Phoenix Advantage Charter School

Performance Management Plan 2011

Introduction:

Phoenix Advantage Charter School is a single site charter school that serves 511 students in grade kindergarten through eighth grade. The mission and goal of the school is to provide each student with the instruction necessary to allow him or her to be successful. The vision of the school is to reach every student every day with a high quality, research based program of instruction that accounts for the needs of the individual and provides for those needs.

The Phoenix Advantage curriculum is standards based and designed to engage students from diverse backgrounds and personal experiences. The program monitors student progress extensively and uses this data to make the appropriate instructional decisions for all students. Phoenix Advantage is organized with a focus on student learning and achievement. Students are required to attend school for an extended day and an extended school year. While most Arizona Schools operate on a 184 day calendar, Phoenix Advantage students attend school for 192 days. The extra time that students attend school is used to learn higher level curriculum and to intervene when students are not able to master the required standards.

The Phoenix Advantage model provides extensive professional development (15-20 days per year), curriculum and instructional guidance and support, executive management support, grants management and provides the award winning Paragon curriculum. Paragon includes music, art, humanities, literature, philosophy, natural sciences, archeology, history, geography and more. Paragon prepares students for college and exposes them to a classical liberal arts education using cooperative learning, graphic organizers, Socratic discussion, role play and personal connection journaling.

Students and Families

The students at Phoenix Advantage face a variety of challenges evident in any population with a high poverty rate. More than 90% of the population qualifies for free or reduced lunch. More than half of the student population is identified as ELL. Students also face the challenges of a community that is highly mobile, with parents who are under a great deal of pressure to provide for their families. Often parents do not have the time or energy to devote to their students and the educational process that they know to be necessary for students to be successful.

At the same time, families make extraordinary efforts to support their children. Recently the school invited families to review data about their children and then the school provided them with the material for a simple game to help with mathematics fluency. In interviews with students later, it was apparent that families found a way to work in the “game” that would help the student do well in math. The administration and staff at Phoenix Advantage readily accept the challenge to meet the students where they are.

Teaching and Administrative Staff

The school has a turnover rate of teaching staff that is consistent with the national trend in charter schools. The current staff is characterized by a lack of teaching experience. Currently the school has 24 classroom teachers, of which 7 are in their first year of teaching. The school provides support through the administrative staff and a Curriculum Instructional Specialist. Teachers are provided training in research based instructional strategies, specific curriculum training, classroom management and effective use of data and assessments to make instructional decisions.

In contrast to the instructional staff, the administrative staff is very experienced. The leadership team has done extensive work in curriculum design, professional development design and delivery, assessment development, data analysis and classroom management. Two of the leadership team have been school administrators and all of the team members had school leadership experience prior to coming to Phoenix Advantage Charter School (PACS).

Phoenix Advantage has recognized that the staff is generally inexperienced and provides training prior to the school year and throughout the year in a focused, job embedded manner. Phoenix Advantage provides a merit pay bonus to all instructional staff based on student achievement scores as measured by both the AIMS assessment and by Benchmark Galileo tests administered school wide on a quarterly basis as well as an anonymous parent survey.

All instructional staff are trained in the use of data to make educational decisions and on the effective interpretation of the data that is collected from a wide variety of sources. Data is collected and analyzed for all core subjects.

All of the teachers at Phoenix Advantage Charter School are required to submit an Individualized Professional Development Plan (IPDP), based on their previous experience and professional goals for the year. Each IPDP has three goals and each goal has an action plan with a timeline of completion and benchmarks along the way. All teachers were asked to complete 2 professional readings, Fred Jones' *Tools for Teaching*, and *A Framework for Understanding Poverty* by Ruby Payne. Teachers have chapters they are responsible for monthly and written reflections are submitted to administration. The third goal is chosen by the individual teacher and is reflective of his/her strengths and weaknesses in the classroom.

Efforts in Literacy to Improve Student Achievement

2006-2007

In the 2006-2007 school year Phoenix Advantage Charter School (PACS) received an AZLEARNS label of Underperforming and did not make AYP. The school began the Reading First program which resulted in changes to the literacy program in several ways. All students in grades K-6 began benchmark DIBELS testing to determine and track reading fluency. The

school also received the 21st Century Learning Community Grant which provided funding for after school tutoring and enrichment programs.

The Reading First Grant required some changes to literacy instruction at PACS. New positions were created, including a Literacy Coach and a Reading Interventionist. The Arizona Department of Education supported PACS with mandatory monthly professional development and site visits to monitor program implementation. Small group instruction in grades K-3 was required and vertical team data meetings with grade levels were held weekly to identify student needs in literacy. The core literacy program, *Open Court*, was not a new program to PACS but the requirement of the Reading First grant was that the program be taught with fidelity. The emphasis for the administration at that time was to follow the program exactly. While the program maintained that it was aligned to the Arizona State Academic standards, there was no attempt to verify this. Teachers were required to teach the program as presented.

Teachers in grades K-3 were given weekly goal sheets and required to progress monitor their students in reading fluency on a regular basis, usually each week. This information was tracked and used for flexible grouping purposes so that students would receive additional support.

K-3 students met or exceeded the state averages for each grade level in reading fluency as a result of Reading First. Tutoring for all students was available after school through the 21st Century program but was not targeted or focused. This element of the grant program was not the primary focus of the administration at the time. Students in grades K-3 were very successful in improving their fluency. However, for the 3rd grade students, this did not translate into improved AIMS scores.

2007-2008

In January of 2007 the school began changing administration. This continued through the remainder of the 2006-2007 school year. The school failed to make AYP and was again identified as an underperforming school.

In August of 2007 the site level administration was replaced and a new team, along with a number of classroom teachers, was brought in to address the issue. After reviewing the school data for the last few years, it became apparent that the curriculum needed to be examined to determine if there were “holes” within the curriculum and to make sure that the teachers were aware of what was expected and required of them in terms of addressing the Arizona Academic Standards. The first task was to have grade level teachers begin creating a literacy curriculum map, linked to the Arizona State Standards. This was done on the weekends during the month of September.

It became apparent that there were significant gaps in the curriculum that would need to be addressed in the literacy program, especially grades 4 and 5. Generally, the staff determined that there was not enough writing to effectively meet the needs of the students and that there would

need to be an emphasis on small group instruction and more focused content instruction to help the students improve.

The administration required that the teachers submit lesson plans for literacy on a weekly basis and that the plans specifically identify the performance objectives that were being addressed by the teacher and the grade level. The grade levels were given common planning time to allow for cooperative planning and the administration met with each grade level on a weekly basis to monitor the progress of the curriculum development, where necessary, and the development of student achievement within each class.

The administration also continued to encourage the development of small group instruction as well as the implementation of the "Walk to Read" program that was based on the students' DIBELS scores and allowed teachers to ability group students for literacy and provide more focused instruction for the students.

With the extensive change in administration and instructional staff (all administrative staff and approximately one quarter of the instructional staff) the administration did extensive classroom observations to determine the effectiveness of both the instruction and the curriculum. While there were holes identified in the curriculum, effective instruction became a more pressing issue. It became apparent as the year progressed that there would need to be additional staff changes made before the next school year.

At the end of the 2007-2008 school year there was limited growth in student scores. It was not possible at that time to determine whether the curriculum was a problem because of the instructional issues that had been identified. The literacy curriculum was left in place but it was determined the curriculum maps should be refined over the summer using teachers and administrators.

A group of teachers were recruited and they worked for 10 days during the summer to refine the curriculum maps. In grades K-2 this was a very successful procedure. In grades 3-5 the activity was helpful but not as successful as with the primary grades. The middle school team struggled with their map because they were using a different core literacy program which, they felt, did not address the needs of the students as well as that which was being used in the primary and intermediate grades. Overall, there was a general reliance on the text to provide the instructional focus rather than the performance objectives from the state standards.

The gaps in the writing program were also identified by the mapping group and the team began putting together a writing program that would be used to supplement what was available to all teachers.

2008-2009

2008-2009 was the last year of the Reading First grant. The criticism for the program that was becoming an issue nationally was also apparent within the school. Students who had been in the program but were now in a grade level that was not serviced by the program were not making the same progress that had been seen previously on the DIBELS scores. It was also very clear that they were not moving forward as quickly as was needed in comprehension. The school used the last of the Reading First grant to make sure that the supplemental and remedial materials for the core reading program were in place for those students who were eligible to receive Reading First support. The school then purchased remedial materials for grades 4-5 to supplement the core reading program.

