment system
	
	The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:
	• Assessment systems are analyzed for:
	  ○ Reliability and validity
	  ○ Timely results to identify students who need intervention
	  ○ Multipurpose scores that are reported as norm-referenced, proficiency, and growth
	• A wide array of reports displaying data in various formats and grouping options
	
	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.

[A.AS.3] **AIMSweb alignment** **Common Assessment Alignment** **Data Dialogs** **Instructional Effectiveness Rubric** **MAP alignment** **3rd grade_CurrAssess_sample** **Aladdin_3rd Grade** **ELA Curriculum Map Q1 2015-2016**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the assessment system is aligned to the curriculum and instructional methodology. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • MAP assessments are aligned to Common Core Standards. • Core Knowledge Language Arts is assessed through the CKLA program assessments • Singapore Math Program Assessments are utilized school wide • The MAP assessment is aligned to Common Core **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.

[A.AS.4]
AIMSweb PM, SM, and benchmark intervals
Common Assessments: formative/summative
Instructional Effectiveness
Formal Observation Rubric
MAP intervals
Paideia Curriculum Guide
	Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate: the intervals that are used to assess student progress and how the assessment plan includes data collection from multiple assessment, such as formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments
	
	The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:
	• Benchmarks:
	  ○ NWEA 3 times per year
	  ○ AIMSWeb 4 times per year
	• Strategic Monitoring
	  ○ AIMSWeb once per month
	• Weekly Common Assessments
	• Data collected from MAP assessment, AIMSweb, Common, and Statewide assessments
	
	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.

[A.AN.5] **SLC Meeting agendas/minutes (teacher grade-level meetings)** **Grade 3 Data Dialogs- monthly interval** **Executive Leadership team minutes/notes** **Meeting expectations guide** **Curriculum Guide 2015-2016 FINAL** **Nov10PD Training PowerPoint** **PD Sign-in 2014-2015**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the assessment system provides for analysis of assessment data and what intervals are used to analyze assessment data **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Teachers generate common assessment data at the end of curriculum units. These data are analyzed during grade-level meetings. • Teachers are provided with classroom MAP data 3 times per year. • Teachers are provided with AIMSweb benchmark data 3 times per year. • Data binders are reviewed by the principal, curriculum director, and grade-level teams at the monthly curriculum review meeting. • School-wide data dialog binders contain all teacher monthly data dialogs. These data are reviewed at the Executive Leadership on every 3rd Monday. **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.
[A.AN.6] **Meetings expectations guide** **5th grade observation rubric** **SLC grade level meeting notes** **Vertical grade level meeting notes** **Growth Analysis** **Curriculum Review meeting notes** **MAP Continuum of Learning**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the analysis is used to evaluate instructional and curricular effectiveness **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • 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. • Teachers use MAP data to determine mastery of standards and evaluate growth towards proficiency. Analysis of grade-level summative data is used to determine effectiveness of curricular programs and prompt decisions about curriculum. • Analysis of the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric gives information about teacher instructional effectiveness. • During post observation meetings, the teacher and principal go over curriculum maps and data binders for effectiveness. **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.

[A.ADJ.7] **Curriculum Guide** **Curriculum Maps** **Meeting notes and agendas** **PD Calendar**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the analysis is used to adjust curriculum and instruction in a timely manner and what intervals are used to adjust curriculum and instruction **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • For strategic monitoring, data is analyzed by the last week of the month to adjust instruction for those scholars in strategic monitoring. • For common grade-level assessments, analysis of data is used to adjust curriculum and instruction weekly. • For Benchmark assessments, analysis of data is used to adjust curriculum and instruction in September, January, March, and May. **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.
[A.S.8] **Data Dialogs; RTI notes** **Intervention plans/assessments** **AIMSweb strategic monitoring** **CKLA Assessment and Remediation Guide** **Move on When Reading Meeting Notes**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the assessment system is adapted to meet the assessment needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Students in the bottom 25% are in intervention. RTI is monitored through progress monitoring. This happens through AIMS web. Students requiring RTI and more frequent monitoring are identified through the data dialogue. • Read Naturally is used for intervention with all SEI kids. It is also used with students who need specific intervention as determined by interventionists. **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.

[A.S.9] **Data Dialogs** **SEI Intervention plans/assessments** **AIMSweb strategic monitoring** **CKLA Supplemental Guide** **Assessment Remediation CKLA** **ILLPS (Attachments A and B)**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the assessment system is adapted to meet the assessment needs of English Language Learners (ELLs) **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The Core Knowledge Assessment and Remediation Guide is used for assessment. The pausing points are specific areas for reassessment. • ILLPs identify goals and standards. These are progress monitored through AIMSweb. **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.
[A.S.10] **N/A**	**Not Applicable**	
[A.S.11] **Data Dialogs** **Special Education Intervention plans/assessments** **AIMSweb strategic monitoring** **CKLA Supplemental Guide** **Student IEPs**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the assessment system is adapted to meet the assessment needs of students with disabilities **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Assessment of IEP students is related to the goals in the IEP. Goals are monitored through additional assessments. Progress monitoring toward goals is tracked in IEP Pro. **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.