Demonstration of Sufficient Progress

DSP Report

Charter Holder Name: **Griffin Foundation, Inc.**

School(s): **Children Reaching for the Sky Elementary School**

Date Submitted: 02-23-2015

Purpose of Demonstration of Sufficient Progress *(check one):*

☐ Annual Monitoring

☐ Interval Review

X Renewal

☐ Failing School

☐ Expansion Request

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

X FY2013

X FY2014

Directions:

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

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

vi. Locate and download the “Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Process and Instructions”.

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

d.

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

Area I: Data

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

School Name: **Children Reaching for the Sky Elementary School**

Dashboard Ratings for All Measures					
Measure	Prior Year Dashboard		Current Year Dashboard		Data Required for Report
	Meets Exceeds	Does Not Meet Falls Far Below No Rating	Meets Exceeds	Does Not Meet Falls Far Below No Rating	
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) - Math	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Reading	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP), Bottom 25%,- Math	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP), Bottom 25%,- Reading	☐	✓	✓	☐	✓
Improvement – Math (Alternative High Schools Only)	☐	N/A	☐	N/A	☐
Improvement – Reading (Alternative High Schools Only)	☐	N/A	☐	N/A	☐
2a. Percent Passing – Math	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
2a. Percent Passing – Reading	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
2c. Subgroup, ELL – Math	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
2c. Subgroup, ELL – Reading	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
2c. Subgroup, FRL – Math	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
2c. Subgroup, FRL – Reading	✓	☐	☐	✓	✓
2c. Subgroup, students with disabilities – Math	☐	N/A	☐	✓	✓
2c. Subgroup, students with disabilities – Reading	☐	N/A	✓	☐	✓

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

High School Graduation Rate	☐	N/A	☐	N/A	☐
Academic Persistence (Alternative Schools Only)	☐	N/A	☐	N/A	☐

Data for All Applicable Measures and Subgroups

1. **What year-over-year comparative data demonstrates improved academic performance? Describe and provide data for each measure that does not meet the Board's standards in the relevant Academic Dashboards. Clearly label all data to demonstrate which measure(s) it addresses.**

Directions: Prepare graphs, tables, or data charts to include in the template that address all measures that do not meet the Board's academic standards for either of the two most recent years. The Charter Holder must provide comparative year-over-year data and analysis generated from valid and reliable assessment sources that demonstrates and evaluates the change in academic performance for all required measures for at least the two most recent school years. The Charter Holder must provide data for each school operated by the Charter Holder that does not meet the Board's academic expectations and must:

- clearly label all data to demonstrate which measure(s) it addresses,
- provide data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources,
- limit all data to no more than one page per measure per content per school, and
- redact all student identifiable information

Insert data here:

Insert Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Math data here:

Student Median Growth Percentile 2nd Math.jpg

Student Median Growth Percentile2 2nd Math.jpg

Instructions: Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: Aggregate Multi-Test Report-(2nd-5th grade)

The district has implemented various Math resources and programs to increase students' academic growth and to improve Student Growth Percentile (SGP). CRS 2nd grade has shown growth in Math over the past years. The 2013-2014 Math data shows students scored 572 on their Pre-Test and the benchmark was 567. Each assessment showed growth. The Post-test score increased to 711 point on the Post-Test. Math 2014-2015 Pre-Test and Mid-Test for 2nd grade show continued growth with an increase during both assessment periods and the scores were above benchmark.

Insert Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Reading data here:

Student Median Growth Percentile 4th Reading.jpg

Student Median Growth Percentile2 4th Reading.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: Aggregate Multi-Test Report - (2nd-5th grade)

The district has purchased/implemented various Reading resources and Reading programs to increase students' academic growth and to improve Student Growth Percentile (SGP). Students' Reading skills have continually improved throughout the school, and 4th grade results support this trend. In 2013-2014 the data shows that the 4th grade class during each assessment period scored above benchmark. Reading programs and after/before school intervention services are having an impact in academic growth.