Certain aspects of the Reading First program seemed to be producing better results than other portions and so the school then required that all teachers in grades K-6 implement those elements that seemed most effective. This included small group instruction and careful monitoring with the DIBELS assessment tool. The school also recognized that it would be necessary to put into place an assessment system that would allow teachers the opportunity to more effectively evaluate student comprehension. The tools used during this school year (and previously) were primarily the comprehension assessments provided by the core literacy program. These assessments, even when modified by the teacher, focused on the content of the story and failed to address the performance objective at a level that was sufficiently rigorous to effectively evaluate mastery.

Grade level meetings continued during this time to evaluate student achievement and to monitor teacher instruction focused on the state standards. During these meetings it became apparent to the administration that the teachers were not using a common vocabulary and that they did not necessarily have a professional learning community in place which would have helped them enrich the current curriculum.

The school introduced the professional learning community (PLC) concept to the staff as a voluntary activity. The teachers were given materials to work with that would aid them in expanding and supporting the curriculum and improve their instructional strategies. They were required to meet regularly and to share ideas with their team and with other teachers.

The school also expanded the class time allowed for literacy instruction from 90 minutes to 120 minutes for all students. The schedule was altered to allow for a 30 minute “Power Time” which was set aside for teachers to work with students struggling with a specific concept or idea.

At the end of the school year the administration continued the process begun the year before of evaluating staff and replacing staff as needed. A review of the AIMS scores at the end of the year continued to reflect little change. Scores continued within a narrow band. The school recognized the need for an assessment program beyond the DIBELS assessments and the formative and summative assessments provided by the text or created by the teachers. The

school needed to implement a program that was more rigorous and was more closely aligned to the Arizona State Academic standards.

2009-2010

By the summer of 2009 the staff at PACS had changed significantly. The current staff was young and had, for the most part, less than 3 years experience. In evaluation of AIMS scores in comprehension of informational text for grades 6-8 the school recognized a specific need in literacy. While the scores were not particularly low, they were not growing either. There were two new language arts teachers and it was determined that a supplemental literacy program needed to be available. The school reviewed a number of programs and determined that *Read to Achieve* provided the necessary student material and was structured in a way that would allow both teachers the best support while being more fully aligned to state standards. This program was implemented in 2009-2010. The teachers received direct professional development for the implementation of the program from the publisher.

The school was also able to add interactive "SmartBoards" to most classrooms to allow teachers an additional instructional tool for literacy, vocabulary, modeling and other instructional needs. All teachers received professional development along with examples and modeling on how the boards could be used to support literacy in all grade levels and integrate technology further into the curriculum.

The school continued to require small group instruction, the extended literacy time and implemented the use of the Galileo Assessment system for quarterly comprehensive benchmark assessments. Full implementation of the benchmark system was completed by the end of the first semester. However, even as implementation was going on, the school was meeting at grade levels to discuss the data from the assessments.

During these meetings two things became apparent. The first was that the literacy program was not an easy program for new, inexperienced teachers to use and second that the program, as structured, was not providing the rigor that was needed to assure mastery. In the spring of 2010 the administrative team attended a workshop presented by the Arizona Charter School Association in which the Arizona Growth Model was made available. This information confirmed what the school had been seeing.

Several conclusions were reached. The first was that the core curriculum would need to be supported differently (since it could not be replaced due to budget cuts). The second was that the school now had a tool in Galileo that would provide adequate data to help teachers more effectively plan instruction but that the inexperience of the teachers would necessitate extensive support throughout the course of the year.

At the end of the year it also became apparent that while the *Read to Achieve* program should have been a benefit to students, the implementation did not appear to be as direct and fluid as had been assumed.

With a drop in the AIMS scores for the 2009-2010 school year, the school determined that the staff would need additional support in the effective use of the data now available to them and would need help in effectively tracking the success of individual students to assure the success of all.

2010-2011

With that in mind the school made several changes to support the literacy curriculum. Each teacher began the year by creating a "Personal Student Achievement Plan" for each student in his or her classroom. This plan was based on the student's scores from several different data sources from the year before. Teachers were required to create goals for students with action plans based on these scores. This allowed teachers to be able to identify which students would need additional support in literacy (as well as math and writing).

Teachers were also provided with a "Standards Checklist" for literacy. This was a list of all of the performance objectives with a series of columns for the teacher to indicate when the performance objective had been addressed in class. This checklist served several purposes.

First, it allowed teachers to focus on the performance objectives on a daily and weekly basis, rather than the objectives that were being presented in the text. It also allowed them to resurface previously learned materials by constantly having all performance objectives before them. The checklists were also used to create the weekly and monthly assessments that were required to be created using the Galileo tool and administered to all students in the grade level.

Because data was now directly tied to performance objectives rather than content within the program, the data became more meaningful for instructional decisions. Teachers met with the administration on a weekly basis to review the data student by student and to make the necessary changes in instruction. This information was also used by teachers to create the small groups within their classrooms for re-teaching and, in conjunction with the administration, to determine students in need of tutoring before and after school.

All student benchmark data was posted and maintained in a central location by the teachers for immediate reference and review by both the teachers and administration. These "data walls" were also used during the weekly grade level meeting to review student progress and teacher effectiveness.

Once it was determined that the curriculum could be used as a resource to teach the performance objectives and not as the sole source of information and instruction, teachers became more

effective and student achievement rose in a very positive manner. Every tested grade level showed strong growth using the AIMS scores for the 2010-2011 school year.

Curricular Efforts Math

2006-2007

During the 2006-2007 school year the school was using an older version of Saxon Math as the core curriculum. This program had been in place for several years. The school was not making AYP and had been determined to be Underperforming. The administration at the time determined that the version of Saxon then in use was too limiting and did not allow for the growth of the students.

2007-2008

The core curriculum was changed to SRA Real Math for grades K-5 and SRA Impact Math for grades 6-8. The first year of implementation of this program was 2007-2008. During this year the administration of the school was changed dramatically.

The intent of the new math program was to allow the students to be more interactive with the math concepts. The program was designed to be less direct instruction than was the case with Saxon. The new program provided both enrichment and remediation while allowing the teacher much more flexibility in the determination of the instructional approaches to use.

2008-2009

During the summer of 2008 the curriculum maps during the 2007-2008 school year were revised and refined. A group of teachers were brought in to work in vertical teams to map the new curriculum and ensure that all standards were being addressed in an appropriate manner and within the correct time frame. Any areas that were not being adequately addressed were then identified and support material developed.

As with literacy, the most effective vertical team proved to be the primary team. The intermediate team was able to provide good insight and the middle school team determined that they would need to support the curriculum more fully than had been the case during the first year.

During the 2008-2009 school year the teachers received professional development in instructional strategies and in effective use of the materials within the newly adopted core math curriculum. Teachers struggled with the intervention materials and enrichment materials. The assessment data used for evaluation of student progress was primarily those assessments created by the publisher and directly connected to the program. It was determined that these assessments would continue to be used throughout the year to encourage fidelity to the program allowing for

an accurate determination of the effectiveness of the new program and the teachers' use of the program.

At the end of the 2008-2009 school year the AIMS results were mixed. Several grades showed improvement while several remained basically at the same level. The administration determined that additional support would be needed for both the remediation and the enrichment portions of the program and that manipulatives should be added to the general program to help teachers present the basic concepts.

2009-2010

Beginning in 2009-2010 teachers were provided with a range of manipulatives to support the instruction of basic math concepts. Teachers were trained in the use of these tools. In addition, teachers were required to post the performance objectives for each lesson on their boards, in a student friendly manner, to help students understand the basic concepts they were to be learning.

To support the new math strategies the math class period was extended from 60 minutes daily to 90 minutes daily. The extended time was designed to provide the teachers at least 30 minutes each day to do small group instruction with the students, providing additional support or enrichment for all students.

As with literacy, teachers were required to submit lesson plans with the performance objectives from the Arizona State Academic Standards listed on a weekly basis. Teachers were provided with the revised standards when they were implemented by the state and were required to use these new standards.

During this school year the Galileo assessment system was implemented for math (as well as literacy.) Teachers were trained in creating formative assessments and the school implemented quarterly benchmark assessments school-wide.

