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: Monitoring Instruction

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome	
[M.M.1] **Coaching Documents** **Communication** **Curriculum maps** **Instructional Effectiveness Rubric** **Sample curriculum review meeting documents** **Teacher observation data** **Paideia learning objective shells** **Paideia instructional monitoring** **Strategy Based Performance Management Plan** ***Curriculum Guide 2015 (P. 47-51)*** ***% of Learning Objective Plainly Posted and Referred to***	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the Charter Holder's process for monitoring the integration of standards into classroom instruction and how the Charter Holder monitors whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The principal, assistant principal, and curriculum director conduct formal observations using the Instructional Effectiveness Rubric. Formal observations are conducted twice per year for master teachers, and three times per year for those that are struggling or new. • The Instructional Effectiveness Rubric is aligned with the InTASC Standards as well as the Arizona state standards. The rubric includes an alignment with Paideia's instructional methodology. • The curriculum director conducts informal instructional observations and coaching visits to monitor whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS aligned curriculum with fidelity. • Conduct curriculum review meetings to ensure instructional fidelity and alignment to standards. • Posted objectives are monitored for alignment with curriculum maps and the instruction that is taking place. **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.
[M.M.2] **Instructional Effectiveness Rubric** **SLC Meeting Minutes** **2015 Growth Analysis** **Monthly Checkpoints document** ***Curriculum Guide 2015-2016 (Curriculum Map and Lesson Plan Sections)*** ***% of Learning Objective Plainly Posted and Referred to*** ***Teacher Formal Observations on***	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how does the Charter Holder monitor the effectiveness of standards-based instruction throughout the year. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Informal Drop-in Observations are conducted by the Curriculum Director. Observations are debriefed with teachers. • Rubric includes sections utilizing Teach Like a Champion techniques. • Analysis of Data Dialogs and common assessments. Data is also analyzed in post-observation and one-on-one conferencing. **Final Evaluation:**	

the Instructional Effectiveness Rubric ***EL Meeting Notes***	☒ 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.

[M.E.3]
Executive Leadership team notes
Growth Analysis
Instructional Effectiveness Rubric
Post Observation One-on-One documents
 	
Individual Teacher Evaluations
	Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate: the Charter Holder's process for evaluating instructional practices and how this process evaluates the quality of instruction.
	
	The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:
	• The Executive Leadership Team rewrote the formal observation rubric to include "Excellent Lessons" section which evaluates:
	  ○ Student Friendly Learning Objective
	  ○ Embedded Critical Vocabulary
	  ○ Anticipatory Set
	  ○ Teach to the Objective
	  ○ Guided Practice
	  ○ Check for Understanding
	  ○ Independent Practice
	• Teachers have one-on-one plans that are created with administration.
	• Conduct formal instructional observations to evaluate instructional practices using the Instructional Effectiveness Rubric.
	• Quantify observation data in the "Excellent Lessons" and Curriculum Maps/Lesson Plans section of the Instructional Effectiveness Rubric
	
	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.

[M.E.4] **Teacher Observation Data Growth Analysis** ***Davidson_InstrEffRubric (Teacher Instructional Effectiveness Rubrics)*** ***Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (Scores Jan 2014 disaggregated)***	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how this process identifies individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The process helps each teacher identify his or her own individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs by receiving data in a post observation conference. This process includes pre conferences as well. • Analysis of scores helps administration identify overall strengths, weaknesses, and needs of teachers and instructional effectiveness by quantifying and analyzing the data. **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.
[M.F.5] **Executive Leadership Team notes** **Mentoring Documents** **Teacher observation data** **CLC meeting minutes(campus leadership council)** **Professional Day of Learning**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder provides feedback on strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs based on the evaluation of instructional practices. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • 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 improvement in the quality of instruction. • 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. • Executive leadership team analyzes grade-level observational data for strengths, weaknesses, and needs across grade levels. **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.

[M.F.6] **Growth Analysis** **Meeting agendas and notes** **Instructional Effectiveness Rubrics** ***Paideia Instructional Monitoring Plan*** ***Campus Leadership Council Meetings Agendas and Minutes (12/2 includes a setting of averages)*** ***April 1, 2015 ADE CSP Academic program Monitoring debrief notes (Smoudi and Francis)***	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder analyzes this information, what the data about quality of instruction tells the Charter Holder, and what the Charter Holder has done in response. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Each teacher's observation scores are graphed in an Excel document that is analyzed in a post-observation Executive Leadership Team meeting. • Information is analyzed according to the "Excellent Lessons" section. • Based on information from ADE and outside trainers, the school revisited instructional monitoring and implemented a monthly walk-about checkpoint document and a new rubric for evaluations. • Based on this analysis and the data that came out of this analysis, a professional development plan was outlined to address the T20-GP-C4U instructional cycle and to implement more in-depth study of the essential elements of instruction. • Teacher scores are disaggregated by sub-skill and an analysis of individual strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs is conducted. **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.
[M.S.7] **Instructional Effectiveness Rubric** **Data Dialogs** **Curriculum Guide**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • 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%. The Charter Holder looks for re-teaching and reassessment as tracked on the data dialogs. • The instructional effectiveness rubric evaluates the effectiveness of the essential elements of instruction for students in the bottom 25%. **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.

[M.S.8] **AZED ELD PD documents** **ILLP Guidance Document** **SEI lesson plans** ***SEI Class Obs*** ***Paideia Instructional Effectiveness Formal Observation Rubric: Garrison***	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs). **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • 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. • The instructional effectiveness rubric evaluates the effectiveness of the essential elements of instruction for non-proficient students. • Evaluate the use of common assessments in Data Dialogues to adapt/modify instruction. • SEI interventionist works with ELL students who are failing to master objectives according to the teacher's Data Dialog forms. • ELL Coordinator ensures that "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. **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.
[M.S.9] **N/A**	**Not Applicable**	
[M.S.10] **Data Dialogs** **Instructional Effectiveness Rubric** ***General Education Teacher Input for the IEP*** ***The Differentiated Classroom Observation Form*** ***TeacherObservation 2014-2015***	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with disabilities. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Evaluate the use of common assessments in Data Dialogues to adapt/modify instruction for students with disabilities. • The special education teacher is evaluated using the Instructional Effectiveness Rubric. **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.