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

Bottom 25 percent Grade Math.jpg

Bottom 25 percent Grade Math2.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: Aggregate Multi-Test Report - (2nd-5th grade)

The SGP Bottom 25% of students identified in Reading or Math are placed in pull-out Math/Reading program or After School Intervention program. The Math 3rd grade 2013-2014 assessment data shows 4 students are on course or low risk, and SGP Bottom 25% subgroup is closer to meeting the Math benchmarks. The Math 3rd 2014-2015 data shows 10 students are identified as Moderate Risk with 4 students Low or Minimal Risk.

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

Bottom 25 percent Grade Reading.jpg

Bottom 25 percent Grade Reading2.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: Aggregate Multi-Test Report - (2nd-5th grade)

CRS's 2013-2014 5th grade class has shown some growth each benchmark. With 1 student on course/minimal risk and 3 students moderate to low risk of passing Reading. CRS's 2014-2015 5th grade class was assessed above benchmark with 7 students on course and 1 moderate risk.

Insert Improvement – Math data here:

(Alternative High Schools Only)

N/A

Insert Improvement – Reading date here:

(Alternative High Schools Only)

N/A

Insert Percent Passing – Math data here:

Percent Passing Math Reading CRS 3rd grade.jpg

Percent Passing Math Reading CRS 4th grade.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: CRS-Percent Passing Chart-AZ-Dash Services-(3rd-5th grade)

The AIMS data shows that the 3rd grade Math class percent passing was 42.5 in 2013 and followed by an increase of 53.2 in 2014. The 4th grade Math class percent passing has shown increased growth each year with 35.0 percentage points earned in 2013 and in 2014 earned 40.8 percentage points. Our goal is to improve the CRS's Math percent passing scores by 10 to 15 percentage points with the use of Math intervention and Math tutoring programs that are in place for the 2015 school year, and a newly implemented Singapore Common Core Math curriculum.

Insert Percent Passing – Reading data here:

Percent Passing Math Reading CRS 3rd grade.jpg

Percent Passing Math Reading CRS 4th grade.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: CRS-Percent Passing Chart-AZ-Dash Services-(3rd, 4th, and 5th grade)

The AIMS data shows that the 3rd grade Reading class percent passing was 60.0 in 2013 and followed by an increase of 68.1 in 2014. The 4th grade Reading class percent passing has shown consistent growth each year 60.0 in 2013 and 69.4 in 2014. The use of Reading intervention and pull out Reading tutoring program that are in place for the 2015 will improve our assessment scores this school year even more.

Insert Subgroup, ELL – Math data here:

Subgroup ELL2 3rd Grade Math.jpg

Subgroup ELL 2nd Grade Math.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: CRS-Aggregate Multi-Test ELL Report (ATI)-(2nd- 5th grade)

The 3rd grade class for 2014-2015 Math Aggregate Multi-Test Report shows that the ELL students are approximately 85-61 points short of meeting the Math benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test with 1 student on course and 6 students moderate risk. Many of the ELL students identified as being low academically are receiving pull out Math tutoring and attending before/after school Math intervention. ELL students have shown growth, and the 2nd grade class ELL Math 2014-2015 assessment identified 4 moderate risk students, and 4 low or minimal risk students.

Insert Subgroup, ELL – Reading data here:

Subgroup ELL2 5th Grade Reading.jpg

Subgroup ELL 2nd Grade Reading.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: CRS-Aggregate Multi-Test ELL Report (ATI)-(2nd-5thgrade)

The 5th grade class was short 17 points from benchmark on the Pre-Test and 2 points over the benchmark on the Mid-Test. Many of the ELL students identified as being low academically are receiving pull out Math tutoring and attending before school Math intervention. The 2nd grade scores were above benchmark for ELL students and students are on target of meeting academic standards.

Insert Subgroup, FRL – Math data here:

Subgroup FRL2 3rd Grade Math.jpg

Subgroup FRL 2nd Grade Math.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: CRS-Aggregate Multi-Test FRL Report (ATI)-(2nd-5thgrade)

The 3rd grade class for 2014-2015 Math Aggregate Multi-Test Report shows that the FRL students are approximately 9 points below Pre-Test benchmark and 3 points above Mid-Test benchmark. The FRL 2nd grade students have shown continued growth each assessment and the students are above benchmark in 2014-2015. FRL subgroup is on target to meet future benchmarks and to meet State standards.