Following each assessment, teachers met with the administration and reviewed individual student data. The progress, or lack of progress was then addressed and students were then grouped for small group instruction or tutoring as needed. During the 3rd benchmark assessment the school noticed a drop in the math scores for several grade levels. This included content in which students had demonstrated mastery during the first semester. When the teachers were asked about this drop, it became apparent that the curriculum did not lend itself well to scaffolding of information and did not revisit previously learned materials with any regularity or purpose. It was left to the teacher to resurface previous learning and review mastered material. It became apparent to the administration that this was something that was happening with the more experienced teachers but was a challenge for the less experienced ones.

Each grade level created a review schedule to resurface previously learned material but the resulting scores indicated that both the students and the teachers struggled with this.

Using the growth model information available through the Arizona Charter School Association, and by researching with other schools that were using the same math program, it became apparent that while the SRA math programs allowed teachers a great deal of flexibility, it made assumptions about the experience level of the instructors using the program that were not necessarily appropriate for PACS at this time.

2010-2011

The school began to immediately evaluate alternative programs for adoption and implementation during the 2010-2011 school year. The program that was determined to best meet the needs of the school was the revised version of Saxon Math. This program required more direct instruction and had a component that reviewed previously taught material on a regular basis.

The program was adopted and implemented for the 2010-2011 school year. The administration was aware that when the school had changed math programs in 2007 there had been a slight drop in overall test scores. That was not acceptable especially in light of the drop in scores during the 2009-2010 school year.

To prevent a reoccurrence of that drop the school implemented several programs to support both the students and the teachers.

First, the teachers received extensive training in the correct implementation of the Saxon math program, including training prior to the start of the year as well as on-going training throughout the year both from the school staff and the Saxon representatives.

Next, teachers were required to administer the Saxon assessments but were also required to administer grade level monthly assessments using the Galileo system to assure that the students were mastering the state academic standards. The school also administered school wide bench mark assessments five times during the school year.

Following each of the monthly and benchmark assessments, teachers met with the administration to review the data and determine, at a student level, what additional instruction, remediation or tutoring needed to occur.

In December it was determined that a portion of 8th grade was struggling with the level of Saxon appropriate for their grade and that a portion was more advanced. Students were presented with adjusted curriculum to address their needs at this time. The performance objectives continued to be addressed but the adjustment in the level of difficulty occurred too late in the school year to help the students overcome the deficiencies and frustrations that had occurred to the extent that was apparent at other grade levels. PACS made AYP in every grade level except 8th grade.

Integration of Arizona State Standards to Improve Student Achievement.

The information presented here was done for all subjects. This specifically includes both literacy and math. The school has adopted a new math curriculum but has continued to implement all of the efforts listed here.

During the 2006-2007 school year there is no indication of specific, directed efforts to integrate the Arizona State Academic Standards into the curriculum that existed. Lesson plans were not required. Both the core literacy and core math programs did align to state standards generally but there was no obvious oversight on the part of the school to assure that instruction and assessment was directed at the state standards.

As has been mentioned previously, beginning in January of 2007 there was a change in administration within the school. This change culminated with a new building administrator in August of 2007. Beginning with the first Saturday in September the administration and instructional staff began the process of aligning the curriculum directly to the Arizona State Academic Standards. Each grade level was required to go through each unit in math and literacy and determine which performance objectives were explicitly taught in that unit. The team then identified which performance objectives were omitted and would need supplemental materials.

Teachers were required to turn in lesson plans on a weekly basis that identified the performance objectives that were being addressed for the week in both literacy and math. These lessons were reviewed by the administration and were discussed with the grade level teachers in weekly grade level meetings. Since many of the teachers had not been required to do this in the past, the teachers were provided with a template for the lesson plan. The teachers were also required to post their weekly performance objectives in their classrooms using student friendly terms. These were reviewed by the administration in both walk-through and formal observations.

The mapping activity that occurred during the school year was designed to align the curriculum and state standards and to require the teachers to address the performance objectives. To refine this map, the school used the summer of 2008 and brought together vertical teams of teachers representing all grade levels to make a more detailed map of the curriculum aligned to the standards and to create specific pacing guides to be used by each grade level.

During the 2008-2009 school year the requirement of weekly lesson plans along with extensive formal and informal teacher evaluations continued. Teachers and administration continued to meet on a weekly basis to review both the lesson plans and student progress. As a result of these observations and meetings, some of the instructional staff were not offered positions for the following year.

During the observations it became apparent to the administration that a more formal assessment plan needed to be in place that was directly aligned to state standards and was not driven by the content of the program in use.

During the 2009-2010 school year the school employed a number of young, inexperienced teachers and adopted the Galileo assessment program to use for benchmark assessments throughout the year.

The school continued to require weekly lesson plans, weekly grade level meetings, formal and informal teacher observations, posting of objectives in student friendly format and a posting of monthly and quarterly assessment calendars along with the results of the assessments.

Because of the level of experience of the staff, the school added individual teacher meetings to the weekly grade level meetings to support teachers in addressing the state standards and not just the content within the core curricular texts.

At the end of the school year the school did not see the increase in the AIMS scores that had been expected. In interviews with teachers and extensive review of the data the school implemented several additional steps for the 2010-2011 school year.

All of the pieces previously adopted to assure that the Arizona State Academic Standards were being addressed remained in place including:

- Weekly lesson plans identifying the performance objectives
- Weekly grade level meetings
- Posting of objectives by all teachers
- Formal and informal classroom observations
- Expanded assessment calendar

Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, the administration required that each teacher create and maintain a "Personal Student Academic Program" form for all students in his/her classroom. This form would track student growth on benchmark assessments and would allow the teacher and student to set individual goals. These goals were based on state performance objectives and identified student needs.

The weekly grade level meetings included a review of the most recent formative or summative data. This data was from assessments generated using the Galileo system item bank, which is directly taken from the state academic performance objectives and not from a given text or curriculum. This assessment change mandated that teachers be actively engaged in teaching the standards and not just the content of the text.

This data was also used to create small group instruction and to identify students to be supported by tutoring. The assessment system allowed the teacher and the administration to identify by performance objective what an individual student had mastered and what still needed to be taught, remediated or tutored. All teachers were given this information for monthly and quarterly assessments. Teachers also used this system to create formative weekly assessments

that included previously taught performance objectives and they had the same information available for these assessments.

Each student in the school was tracked on the data walls where all monthly and benchmark assessments were posted and student growth was indicated. Student scores were monitored and discussed with teachers in weekly meetings. In addition to the benchmark data scores, the data walls reflect additional services and support students receive. All of the assessments were based on performance objectives rather than specific text content.

Math Documentation of student proficiency in Mathematics (Assessments)

During the 2006-2007 school year the PACS was using an older version of Saxon math as the core curriculum. The curriculum provided assessments for teacher use. These were the primary sources for grade levels to determine student proficiency in mastering the math concepts. At the end of this year the determination was made to change the core curriculum for the 2007-2008 school year.

As was noted earlier, beginning with the 2007 school year, there was a concerted effort to align the curriculum to the Arizona State Standards through mapping, required lesson planning, teacher observations and weekly grade level meetings. These weekly meetings were also used to discuss student proficiency based on the assessments provided by the core text. Teachers were required to create formative assessments and to use the summative assessments provided by the publisher. Student data was then used to determine small group activities and which students were in need of tutoring.

Beginning in January of 2008 the tutoring program was expanded to include more students to provide additional support for all grade levels. The AIMS scores for this year remained as basically "flat" for all grade levels. This was not completely unexpected with the introduction of a new curriculum and the first serious efforts to align the curriculum to the state standards.

In the 2008-2009 school year an additional 30 minutes each day was set aside to allow teachers to work with students in a remedial or enrichment setting. This time would be in addition to all tutoring that occurred before or after school.

Weekly grade level meetings to review student progress and monitor both the curriculum implementation and data continued throughout the year. Extensive classroom observations also continued. At the end of the year the school continued to be a "Performing" school but it was also apparent that some instructors were not moving students effectively or were reluctant to adjust to the increased accountability and monitoring. It was also determined that an additional assessment other than the system provided by the core text would be needed to adequately assess student progress towards mastery of the state standards.

As a result, the school did not retain some veteran staff members and adopted the Galileo Assessment System to be used for all benchmark testing during the 2009-2010 school year. Implementation of the assessment system began in October of 2009 with 4 benchmark assessments given throughout the year. Following each benchmark assessment data for each instructor was posted on the data walls and discussed with the administration.

