Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Phoenix Advantage Charter School, Inc.
School Name: Phoenix Advantage Charter School
Site Visit Date: February 19, 2015

Required for: Annual Report
Evaluation Criteria Area: Monitoring Instruction

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[M.1] **Intervention Schedules** **Lesson Plans** **Observation Coaching and Modeling** **Observations** **Standards Checklists** **Offer Letter**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the Charter Holder's process for monitoring the integration of standards into classroom instruction and how the Charter Holder monitors whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The Teacher Observation Tool includes a checkbox for if the lesson is aligned to CCSS standards. • Lesson plan examples are aligned to CCSS standards. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The ACCRS are monitored for proper introduction with the use of Standard Checklists as well as a log of lesson plans. Teachers are required to date each occurrence in their standard checklists. • The Curriculum Specialist and other interventionists provide weekly modeling and whisper coaching sessions to monitor for appropriate delivery and documentation of the standards. • The teacher is responsible for dating and indicating the percent of students that have mastered an objective. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** • The Charter Holder stated that there is not a formalized process for checking the Standards Checklists at this time. The evidence provided showed inconsistent implementation of CCSS standards. The Math checklist indicated that 0 standards were taught in August, November and December, 3 standards were taught in September, 1 standard was taught in October, 6 standards were taught in January, and one of the dates listed for instruction of a standard was on a Saturday. The Reading checklist provided indicated that 0 standards were taught in October and January, 2 standards were taught in August, 3 standards were taught in September, and 1 standard was taught in November and December. • While the Curriculum Specialist does provide weekly modeling and coaching, the evidence provided does not show that it included a reference to effective standards-based instruction. • While the teachers use a tool to show that standards are mastered, there are only 3 standards listed as assessed between August and February for one sample, and in another sample, almost all of the assess/reassess dates are the same date with the same scores.

[M.2] **Assessment from Gradebook** **Coaching Log** **Formal Teacher Evaluation** **Intervention Schedules** **Lesson Plan Sample** **Standard Checklist 3rd grade**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how does the Charter Holder monitor the effectiveness of standards-based instruction throughout the year. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Teacher evaluations are tied to standards based instruction. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Lesson plans are checked for alignment to standards • Standards Checklists are provided that show consistent documentation of standards being taught and assessed. • Coaching is used to help hone in on effective standards-based instruction **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** While there are many tools to identify if teachers are aligning instruction to the standards, the Charter Holder indicated that there is no process or evidence to prove that the Charter Holder uses these tools, and subsequently, that teachers are monitored to ensure that they are teaching standards-based instruction effectively.
[M.3] **Coaching Log** **Formal Teacher Evaluation**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** the Charter Holder's process for evaluating instructional practices and how this process evaluates the quality of instruction. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Administration monitors teachers during observations with checklists which outline necessary pieces to an effective classroom. • The process includes the following steps: Observe, Leave Feedback, Meet to discuss observation, Model if necessary, and Return to observe teacher using strategies that were modeled
[M.4] **Formal Teacher Evaluation** **Observation Checklist** **Sample Staff IPDP**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how this process identifies individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Strengths are documented in the observation and evaluation process **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Needs are identified and connected to a teacher's IPDP **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** While needs can be identified in an observation, no evidence was provided to show that these needs directly correlate to a goal on a teacher's IPDP.

[M.5] **Drive By Informal Feedback Form** **Formal Teacher Evaluation** **Observation Checklist** **Sample Staff IPDP**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder provides feedback on strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs based on the evaluation of instructional practices. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The IDPD includes areas to provide feedback on all areas addressed in the observation form • Observations and Formal Evaluations include documents to give immediate feedback to teachers • Meetings happen after the observation to discuss findings • Other feedback is given through email, or a note is left on the teacher's desk (Drive By forms)
[M.6] **Formal Teacher Evaluation** **Observation, Coaching, Modeling** **Sample IPDP** **PD agendas** **EPD**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder analyzes this information, what the data about quality of instruction tells the Charter Holder, and what the Charter Holder has done in response. **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The data gathered during observations and meetings allows Phoenix Advantage to decide on the specific needs to focus on during a modeling session. It tells the charter holder what is necessary for the students to receive effective instruction. Ultimately it can tell the charter holder whether or not the instructor is capable of effectively delivering the necessary information to students. • The Charter Holder analyzes the information by comparing the observation data with the teacher self-reflection in order to fine tune specific areas that need to be addressed. • The Charter Holder suggests PD sessions for whole staff, EPDs for specific teachers, and goals on the IPDP.
[M.7] **Assessment Data from Gradebook** **Formal Teacher Evaluation** **Grade Level Meeting Team learning** **Observation Checklist**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** • The Charter Holder looks at assessment data of the students that are "in the red" to monitor if targeted instruction happens for those students, but there is no evidence of this happening. • Using the observation checklist and evaluations, the Charter Holder checks for differentiated instruction for the below average learners. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** The Charter Holder stated that there is no evidence to prove that the assessment data is looked at to identify the students in the bottom 25%, and therefore, the Charter Holder cannot effectively implement a process to ensure that targeted instruction is happening to meet the needs of those learners.

[M.8] **Observation Checklist Proof of Meeting ELL Needs** **Eval Proof of Meeting ELL Needs** **ELP Standards Checklist Gr. 3-5** **ELL Lesson Plan**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs). **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of the following:** • Teacher observation checklists include a section for Comprehensible Input for ELLs. • ELL strategies are addressed in pre-observation forms for teacher evaluations.
[M.9]	**N/A**
[M.10] **Standards Checklists** **45 Day Screener** **504 Sample** **IEP** **PSAP Samples**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** how the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with disabilities. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** How the Charter Holder monitors instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with disabilities. **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the described processes because:** The Charter Holder stated that there is no evidence of a process to reflect that instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities is monitored.

I, Katherine Poulos, completed this Site Visit Inventory during the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on February 19, 2015. _____

I, Leanne Bowley, received a copy of this document at the end of the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on February 19, 2015. Leanne Bowley