Insert Subgroup, FRL – Reading data here:

Subgroup FRL 4th Grade Reading.jpg

Subgroup FRL2 5th Grade Reading.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: CRS-Aggregate Multi-Test FRL Report (ATI)-(2nd-5thgrade)

The 4th grade FRL is above benchmark 55 and 46 points above the ELA benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test, with 22 students on course/minimal risk and 10 students moderate/low risk. The 5th grade 2014-2015 FRL during the Pre-Test was 91 points above benchmark and 80 points above benchmark for Mid-Test. FRL students are above the ELA benchmarks and on target to performance well on our next State assessment.

Insert Subgroup, students with disabilities – Math data here:

Subgroup SPED 4th Grade Math.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: CRS Aggregate Multi-Test SPED Report (ATI)-(3rd, 4th, and 5th grades)

The 4th grade SPED students scored 135 on the Pre-Test and 128 points Mid-Test, both were short of the Math benchmark. Our Special Education Teacher provides IEP services to each SPED student using a pull-out program. In addition, we have implemented additional data review requirements for all teachers including our Special Education Teacher that will monitor each student's/class's academic growth per benchmark assessment period, and the teacher will meet with the administrators to discuss progress and services provided to the student's IEP needs and/or instruction needs, as well as discuss services provided during pull-out scheduled service minutes with the Special Education Teacher.

Insert Subgroup, students with disabilities – Reading data here:

Subgroup SPED 4th Grade Reading.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: CRS-Aggregate Multi-Test SPED Report (ATI)-(2nd-5thgrade)

2014-2015 ELA Aggregate Multi-Test Report shows that the SPED 4th grade scored 32 points short of benchmark and 46 points short of benchmark for the Mid-Test; with 1 student on course/minimal risk and 4 Moderate Risk students. Our Special Education Teacher provides IEP services to each SPED student using a pull-out program. In addition, we have implemented additional data review requirements for all teachers including our Special Education Teacher that will monitor each student's/class's academic growth per benchmark assessment period, and the teacher will meet with the administrators to discuss progress and services provided to the student's IEP needs and/or instruction needs, as well as discuss services provided during pull-out scheduled service minutes with the Special Education Teacher.

Insert High School Graduation Rate data here:

N/A

Insert Academic Persistence data here:

(Alternative Schools Only)

N/A

Valid and Reliable Data

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

Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):

The Griffin Foundation, Inc's schools have consistently implemented a comprehensive assessment system using Galileo (ATI) assessment software, AIMS/AZ-MERIT, and AZ-DASH Board that addresses defined elements required by the Arizona Department of Education and in compliance with the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools and Data Based Research.

Administrators and faculty monitor, review, analyze, and evaluate each of the required measurements to improve students' academic growth, provide data and analysis generated from valid and reliable sources using such software/reports as Galileo, DIBELS, Stanford 10, and ADE's AIMS/AZMERIT, AZ-DASH Academic Performance Dashboard that demonstrates comparative improvement, year-over-year, for the most recent years.

Academic Growth in 2014-2015:
In 2014, the Griffin Foundation, Inc., LEA received a letter grade of "C" from the Arizona Department of Education. The Griffin Foundation, Inc. had a growth rate of 46 and composite score of 61, totaling 107 points.

Both schools have shown growth in 2014/2015 by earning a letter grade of "C" from the Arizona Department of Education. This supports the data and documentation in our application that positive improvements have been developed and implemented in the areas of weakness identified in Arizona Department of Education data and our internal assessment system (Galileo ATI assessment system). This is an ongoing process that requires commitment and dedication from our Arizona State Certified /Highly Qualified Teachers.

Our mission in part depends on having a vision and road map on how to reach our designation of student achievement. The data is the school/district's road map and the vision is our teachers' skills to instruct and provide support to our student for academic growth and success. With this in mind, all things are possible.

Conclusions Drawn From Data

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

Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):

In reviewing the AZ-Dash Reporting Services, Percent Passing for Future Investment Middle School (2012, 2013, and 2014) the data shows an overall positive trend in Math performance over the past 3 years in all middle school grade 6th through 8th grade, with the exception of 6th Math in 2012.