Weekly grade level meetings continued through the year with a focus on student proficiency and the data that was being generated. It was during these discussions, especially with newer staff that a weakness in the math curriculum was identified. The school also became aware of the need to assess students on the state standards more frequently than the quarterly benchmarks that were administered. As the staff became more familiar with the capacity of the assessment system, it was determined that for the 2010-2011 school year grade levels would conduct common monthly assessments generated using the Galileo assessment test bank to assure that students were being assessed based on the state standards accurately. It was also determined that the "data walls" would be used to track data on all students individually rather than as an entire class. This would allow teachers to more accurately determine small group instruction needed and who to recommend for additional tutoring.

Following the AIMS test in 2010 and using the data on student growth provided by the Arizona Charter School Association, the school determined that a change in curriculum was also needed. The revised Saxon program was adopted to begin in the 2010-2011 school year.

For the 2010-2011 school year, students were monitored with weekly Saxon assessments over the lessons that were taught and were given monthly grade level assessments based entirely on the state standards. These assessments were generated using the Galileo test bank of items specifically designed for individual performance objectives. Teachers were then provided with data that indicated which performance objectives were mastered and which needed additional instruction. This data was provided to the teachers for the entire class and for each student.

Individual student data was also tracked on the "Personal Student Academic Plan" that the teachers created for each student and on the "data walls". Teachers updated this information on a monthly basis and following each of the five benchmark assessments given. During weekly grade level meetings data and student proficiency were addressed, small group instruction planned and students in need of additional support were identified.

Because the data was tracked by individual student, the school was able to provide very specific information to parents. This significantly increased the level of parent engagement for the school and allowed families to become more actively involved in the education of their students through simple activities provided by the school to address the identified needs of their student.

The preliminary AIMS data indicates a significant improvement in math scores.

Documentation of Student Proficiency in Reading

During the school year 2006-2007 the primary method of monitoring and documenting student achievement in literacy was through the use of the assessments provided in the core programs, which were primarily content specific. Teachers also used the DIBELS assessment for grades K-6 and the AIMS tests for grades 3-8.

Beginning in 2007-2008 and continuing through 2008-2009 the literacy curriculum was aligned to the state standards but the assessment program remained the same. Student proficiency towards mastery of the state standards was based on text generated assessments, DIBELS testing in grades K-6 and AIMS.

To insure that instruction and student proficiency was focused on state standards each grade level created a curriculum map to align the core text, met with administration on a weekly basis, were required to submit lesson plans including the performance objectives to be taught and the method of assessing the objectives. Extensive classroom observations were done by the administrative team.

During this time data was collected using the DIBELS program in two forms. Each student was progress monitored based on the student's most recent benchmark test. Students who were considered significantly below grade level were monitored on a weekly basis. Those that were moderately below grade level were monitored every two weeks and those that were at or above grade level were monitored monthly. In addition, students were given benchmark assessments at the beginning of each year, again in December and at the end of the year.

The results of these assessments indicated that the students were performing and progressing at a rate that was at, or even slightly above, the state average. However, this was not reflected in the AIMS test results. This assessment remained primarily flat.

Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year, the school implemented the Galileo assessment program to more closely monitor the student progress and proficiency in state academic standards. This program allowed the teachers to identify which performance objectives were mastered and which needed additional work.

Weekly grade level meetings continued and focused on student proficiency through the data provided through the Galileo benchmark assessments and the monthly assessments that were teacher generated from the material presented. The Galileo data was also posted on the "data walls" and was discussed during the weekly grade level meetings with the administration and instructional staff.

The school evaluated grades 6-8 for reading proficiencies. The assessment indicated a need by some of the students for a direct instructional remediation. A support text was identified and implemented during the year to meet the needs of these students. The school continued to use

the unit assessments from the core text and DIBELS progress monitoring, as well as benchmark assessments for all grades. This data was shared with the teachers and administration and was used to make instructional decisions as well as for the formation of "Walk to Read" groupings and tutoring recommendations. This information was also provided to the reading interventionists to determine which students were in need of the intensive support.

The AIMS results for the 2009-2010 school year in reading remained basically flat again.

A careful review of the data along with extensive classroom observations and discussions with teachers led to the conclusion that the school was doing a good job of evaluating the level of fluency for all students but that the skills and strategies for extensive comprehension needed to be more carefully assessed.

Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year each student was assessed for fluency using either the DIBELS assessment or the reading inventory for 7th and 8th grade. In addition all students were assessed monthly using the Galileo assessment test bank. These monthly assessments were given to the entire grade level at the same time in a formal testing environment. This data was then posted on the "data walls" by student and the student's mastery was tracked throughout the year.

All students were assessed on 5 benchmark assessments during the year using the Galileo assessment tool. These were formal testing days for the entire school. This data was posted and tracked.

Weekly grade level meetings continued and were used to focus on the data of student proficiency and the necessary adjustments to instruction to assure mastery for the students. Students were also assessed using the unit assessments from the core curriculum but with less emphasis than in previous years.

Because the data was now specific and timely, the information was used to identify students for tutoring, provide the tutors with specific performance objectives that needed to be addressed and to provide families with specific information and suggestions for supporting their students to increase the student's level of proficiency and achievement.

Based on the preliminary AIMS data for the school this approach has been very successful. All grade levels have shown growth and in all but one the growth was significant.

Professional development plan Math

During the 2006-2007 school year, the core curriculum for math was an older version of Saxon math. The instructional staff was familiar with this material. Professional development was limited to several days of presentation at the beginning of the year to review the format of the "Saxon lesson." This approach changed during the 2007-2008 school year with the change in administration.

During that year (2007-2008) the teachers still received professional development at the beginning of the year, but the core curriculum was changed from the older Saxon math program to *Real Math* and *Impact Math*. The professional development at the beginning of the year was much more thorough and intense to help teachers make the transition to the new program. This training included not only the core curriculum but an introduction to the remediation elements available in the program.

The school also presented 4 days of professional development to help the teachers align the curriculum to the Arizona State Academic Standards. These days were presented in September on 4 consecutive weekends. The staff was given tools to help them align their lessons and to become familiar with the state standards and where in the curriculum the standards would be addressed. It also helped the staff determine what areas in the state standards would need additional support. This professional development would continue during the summer following this school year.

The administration also determined, through classroom observations that each grade level had significantly different needs for professional development in classroom instructional strategies for both math and literacy as well as understanding student data. To address this need, the administration met with the grade levels on a weekly basis and provided job-embedded professional development for the grade level during those meetings. This approach continues through the 2010-2011 school year.

After reviewing the school level data for the 2007-2008 school year, the school determined that additional math instructional time would be beneficial to all students.

This additional time would be in the form of a "math workshop" for 30 minutes each day. In order to make this time most effective the school provided professional development in small group instruction for math during the 2008-2009 school year. This professional development was in addition to the professional development provided prior to the beginning of the year in the use of the core curriculum for all new teachers and the use of enrichment materials for all teachers (new and returning). The administration also continued to meet with grade level teams to review student data and to provide professional development for instructional strategies based on teacher need as determined through classroom observations and student achievement results.

In the 2009-2010 school year, the instructional staff continued to receive professional development in the use of the curriculum during pre-service. In addition, a full day of professional development was devoted to the effective use of manipulatives in math instruction and in small group instruction. A second day of professional development was devoted to the use of the enrichment tools available in the math curriculum, especially the "games" that were part of this enrichment. This professional development was to help teachers gain a better understanding of alternative ways of assessing student understanding and of engaging students in mastering complex concepts by providing alternative learning opportunities. The school had

noted over the previous several years that the AIMS scores had remained basically flat. It was also determined during the weekly grade level meetings that the program did not have a built in "scaffolding" of materials to help teachers resurface previously taught material. This recognition caused two things to happen.

The first was the need to provide teachers with professional development in how to create this resurfacing within their lessons. This was done in January of 2010. The second was to begin examining other text publishers which might lend themselves to this scaffolding of learning more easily for younger, less experienced teachers.

The school also provided the staff with 3 ½ days of professional development using outside consultants. The focus of these days was on student engagement strategies. These days focused on engaging students in math and literacy.

The school adopted a new core curriculum in 2010-2011. As a result there was increased professional development for all staff to effectively implement this curriculum. During pre-service staff were trained for two days on the basic format of the revised Saxon program. An additional day of training was provided a month after school had begun as a follow-up to the initial training. All of this training was done by Saxon representatives. Saxon also assigned a representative to the school who met with the administration and did classroom observations on a quarterly basis and provided professional development for teachers on an individual basis according to what was observed by the representative from Saxon or by the school administration.

The school continued to conduct weekly grade level meetings to review student data and provide professional development for teachers on an individual basis. The school provided a professional development day on small group instruction based on student data as well as having the Saxon representative model lessons in several grade levels to allow teachers to see how the lessons could be most effectively presented.

The weekly grade level meetings also continued to review student data. These meetings always consisted of the teachers involved and at least one administrator. Teachers were also required to update the "data wall" in the data room with the most current math and literacy data following each grade level monthly assessment. This data was then used by the administration to determine what additional professional development might be necessary or helpful for the individual teachers or the grade levels.

This allowed for the differentiation of professional development during each of the monthly professional development days scheduled throughout the year. The administration and the teachers were able to effectively focus on specific needs and address those needs in a manner that had an immediate impact within the classroom.

The results of this approach to the new curriculum were evident in the increases in AIMS scores for all students when compared to the same students from the previous year and also were a strong indication that this approach was most beneficial to new and less experienced teachers within a grade level.

Professional development literacy

During the 2006-2007 school year the school was participating in the Reading First program for the 1st year. The Reading First grant required monthly professional development for all K-3 teachers. The school had a reading coach. This person created and presented professional development to the K-3 staff in the use of the core curriculum with fidelity and the proper use of the DIBELS assessment program. The school also created a literacy block of 120 minutes.

As noted previously, the school made significant changes in the administrative staff beginning with the 2007-2008 school year. The administration held four full PD days in September on the weekends for the entire staff to align the curriculum with the Arizona State Academic Standards. The purpose of this alignment was twofold. First, to make sure that the staff was aware of the state standards and were teaching those concepts and second to identify any areas within the state standards that might not be addressed by the core text. Several areas in literacy were identified.

The school employed a reading interventionist to work with students in grades K-3 as required by the Reading First grant. Both the Reading Coach and the Reading Interventionist worked with students and with teachers. Work with teachers included job embedded professional development in the effective use of the core curriculum and in effective strategies for small group instruction.

Both the Reading Coach and the Reading Interventionist continued to work with both students and teachers through the 2010-2011 school year. The school ended its participation in the Reading First grant with 2008-2009 school year. This allowed the school to use the Reading Coach and Reading Interventionist across all grade levels. The job embedded professional development for small group instruction and effective literacy instruction occurred at all grade levels beginning in 2009 and continued through the current school year.

In the 2008-2009 school year the school determined that the staff needed additional support in the writing instruction. A Six-Traits writing curriculum was developed and professional development was provided to all staff members in presenting the six traits to students and the inclusion of the teaching of writing across the curriculum.

A significant portion of the school's population is ELL learners and more than 90% of the population qualify for free and reduced lunches. The school determined that there is a significant overlap in language acquisition issues for these two groups. The school then brought in state certified SEI trainers and provided all instructional and administrative staff with the full 90 hours of SEI training to increase the effectiveness of instruction especially as it impacted on literacy.

During this school year and the following summer, the administrative staff and several teachers received extensive training with Dr. Ruby Payne on the impacts of poverty on students in school. The administration and teachers then provided several professional development days of training on effectively instructing students who live in generational poverty. The primary focus of these PD days was on language instruction and effectively increasing student literacy through vocabulary development and use of graphic organizers.

Beginning in the 2009-2010 school year, teachers continued to receive training in effective literacy instruction. Professional development included the use of "grammar walls" for all classrooms and school-wide usage of the same strategies for the instruction of vocabulary.

The school also brought in external consultants who provided 3 ½ days of professional development on effective student engagement strategies focusing on literacy and math. In addition, the school brought in a consultant to provide specific literacy professional development for the 6th-8th grade teachers. This was done to address the identified need of the students in the older grades who had not been part of the Reading First program and who lacked some basic strategies in addressing certain types of literature.

During the 2010-2011 school year the school continued to use the Reading Coach and Reading Interventionist to provide job embedded professional development for teachers as well as work with students. The school also provided professional development to teachers on instructional strategies for students in poverty. These professional development sessions focused on literacy and math. These sessions occurred at least once each month throughout the school year from August through April.

In addition, the school brought in a Title I interventionist to work with both teachers and students in the older grades as an additional support to the professional development provided to all staff. Professional development was provided to all staff on the implementation of the Drop Everything and Read program (D.E.A.R.) which was implemented for the 2010-2011 school year to increase literacy time.

Each staff member had an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) which was created in conjunction with the administration. Part of this plan included professional readings in effective instructional strategies. The teachers then shared these readings with the administration. Teachers also met with the administration on a weekly basis to review student data and to discuss the next instructional steps. Each of these grade level meetings was used by the administration as personalized professional development sessions for literacy and math, as needed by the teachers.

School's Efforts to Analyze Relevant Pupil Achievement Data

In 2006-2007 the school relied heavily on the data from the AIMS testing and from the assessments that were part of the curriculum for both reading and math. The only other data that was collected extensively was the DIBELS testing and progress monitoring for grades K-3.

Beginning in 2007-2008, with the alignment of the curriculum to the state standards the school was able to more carefully look at student data as it related to performance objectives. From 2007 through the end of the 2009 school year, the data was still primarily generated by the teachers using the core texts as the source for these assessments. While this data reflected the student progress on the content being assessed, there was a disconnect with the level of difficulty required by the performance objectives in the state standards. The school did continue to collect the DIBELS data, even after the end of the Reading First grant. However, there did not seem to be a close correlation between the levels achieved on the DIBELS monitoring and on the AIMS testing.

The DIBELS data was reviewed by the grade levels and administration during the weekly grade level meetings along with the data from the core content assessments provided by the publishers for both reading and math. However, at the end of the 2008-2009 school year, the administration, in conjunction with the instructional staff, determined that an additional level of assessment would be necessary to reach the level of student achievement desired.

Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year the school implemented several significant changes. The first was the introduction of the Galileo assessment system to provide school wide cumulative benchmark assessments 5 times each year. This would provide the teachers and administration with assessment data that was tied directly to the state performance objectives and not limited to the content of the text.

The second change was the introduction of data walls that were maintained in the office of the school's mentor. This was also a room used extensively for grade level meetings. Teachers were specifically trained in the use of the Galileo system and the various reports that they could access through the new system. This data became an important focus of grade level meetings throughout the school year. Teachers were required to analyze their data and post the results from each of the benchmark assessments by class on the data walls. This level of analysis was more extensive than had been done in the past and allowed the administration to address issues at the class level rather than at grade level throughout the building.

The school also required that teachers create monthly assessments for each grade level, post a calendar of the assessment dates in the data room and post the results of the monthly assessments on the data walls. These assessments were generated by each teacher from the content covered in the class during that instructional period.

By January of 2010 the analysis of the data showed a disparity between the level of student achievement on the teacher generated assessments and the Galileo assessments. The reason for this was not determined until the end of February. Following the quarterly benchmark assessment from Galileo each grade level met with the administrative team for an extended time to review the assessment on a question by question basis. The data provided by Galileo allowed the staff to look at each question and what performance objective was being assessed. This in depth analysis highlighted two significant shortcomings.

The first was that many of the teachers were not resurfacing prior learning enough to assure that the students had truly mastered the performance objective. The second was that students could be confused by the form of the question and that teachers would need to present the concepts of the performance objectives in a variety of situations to assure that all students could demonstrate their learning regardless of the form of the question.

These lessons resulted in immediate changes for the remainder of the school year, but their biggest impact occurred during the 2010-2011 school year. Beginning with the first Galileo assessment, which the school was able to give 2 months earlier since the program was fully in place; all monthly assessments were created using the Galileo system rather than the core program. In addition, teachers received extensive and continuous training on the types of data that could be gathered using the Galileo system and on how to analyze the data to make instructional decisions. The results were shared with the students and followed up with goal setting by the teacher and the student. It was also determined that teachers would meet with the administration regularly to review student achievement data and the reports from Galileo. The administrator would provide additional experience in data analysis for any teachers or teams that lacked this experience.