But in the last two to three years, CRS has experienced major external factors outside of the educational services of our schools; more and more students are entering our schools under grade level, and we have fewer students entering our schools that are at grade level. We believe that this is partially due to a certain nationally recognized charter school that seeks high achieving academic students; in addition, we are being affected by the students' home life situations and surroundings. The Griffin Foundation Schools are located in South Central Tucson, in a low-income area high in crime and gang activities. Most of our families are disadvantaged and many speak very little English. Students come to school with very little home support to assist them in their education, and many students share their experiences with educators at school (ie. Lack of sleep, staying up late watching TV, playing video games, not receiving supper at home the night before, both parents working and could not help them with their homework, the oldest child is caring for his/her siblings, or children outside/non-productive activities). As a Title I school with 87% of our students qualifying for free or reduced lunch, GFSD's students come to school with a challenge each and every day.

Another factor is that prior to CRS/FIMS's classroom placement, 90% of the students entering our school are assessed two to three grades below grade level; some students are assessed four to five grades below grade level. Unlike a nearby charter school that recently opened during the past several years in the immediate area, the Griffin Foundation's schools do not have parents agree to transfer their child to another school if their child does not meet the school's academic standards or be placed at a lower grade level. This type of screening/agreement creates an imbalance within the surrounding area, especially for those schools left with educating the disadvantaged/low academic students; and the public often does not recognize the educators that are truly on the front line making a difference. Another impact that hurts low-income/disadvantaged, Title I students is the Equalization/funding cuts for Full-day Kindergarten students. Parents do not the available income to pay for child care or extended ½ Kindergarten classes. Although we provide full-day instruction for our Kindergarten students

out of our M & O account; the decrease in funding for full-day Kindergarten students caused reductions in needed resources for GFI and other schools Statewide. Title I schools are hurt the most from this action. Finally, the failure of the Arizona Department of Education and State legislators to fairly fund charter schools that provide "Public Choice Transportation" for their students as that of the State owned public schools that are funded fully for transportation; and paid per student, per mile traveled. Education must come first in the State of Arizona; we must learn to become leaders and represent this State well across the nation.

Over the past several years, we have noticed an increase in the number of students enrolling in our schools that have done very poorly on AIMS and/or have placed below grade level. In addition, we have seen less and less funding go to these types of schools; but instead, States and the Federal government agencies are providing more funds/capital facilities to the schools that already have the most gifted/high achieving students. These political changes are leading us back to the discriminatory practices of the 60's. GFSD is proud to know that our parents appreciate the quality education that we have provided to their child/children over the past 14 years, and that this educational institution is established as a result of our teachers' commitment, dedication, and the support from the community.

The Academic Performance Report shows that the Future Investment Middle School over the past 3 years is on an upward trend headed in a positive direction. The programs and resources newly implemented has made an impact in the educational process and improved academic growth of our students.

Area I: Data

Charter Holders with multiple schools must complete the Data area for each school that received an Overall Rating of "Does Not Meet", "Falls Far Below" or "No Rating" on the current Academic Dashboard.[2] The Charter Holder must copy and paste the entire Data area for each school.

School Name: **Future Investment Middle School**

Dashboard Ratings for All Measures					
Measure	Prior Year Dashboard		Current Year Dashboard		Data Required for Report
	Meets Exceeds	Does Not Meet Falls Far Below No Rating	Meets Exceeds	Does Not Meet Falls Far Below No Rating	
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) - Math	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Reading	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP), Bottom 25%,- Math	☐	✓	✓	☐	✓
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP), Bottom 25%,- Reading	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
Improvement – Math (Alternative High Schools Only)	☐	N/A	☐	N/A	☐
Improvement – Reading (Alternative High Schools Only)	☐	N/A	☐	N/A	☐
2a. Percent Passing – Math	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
2a. Percent Passing – Reading	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓

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

2c. Subgroup, ELL – Math	☐	N/A	☐	N/A	☐
2c. Subgroup, ELL – Reading	☐	N/A	☐	N/A	☐
2c. Subgroup, FRL – Math	☐	✓	☐	✓	✓
2c. Subgroup, FRL – Reading	✓	☐	☐	✓	✓
2c. Subgroup, students with disabilities – Math	☐	N/A	☐	N/A	☐
2c. Subgroup, students with disabilities – Reading	☐	N/A	☐	N/A	☐
High School Graduation Rate	☐	N/A	☐	N/A	☐
Academic Persistence (Alternative Schools Only)	☐	N/A	☐	N/A	☐

Data for All Applicable Measures and Subgroups

4. **What year-over-year comparative data demonstrates improved academic performance? Describe and provide data for each measure that does not meet the Board's standards in the relevant Academic Dashboards. Clearly label all data to demonstrate which measure(s) it addresses.**

Directions: Prepare graphs, tables, or data charts to include in the template that address all measures that do not meet the Board's academic standards for either of the two most recent years. The Charter Holder must provide comparative year-over-year data and analysis generated from valid and reliable assessment sources that demonstrates and evaluates the change in academic performance for all required measures for at least the two most recent school years. The Charter Holder must provide data for each school operated by the Charter Holder that does not meet the Board's academic expectations and must:

- clearly label all data to demonstrate which measure(s) it addresses,
- provide data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources,
- limit all data to no more than one page per measure per content per school, and
- redact all student identifiable information

Insert data here:

Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Math data here

SGP Math 7th Grade 13-14.jpg

SGP Math 7th Grade 14-15.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: Aggregate Multi-Test Report-(FIMS 6th, 7th, and 8th)

The Future Investment Middle School's (SGP) Math has shown continuous growth over the past 2 years as 2a Percent Passing charts will support findings. The district has implemented various Math resources and programs to increase students' academic growth and to improve Student Growth Percentile (SGP). The 7th grade students scored above benchmark on all three 2013-2014 assessments. Points earned on Pre-Test 1095 and ended with 1125 points on the Post-Test. The 7th students scored a few points short of the Math benchmark on the Pre-Test but recovered to score above the Math benchmark 2014-2015Mid-Test.

Insert Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Reading data here:

SGP Reading 8th Grade 13-14.jpg

SGP Reading 8th Grade 14-15.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: Aggregate Multi-Test Report-(FIMS 6th, 7th, and 8th)

The Future Investment Middle School's Reading Median Growth Percentile (SGP) has shown continuous growth over the past two years. On the 8th Grade 2013-2014 Reading assessments, our students scored above benchmark on all 3 assessments, scoring above benchmark by 62 points, 79 points, and 94 points. The 8th grade class scored above benchmark on both 2014-2015 Reading assessments by 32 points and 22 points. FIMS has made improvements in our Language Arts Department by hiring a new ELA Teacher. After reviewing ELA assessments, our students are at or above benchmark at this point using Galileo (ATI) assessment. Furthermore we provide Before School Intervention for students seeking help in reading on Tuesdays and Thursdays for 30 minutes.

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

1b SGP Bottom 25Math 6th Grade 13-14.jpg

1b SGP Bottom 25Math 6th Grade 14-15.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: FIMS-Aggregate Multi-Test Report (ATI)-(6th, 7th, and 8th grade)

The 6th grade Bottom 25% in Math has shown growth during all 3 benchmark assessments in 2013-2014. Although the growth is small, students have made academic gains. During 2014-2015, the Bottom 25% of the 6th grade class has made improvements; 3 students are moderate risk and 1 student is high risk. All of these students are receiving Math Tutoring 5 days per week.

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

1b SGP Bottom 25Reading 7th Grade 13-14.jpg

1b SGP Bottom 25Reading 7th Grade 14-15.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: FIMS-Aggregate Multi-Test Report (ATI)-(6th, 7th, and 8th grade)

The 2013-2014 Bottom 25% of 7th grade students are showing progress in Reading. 2 students are identified as Moderate Risk and 1 student is On Course. Students are short of benchmark between 35-64 points on average. In 2014-2015, 5 students are On Course and 1 student is Low Risk.