Further, to assure that the assessments would align with instruction; teachers were given a "performance objective tracker" which they would use to indicate the performance objectives taught for the month. These were then given to the administration who created the assessments for each grade level. The data then collected from the assessment would be compared to the performance objective tracker to determine which performance objectives needed to be re-taught, which needed to be resurfaced soon and which the students had mastered. This information was also used by the teachers when creating small groups for small group instruction and for identifying students that was additional tutoring or intervention.

The next significant change in the analysis of achievement data was that the information posted on the data walls moved from being class level data to individual student data. This allowed all staff to review individual student progress. The data was maintained on a monthly basis and was used to identify students for remediation, tutoring, or enrichment. Following each of the monthly assessments and the benchmark assessments, individual student reports were created and discussed with each teacher in both reading and math. Benchmark assessments were also

done in science and writing with individual student achievement data used by the teachers and administration for instructional purposes.

These in-depth, student level reports allowed teachers to know what errors the student made, where confusion might exist and which performance objectives to address in small group or tutoring situations.

Data analysis was also presented to families with the introduction of DATA NIGHTS. These were family events during which families were presented with the data from the Galileo assessments in graph form along with the information about where the students should be at that point in the year, where they needed to be to meet or exceed on the AIMS testing and what level the student needed to reach in order to be successful in the next grade. This information was presented by grade level. The classroom teachers generated the data and created the presentations. This was an additional way to help teachers analyze the data for each of their students.

The school continued to collect and analyze DIBELS data to identify those students who were not yet as fluent as they needed to be. This information was used throughout the school but was especially vital to the ELL classroom teachers. This information was used to create "walk to read" groups in the non-ELL classrooms, small groups for instruction during the literacy teaching block in all classes, and for work with the Title I interventionist or the reading specialists.

Math assessment data, both from the Saxon program and from Galileo was used to identify both the students who were struggling and those that were excelling. Both groups received additional support through the Title I interventionists and the classroom teachers. As with the literacy assessments, both Saxon and Galileo allowed the teachers and administration to identify which performance objectives were not yet mastered.

By January of 2011 the use of the monthly assessments generated by Galileo had demonstrated the effectiveness of this approach. As a result, all incoming students are assessed using the Galileo system to determine their level of reading and math skills to assure that they would be placed in an environment that would provide them with the best opportunity to be successful.

Types of Data Collected and the Process for Analysis of Relevant Data

From 2006-2009 the data collected was that of the AIMS testing results, DIBELS testing and progress monitoring and the assessments created by teachers using the core text materials. The school also used the ITBS tests during the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 school years. These tests were discontinued when the school determined that the year end test followed closely after the AIMS and that students were not taking the testing as seriously as necessary to get accurate and useful data.

During this time period the analysis was done by the teachers and administration in grade level meetings in conjunction with the mentor teachers and the reading interventionists. Reading scores were analyzed at the student level but all other assessments were analyzed at the class level unless specific students were identified by the teacher as struggling. In those cases the individual student assessments were reviewed.

Prior to the 2007-2008 school year there was no identifiable attempt to specifically align instruction or core content to the state academic standards. In September of 2007 the first alignment was done for all grade levels. This allowed the analysis to be more focused on the performance objectives. This process continued in weekly grade level meetings with the administration for analysis of content assessments, DIBELS assessments and, when the materials became available, AIMS assessments. These analyses resulted in instructional decisions and professional development as well as identifying students for specific small group instruction, remediation, or tutoring.

Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year the school added an additional level of data collection and analysis with the implementation of the Galileo assessment system. During this school year the additional data was from benchmark assessments given to each grade level. The first assessment occurred in October. The students were assessed and the results were then presented to all teachers during professional development and then in weekly grade level meetings. The data and the various reports available presented a steep learning curve for the staff. The administration was actively engaged in the interpretation of the data with the teachers to provide the additional experience in analyzing and making educational decisions based on the analysis.

The school continued to collect data on reading proficiency for all grade levels using DIBELS through 6th grade and several reading assessment tools for the middle school students for whom DIBELS is not available. In all cases the analysis was done with a reading specialist, an administrator and the classroom teachers. The school also reviewed the student level data provided by the AIMS assessment.

In the spring of 2010 the school attended a workshop presented by the Arizona Association of Charter Schools. The data presented at the workshop was that of student growth. This additional data was analyzed by the entire administrative team very carefully. The school had begun to suspect that the math program was not providing adequate scaffolding. The analysis of the data available through the Association confirmed that to be the case and resulted in the adoption of a new curriculum more structured to support scaffolding for younger, less experienced teachers.

The literacy data was also analyzed and the conclusion was reached that while the program was adequate, there was a lack of growth within the students after the 3rd grade. It was determined that additional support would be necessary to make the type of gains necessary.

This process was refined for the 2010-2011 school year. Evaluation of the Galileo data was moved from the class level to the student level. In addition, the data from monthly assessments

was taken from the Galileo test bank based on the performance objectives taught. The assessments were created by the administration to assure a more accurate representation of the performance objectives and the assessments included questions that were based on performance objectives that had been presented previously. This approach then allowed the teachers and administration to determine the level of student mastery for each performance objective. It allowed for analysis of student growth and mastery over the course of the year as well as for a single point in time. The addition of the monthly assessments in this more objective form also provided for additional data points to determine a student's level of mastery.

In addition to the Galileo data, each teacher received the AIMS scores from the previous year for each student in his or her class. This data was used by the teachers and administration to identify students who would need additional assistance immediately.

The school also used DIBELS and Saxon assessments to further refine the needs of individual students. Both of these assessments, while not directly tied to state performance objectives provide the teachers and administration with specifics to help determine the type of remediation or enrichment necessary on a student by student basis.

The school also conducted several writing assessments as part of a school wide writing program that was supplemental to the literacy program and designed to extend the grammar and vocabulary instruction. The teachers presented and instructed on a particular type of writing for a month and then the school was assessed using a prompt created by the administration. Teachers were given a rubric prior to beginning instruction. Following the administration of the assessment, all teachers within a grade level were brought together to use the rubric and assess the writing of all students. Each writing sample was assessed at least twice to assure objectivity and accuracy in determining the student's level of mastery. This information was then shared with both the teacher and the grade level to assist them in making instructional decisions.

Teachers also collected data on assignments given in class. This was shared with parents through progress reports and parent teacher conferences. It was also included as part of the students' grades on report cards.

Beginning in January of 2011 all incoming students to the school were given a placement test. This test was the most recent Galileo benchmark assessment. For students entering over the summer, the assessment was the final Galileo benchmark assessment for the grade the student attended the previous year. This data is shared with parents and with the student's teacher and is used to place the student in the educational setting which provides the appropriate level of instruction and support.

In summary, the primary data used school wide includes the following:

- AIMS data for each student
- Benchmark Galileo assessments for each student

- Monthly grade level assessments for each student
- Saxon weekly assessments for each student
- DIBELS benchmark assessments for all students K-6
- Writing benchmark assessments for each student
- AZELLA assessments for all ELL students

Justification of How Data Selected is Relevant to Improving Student Achievement

Prior to the 2009-2010 school year, the data that was used came primarily from the AIMS results and from assessments that were either teacher generated or textbook generated. The school did use ITBS and DIBELS for additional data sources but neither of these was closely tied to the Arizona State Academic Standards.

Efforts were made to create assessments that were more closely aligned to the performance objectives through curriculum mapping and pacing guides but these efforts showed only mixed results. The school determined that there needed to be a data source that was more closely aligned to the performance objectives and less tied to the content of the particular unit be taught in the class.

The adoption of the Galileo system provided that additional data source. In addition, as the school became more sophisticated in the use of this tool, the level of specific student level data became more usable for both teachers and administrators.

This data source allowed the teachers and administrators to track specific students and performance objectives on a monthly and even weekly basis. Teachers were able to assess students on specific performance objectives by accessing the bank of questions provided in the Galileo system for both literacy and math.

The level of detail available using this data source provided the teachers and students with immediate feedback and allowed for instruction to be adjusted much more quickly than had been the case in the past.

Further, because the assessment data was now directly linked to performance objectives, teachers were able to address more specifically the needs of each student. This also allowed the students to recognize where they were struggling and where they were being successful, thus helping them focus their tutoring and homework time. This is true for both the Galileo benchmark assessments and the grade level monthly assessments created using the Galileo test bank. Teachers were also given access to use this bank of questions for weekly or unit assessments, providing an additional layer of useful data.