Insert Improvement – Math data here:

(Alternative High Schools Only)

N/A

Insert Improvement – Reading date here:

(Alternative High Schools Only)

N/A

Insert Percent Passing – Math data here:

Percent Passing Math Reading FIMS 7th grade.pdf.jpg

Percent Passing Math Reading FIMS 8th Grade.pdf.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: FIMS-Percent Passing Chart-AZ-Dash Services-(6, 7, and 8 grades)

The 7th grade Math class percent passing has shown steady growth each year 41.7, and 48.8 in 2013-2014. The 8th grade Math class also has shown an increased in student's percent passing each year, 18.9 and 33.3. Our goal is to improve the FIMS's Math percent passing scores by 10 to 15 percentage points with the use of Math intervention and Math tutoring programs that are in place, to include the implementation of Singapore Common Core Math curriculum.

Insert Percent Passing – Reading data here:

Percent Passing Math Reading FIMS 7th grade.pdf.jpg

Percent Passing Math Reading FIMS 8th Grade.pdf.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: FIMS-Percent Passing Chart-AZ-Dash Services-(6th, 7th, and 8th grade)

The 7th grade Reading class percent passing has shown stable growth in 2013 at 87.5 and 85.4 in 2014. The 8th grade Reading class has shown a slight inconsistent decreased in student's percent passing each year 67.6 and 59.3. Our goal is to improve the FIMS's Reading percent passing scores for the 6th and 7th grade classes by 10 to 15 percentage points with the use of Reading intervention and pull out Reading tutoring program that are in place for the 2015 school year.

Insert Subgroup, ELL – Math data here:

Subgroup ELL Math 6th Grade 14-15.jpg

Subgroup ELL Math 8th Grade 14-15.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: FIMS-Aggregate Multi-Test Report (ATI)-(6th, 7th, and 8th grade)

The 6th grade class for 2014-2015 Math Aggregate Multi-Test Report shows that the ELL students are approximately 95-22 points short of meeting the Math benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test. The 8th grade ELL margin is slightly larger, 113-75 points short of meeting the Math benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test. There was no 7th grade ELL students identified in the 2014-2015 school year. Many of the ELL students identified as being low academically are receiving pull out Math tutoring and attending before school Math intervention.

Insert Subgroup, ELL – Reading data here:

Subgroup ELL Reading 6th Grade 14-15.jpg

Subgroup ELL Reading 8th Grade 14-15.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: FIMS-Aggregate Multi-Test Report (ATI)-(6th, 7th, and 8th grade)

The 6th grade class for 2014-2015 ELA Aggregate Multi-Test Report shows that the ELL students are approximately 38-41 points short of meeting the ELA benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test. The 8th grade ELL margin is smaller, 12-12 points short of meeting the ELA benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test. No ELL students are identified as high risk, 6 students are identified as low to moderate risk. There was no 7th grade ELL students identified in the 2014-2015 school year. Many of the ELL students identified as being low academically are receiving pull out Math tutoring and attending before school Math intervention.

Insert Subgroup, FRL – Math data here:

Subgroup FRL Math 6th Grade 14-15.jpg

Subgroup FRL Math 7th Grade 14-15.jpg

Subgroup FRL Math 8th Grade 14-15.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: FIMS-Aggregate Multi-Test Report (ATI)-(6th, 7th, and 8th grade)

The 6th grade class for 2014-2015 Math Aggregate Multi-Test Report shows that the FRL students are approximately 55-46 points short of meeting the Math benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test. The 7th grade FRL margin is very small, 10-14 points short of meeting the Math benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test, with 8 students on course/minimal risk and 10 students moderate/low risk.. The 8th grade FRL margin is larger but large gains were made during the Mid-Test, 174-37 points short of meeting the Math benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test. FRL students are on target and close to meeting benchmarks with a Post-Test scheduled for the end of the school year.

Insert Subgroup, FRL – Reading data here:

Subgroup FRL Reading 14-15.jpg

Subgroup FRL Reading 7th Grade 14-15.jpg

Subgroup FRL Reading 8th Grade 14-15.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: FIMS-Aggregate Multi-Test FRL Report (ATI)-(6th, 7th, and 8th grade)

The 6th grade class for 2014-2015 ELA Aggregate Multi-Test Report shows that the FRL students are 85-43 points above the ELA benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test. The 7th grade FRL margin is very large, 190-118 points above the ELA benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test, with 16 students on course/minimal risk and 2 students moderate/low risk.. The 8th grade FRL margin is larger but large gains were made during the Mid-Test, 32-20 points short of meeting the ELA benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test. FRL students for the most part are above the ELA benchmarks with a Post-Test scheduled for the end of the school year.