The use of DIBELS and Saxon assessments allow teachers and students to identify specific weaknesses for each student. Often the performance objectives have several skills and more than one item of knowledge that need to be mastered. On both the AIMS and Galileo assessments the

performance objective is identified but the student may have mastered several of the skills or some of the knowledge but not all. The use of these additional assessments provides the refined, focused look at a specific skill or item with which the student may be struggling.

The collection of the writing data for analysis was done to provide the teachers and the administration with information about the level of proficiency throughout the school in writing, grammar, and vocabulary development. The collection of this data is used to facilitate not only the instruction of writing but the level of use of the classroom "word walls" and "grammar walls" required throughout the building. It also helped identify some very specific needs for ELL students and for the general population. These needs were then addressed and have now become part of the general instructional expectations of the school.

AZELLA and AIMS are both required assessments but also provide general data on student progress. They are not as refined and do not provide quite the same level of detail as is available through the other assessments used for data collection and analysis but do provide the ability to look at state wide data and help identify general weaknesses that might exist.

The growth data provided by the Arizona Association of Charter Schools was valuable in identifying curriculum areas to be investigated further. It also helped indentify a population that was being underserved by the school. This information did not appear in the other data collected and was instrumental in several instructional changes that resulted in significant improvements in the raw AIMS scores we currently have available.

Logic Used to Develop the PMP

(What We Learned and What We are Going to Do About It.)

The analysis of the data for Phoenix Advantage has been ongoing since 2007. Several of the most necessary changes have already been implemented and are currently in effect and being refined.

The school learned that it was necessary to provide staff with very specific guidance in how to implement a curriculum that was focused not on the content of a textbook but rather on the Arizona State Academic Standards. This was an evolutionary process beginning with a mapping of the text with the teaching staff to help them identify where performance objectives were being taught within the text. The school later provided the teachers with performance objective check sheets that were used to create grade level assessments. Teachers used these check sheets to monitor that all performance objectives were being addressed in the classroom and that each was reviewed and revisited in a timely manner. Currently the school is creating performance objective calendars for all grade levels to help teachers focus on the performance objectives even more specifically.

This “calendar” will be implemented with the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year. This is the result of the analysis of data from 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. It became apparent that teachers were teaching performance objectives but not necessarily revisiting them in a timely manner, resulting in students losing the mastery of the material. The data also indicated that some key performance objectives were presented later in the text (or not at all) and the students did not have the opportunity to practice mastery of necessary content.

By reviewing both the Galileo and AIMS data, the school has identified some performance objectives that appear to be difficult for all students and would need additional instructional time. With the new performance objective calendars, teachers will address these performance objectives in a sequence to better support student achievement.

Additionally, it was noted that less experienced teachers might have difficulty locating the appropriate resources to address performance objectives if the instructional order was something other than what was presented in the textbook. The performance objective calendars also contain resources for the teachers.

The data indicated to the school that there was a significant discrepancy between the assessments that students were taking throughout the year to the scores on AIMS. The school considered that some of this might be the result of a difference in the structure of the various assessments, but was more likely a result of the tests used by the classroom teachers focusing on the content of the text rather than the knowledge and skill addressed in the performance objective.

The review of the literacy data led the school to the conclusion that the core curriculum has adequate resources for all teachers but that the sequence of the material presented was not appropriate for the students at Phoenix Advantage. The performance objective calendars will present the performance objectives in an order that more closely reflects the needs of the students and will identify for the teachers what material is available within the text and other resources to best present the performance objectives to the students. The school has data from two grade levels, one intermediate and one middle school which demonstrate that this approach has powerful results. This approach will be implemented throughout the school beginning with the 2011-2012 school year. Several examples will best illustrate this point. In 4th grade the percentage of students passing the AIMS reading assessment rose from 45% in 2009-2010 to 72.7 % in 20210-2011. Similarly, in 7th grade the percentage of students passing the AIMS reading assessment rose from 56% in 2009-2010 to 79.5% in 2010-2011.

The effectiveness of the Galileo assessment system when used for monthly and even weekly assessments to help teachers identify specific areas of weakness for their students has been repeatedly demonstrated throughout the 2011-2012 school year. The use of a performance objective driven assessment program will continue. During the 2011-2012 school year, the school will improve the infrastructure for web-based communications and will explore the use of online assessments to provide teachers with even faster assessment results. This may include the

addition of the Scantron system as well as the Galileo system. The use of the two systems, one for benchmark testing and the other for monthly and weekly assessments will help assure teachers, students, parents and administration that what is being reflected in the data from these assessments is the student's level of mastery of the performance objectives and not just the format of the assessment.

The school has replaced the math curriculum and implemented the new curriculum beginning with the 2010-2011 school year. The new curriculum has proven to be very beneficial for newer, less experienced teachers and was well received by all teachers. Students demonstrated that they were able to master material more successfully with this program than with the previous program.

Data and observations indicated that there is still room for improvement in the implementation of the program which would result in even greater gains in student achievement. The school recognized the need for continuing the extensive training both by the administration and by the Saxon representatives to assure that the teachers are able to effectively use all of the tools available within the program to help students maximize their learning.

In summary, the school has determined that:

- There was a need to replace the math curriculum, which was done for the 2010-2011 school year
- Teachers need additional training to fully implement the new curriculum beyond the year of implementation
- Teachers need additional support and guidance to assure that performance objectives were being mastered by all students in an order that made sense for the students
- Performance objective calendars with resources listed would be beneficial for all staff to assure appropriate coverage of all performance objectives
- Students especially in grades 4-8 needed to read longer, more challenging works than were available in the core text
- The use of the performance objective checklists was very beneficial and will be continued for all teachers in all grade levels
- Weekly grade level meetings to review data and to provide differentiated professional development for staff were effective and should be continued
- The use of standardized assessments were very effective and should continue and even be expanded where possible
- Pre-service and monthly in-service need to continue to be narrow in focus and be driven by student data and observed teacher needs
- The use of the Title I interventionist has the potential to be very effective and should occur during the 2011-2012 school year
- All teachers need to have and use curriculum calendars to focus instruction on state standards and teachers will need specific professional development to use these calendars most effectively to plan lessons.

Graphic Representations

The following pages contain graphs and charts of the data used by the school to tell the story of school achievement at PACS and to determine the goals and actions steps for continuous improvement.

Tables and Graphs

These are tables of PACS AIMS scores for the last 5 years.

Phoenix Advantage Charter School (PACS)

AIMS DATA

		Reading	
Grade	Year	Proficient%	Not Proficient %
3rd	06-07	45%	55%
	07-08	43%	57%
	08-09	47%	53%
	09-10	62%	38%
	10-11	71.6%	28.4%
4th	06-07	38%	62%
	07-08	36%	64%
	08-09	41%	59%
	09-10	45%	55%
	10-11	72.7%	27.3%
5th	06-07	47%	53%
	07-08	67%	33%
	08-09	31%	69%
	09-10	34%	66%
	10-11	54.7%	45.3%

6th	06-07	48%	52%
	07-08	53%	47%
	08-09	50%	50%
	09-10	36%	64%
	10-11	60%	40%
7th	06-07	55%	45%
	07-08	40%	60%
	08-09	60%	40%
	09-10	36%	64%
	10-11	60%	40%
8th	06-07	41%	59%
	07-08	52%	48%
	08-09	47%	53%
	09-10	54%	46%
	10-11	58%	42%

Phoenix Advantage Charter School (PACS)

AIMS Math

Grade	Year	Proficient %	Not Proficient %
3rd	06-07	43%	57%
	07-08	49%	51%
	08-09	44%	56%
	09-10	44%	56%
	10-11	54.7	45.3%
4th	06-07	48%	52%
	07-08	30%	70%
	08-09	37%	67%
	09-10	37%	67%
	10-11	63.6	36.4%
5th	06-07	50%	50%
	07-08	78%	22%
	08-09	33%	67%
	09-10	19%	81%
	10-11	37.7	62.3%

6th	06-07	42%	58%
	07-08	48%	52%
	08-09	53%	47%
	09-10	24%	76%
	10-11	37%	63%
7th	06-07	50%	50%
	07-08	44%	56%
	08-09	56%	44%
	09-10	29%	71%
	10-11	63.6%	36.4%
8th	06-07	32%	68%
	07-08	33%	67%
	08-09	51%	49%
	09-10	35%	65%
	10-11	32%	68%