Insert Subgroup, students with disabilities – Math data here:

Subgroup SPED Math 14-15.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: FIMS-Aggregate Multi-Test SPED Report (ATI)-(6th, 7th, and 8th grade)

The 7th grade class for 2014-2015 Math Aggregate Multi-Test Report shows that the SPED students are approximately 98-85 points short of meeting the Math benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test, with 2 students moderate/low risk. There was no 8th grade SPED students identified in the 2014-2015 school year. Our Special Education Teacher provides IEP services to each SPED student using a pull-out program.

Insert Subgroup, students with disabilities – Reading data here:

Subgroup SPED Reading 7th Grade 14-15.jpg

Note: (To view a larger picture of the inserted data – double click on the above image – it will open in a photo viewer, if it doesn't automatically appear – please look on taskbar)

Documented Evidence: FIMS-Aggregate Multi-Test SPED Report (ATI)-(6th, 7th, and 8th grade)

The 7th grade class for 2014-2015 ELA Aggregate Multi-Test Report shows that the SPED students are meeting the Reading/ELA benchmark for the Pre-Test and Mid-Test, with 2 students on course/minimal risk. There was no 8th grade SPED students identified in the 2014-2015 school year. Our Special Education Teacher provides IEP services to each SPED student using a pull-out program.

Insert High School Graduation Rate data here:

N/A

Insert Academic Persistence data here:

(Alternative Schools Only)

N/A

Valid and Reliable Data

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

Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):

The Griffin Foundation, Inc's schools have consistently implemented a comprehensive assessment system using Galileo (ATI) assessment software, AIMS/AZ-MERIT, and AZ-DASH Board that addresses defined elements required by the Arizona Department of Education and in compliance with the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools and Data Based Research.

Administrators and faculty monitor, review, analyze, and evaluate each of the required measurements to improve students' academic growth, provide data and analysis generated from valid and reliable sources using such software/reports as Galileo, DIBELS, Stanford 10, and ADE's AIMS/AZMERIT, AZ-DASH Academic Performance Dashboard that demonstrates comparative improvement, year-over-year, for the most recent years.

Academic Growth in 2014-2015:

In 2014, the Griffin Foundation, Inc., LEA received a letter grade of "C" with the Arizona Department of Education. The Griffin Foundation, Inc. had a growth rate of 46 and composite score of 61, totaling 107 points.

Conclusions Drawn From Data

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

Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):

In reviewing the AZ-Dash Reporting Services, Percent Passing for Future Investment Middle School (2012, 2013, and 2014) the data shows an overall positive trend in Math performance over the past 3 years in all middle school grade 6th through 8th grade, with the exception of 6th Math in 2012.

But in the last two to three years, CRS has experienced major external factors outside of the educational services of our schools; more and more students are entering our schools under grade level, and we

have fewer students entering our schools that are at grade level. We believe that this is partially due to a certain nationally recognized charter school that seeks high achieving academic students; in addition, we are being affected by the students' home life situations and surroundings. The Griffin Foundation Schools are located in South Central Tucson, in a low-income area high in crime and gang activities. Most of our families are disadvantaged and many speak very little English. Students come to school with very little home support to assist them in their education, and many students share their experiences with educators at school (ie. Lack of sleep, staying up late watching TV, playing video games, not receiving supper at home the night before, both parents working and could not help them with their homework, the oldest child is caring for his/her siblings, or children outside/non-productive activities). As a Title I school with 87% of our students qualifying for free or reduced lunch, GFSD's students come to school with a challenge each and every day.