Spring 2011 AIMS READING DATA % Passing

	EXCEEDS	MEETS	APPROACHES	FALLS FAR BELOW	% pass 2009-2010	%pass 2010-2011	GROWTH
3rd Grade	2	36	10	5	63%	71.6%	+8.6%
4th Grade	2	38	10	5	42%	72.7%	+30.7%
5th Grade	1	29	14	9	42%	54.7%	+12.7%
6th Grade	0	36	21	3	38%	60%	+22%
7th Grade	5	30	9	0	59%	79.5%	+20.5%
8th Grade	1	28	16	5	55%	58%	+3%

Spring 2011 AIMS MATH DATA % Passing

	EXCEEDS	MEETS	APPROACHES	FALLS FAR BELOW	% pass 2009-2010	%pass 2010-2011	GROWTH
3rd Grade	9	20	17	5	44%	54.7%	+10.7%
4th Grade	8	27	9	11	37%	63.6%	+26.6%
5th Grade	1	19	15	18	19%	37.7%	+13.7%
6th Grade	5	17	22	16	24%	37%	+13%
7th Grade	5	23	9	7	29%	63.6%	+34.6%
8th Grade	1	15	11	23	35%	32%	-3%

Projected Student Growth Percentiles 2010-2011- MATH by Cohort

Phoenix Advantage Charter School

	3rd to 4th Grade		4th to 5th Grade		5th to 6th Grade		6th to 7th Grade		7th to 8th Grade	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Total # of Students	49	55	62	53	61	60	42	44	48	50
FFB	11	11	25	18	33	16	16	7	20	23
A	19	9	14	15	16	22	17	9	14	11
M	18	27	23	19	10	17	7	23	12	15
E	1	8	0	1	2	5	2	5	2	1

Projected Student Growth Percentiles 2010-2011 – READING by Cohort

Phoenix Advantage Charter School

	3rd to 4th Grade		4th to 5th Grade		5th to 6th Grade		6th to 7th Grade		7th to 8th Grade	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Total # of Students	49	55	62	53	61	60	42	44	48	50
FFB	4	5	7	9	7	3	7	0	2	5
A	15	10	28	14	33	21	20	9	18	16
M	30	38	26	29	21	36	14	30	27	28
E	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	5	1	1

RENEWAL PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN TEMPLATE

Phoenix Advantage Charter School

INDICATOR:[1] __X _Math __X_ Reading **DURATION OF THE PLAN**[2]**:** Begins __June___, 2011 to _June___ , 2016

MEASURE*	METRIC*	CURRENT STATUS*	End Target For This Plan* [3]
State standardized assessment	Percent (%) of students who score proficient on the State standardized assessment and Student growth percentile (SGP)	(Board staff will enter info here)	Meet or demonstrate sufficient progress toward the level of adequate academic performance as set and modified periodically by the Board.

STRATEGY IA: Provide and implement a curriculum that improves student achievement.

Action Steps [4]	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. Continue to implement the new Saxon math curriculum, K-8	2011-2016	School administrative team, CIS, Saxon trainer	Agenda for professional development, student standardized grade level scores, improvement in number of students meeting or exceeding on AIMS, increase in student growth percentile	$8,000/year, general fund
2. Job-embedded professional development for proper implementation of curriculum in math.	2011-2016	CIS, school administrative team, Saxon trainer (2011-12)	Agenda for professional development, evidence from classroom observations using Saxon walkthrough rubric, student standardized grade level scores, improvement in number of students meeting or exceeding on AIMS, increase in student growth percentile	$ 0

STRATEGY IB: Provide and implement a curriculum that improves student achievement. (READING)

Action Steps [4]	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. Use Performance objective calendars with resources listed	2011-ongoing	CIS, reading coach, reading interventionists, teachers, administrative team	Performance objective checklist, classroom observations, improved standardized student scores throughout the year, improved AIMS scores, improved student growth percentile.	$ 0
2. Expand reading of longer, challenging works at grades 4-8	2011-ongoing	Classroom teachers, CIS, reading coach, administrative team	Reading lists provided to teachers, student work, improved standardized test scores, improved AIMS across all grade levels, improved SGP scores.	$10,000 supplies to expand classroom sets of materials for grades 4-8 from Title I allocation (Year 1 only)

STRATEGY II: Develop and implement a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction.

Action Steps [4]	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. Use Performance Objective calendars with resources listed	2011-ongoing	CIS, teachers, administrative team.	Performance objective checklist, classroom observations, improved standardized student scores throughout the year, improved AIMS scores, improved student growth percentile.	$ 0
2. Use Performance Objective Checklists for the development of monthly grade level assessments	2011-ongoing	Classroom teachers, CIS, reading coach, administrative team	Completed checklists submitted monthly, student work that address the performance objectives, improved standardized test scores, improved AIMS across all grade levels, improved SGP scores, classroom observation forms, lesson plans	$0

STRATEGY III: Develop and implement a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency.

Action Steps [4]	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. Continue to use a standardized assessment system for benchmark assessments based on state standards.	2011-2016	Classroom teachers, administrative team	Students' scores posted for all benchmark assessments on data wall, maintenance of data binder by content and teacher, assessment results recorded and shared using performance objective checklists by grade level and teacher	$56 per student, $28,616/year from Title I allocation
2. Continue to use monthly assessments from a standardized bank of questions based on state performance objectives	2011-2016	Classroom teachers, administrative team, CIS	Student monthly scores posted	Available through the above fee structure
3. Continue to monitor student progress through weekly grade level meetings.	2011-2016	Classroom teachers, administrative team, CIS	Agenda and minutes, improving student test scores, improved AIMS results, improved SGP.	No additional cost.

STRATEGY IV: Develop and implement a professional development plan that supports effective implementation of the curriculum.

Action Steps [4]	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. Provide continuing pre-service training in the effective use of the math curriculum	2011-2016	Administrative team, CIS, Saxon trainer	Agenda, handouts, improved math scores on: Standardized performance objective assessments, monthly performance objective assessments, improved AIMS results, improved SGP.	$0 (part of the standard professional development plan for the school year.)
2. Provide continuing in-service on a monthly basis to effectively implement curriculum based on classroom observations, grade level meetings, student achievement on monthly assessments and teacher reflections. To include instructional strategies, engagement strategies and remediation and enrichment strategies	2011 - 2016	Administrative team, CIS, curriculum representatives, outside consultants (as need is identified)	Agenda, handouts, improved math scores on: Standardized performance objective assessments, monthly performance objective assessments, improved AIMS results, improved SGP.	$ 0
3. Continue weekly grade level meetings with all grade levels to review student data and to identify effective instructional strategies for individual classes, teachers, and students.	2011- 2016	Administrative team, CIS, classroom teachers	Agenda, handouts, improved math scores on: Standardized performance objective assessments, monthly performance objective assessments, improved AIMS results, improved SGP.	$ 0 (part of standard school procedures)
4. Employ a Title I interventionist to work with both teachers and students to provide modeling, instructional strategies, small group support and classroom management.	2010-2016	Title I interventionist, Administrative team	Sample model lessons, improved math scores on: Standardized performance objective assessments, monthly performance objective assessments, improved AIMS results, improved SGP.	$45,000 plus benefits
5. Provide professional development for the implementation of curriculum calendars with resource guides for literacy.	2011-2016	Administrative team, CIS, reading coach	Performance Objective check sheets, classroom observations, improved math scores on: Standardized performance objective assessments, monthly performance	$ 0 (part of the school requirements for all instructional

			objective assessments, improved AIMS results, improved SGP.	staff.

Using the information entered in the " Budget" columns above, please provide a budget total that incorporates all strategies and action steps for each year of the performance management plan's implementation. For " Year 1" , please specify the fiscal year (e.g., 2011). The charter holder may add years, as necessary.

Year 1: 2011-2012: Budget Total = $91,616
Year 2: 2012-2013: Budget Total = $81,616
Year 3: 2013-2014: Budget Total = $81,616
Year 4: 2014-2015: Budget Total = $81,616
Year 5: 2015-2016: Budget Total = $81,616

Notes:
* Provided by ASBCS staff
1 Academic area to be addressed for improvement
2 Duration of the plan must align with the timeline presented in the Action Steps
3 Refer to Terms to Know in the Renewal Application Instructions
4 Repeat these action steps as necessary to include the appropriate number of steps to accomplish the strategy