Another factor is that prior to CRS/FIMS's classroom placement, 90% of the students entering our school are assessed two to three grades below grade level; some students are assessed four to five grades below grade level. Unlike a nearby charter school that recently opened during the past several years in the immediate area, the Griffin Foundation's schools do not have parents agree to transfer their child to another school if their child does not meet the school's academic standards or be placed at a lower grade level. This type of screening/agreement creates an imbalance within the surrounding area, especially for those schools left with educating the disadvantaged/low academic students; and the public often does not recognize the educators that are truly on the front line making a difference. Another impact that hurts low-income/disadvantaged, Title I students is the Equalization/funding cuts for Full-day Kindergarten students. Parents do not the available income to pay for child care or extended ½ Kindergarten classes. Although we provide full-day instruction for our Kindergarten students out of our M & O account; the decrease in funding for full-day Kindergarten students caused reductions in needed resources for GFI and other schools Statewide. Title I schools are hurt the most from this action. Finally, the failure of the Arizona Department of Education and State legislators to fairly fund charter schools that provide "Public Choice Transportation" for their students as that of the State owned public schools that are funded fully for transportation; and paid per student, per mile traveled. Education must come first in the State of Arizona; we must learn to become leaders and represent this State well across the nation.

Over the past several years, we have noticed an increase in the number of students enrolling in our schools that have done very poorly on AIMS and/or have placed below grade level. In addition, we have seen less and less funding go to these types of schools; but instead, States and the Federal government

agencies are providing more funds/capital facilities to the schools that already have the most gifted/high achieving students. These political changes are leading us back to the discriminatory practices of the 60's. GFSD is proud to know that our parents appreciate the quality education that we have provided to their child/children over the past 14 years, and that this educational institution is established as a result of our teachers' commitment, dedication, and the support from the community.

The Academic Performance Report shows that the Future Investment Middle School over the past 3 years is on an upward trend headed in a positive direction. The programs and resources newly implemented has made an impact in the educational process and improved academic growth of our students.

Area II: Curriculum

Evaluating Curriculum	
1. What is the Charter Holder's process for evaluating curriculum? How does the Charter Holder evaluate how effectively the curriculum enables students to meet the standards?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to IV. Griffin Foundation Schools' Data Review team participates in analyzing AIMS, AZMERIT, Stanford 10, DIBELS, and Galileo assessments to assist with evaluating curriculum effectiveness in the classroom and students' academic achievement, as well as, receiving curriculum input and recommendations from teachers, and review of Lesson Plans, Lesson Plan Review Checklist, and Instructional Pacing Guide.. This information is given to our Curriculum Team for evaluation and review. The committee then provides recommendations to Administrators on what types of instructional materials are needed and helpful in attaining school academic achievement goals. To include classroom curriculum evaluation to ensure that effective resources are in place to enable students to meet the objectives required by AZ Common Core Standards. The Curriculum Team is responsible for AZ Common Core curriculum alignment and instructional material adoptions.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Curriculum/Instruction/data team (CID) GFSD's Meeting/Agenda Form II. CRS's Lesson Plans III. Lesson Plan Review Checklist IV. CRS's instructional Pacing Guide
2. How does the Charter Holder identify gaps in the curriculum?	

Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:
I. to IV. The Griffin Foundation Inc's Curriculum team made up from content teachers who specialize in the same content area would work together with classroom teachers to determine existing gaps between the current curriculum and the new Common Core standards. Grade level teachers plan together weekly to prepare lesson plans and review their Instructional Pacing Guide to cover all standards during the course of the school year. The content teachers will align the common core standards as they are compared to the previous state's standards. In this process, each team member for a designated grade level will review the current state standards as they best matchup to the Common Core curriculum. Identifying gaps is processes that will help the Curriculum Team identify the discrepancy, or the gap, between the current state curriculum and "What Is" which is identified teacher practices, in addition to the Common Core curriculum. A gap occurs in the school system when content previously taught at one grade level is now included in the Common Core at an earlier grade level. Thus, as students move to the next grade, they will miss exposure to that content. The gap may occur between one or	I. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD's Meeting/Agenda Form II. CRS's Lesson Plans III. Lesson Plan Review Checklist IV. CRS's instructional Pacing Guide

more grade levels. A gap *does not occur* if the content is now present in an upper grade level. This simply means that students will be exposed to that content in a later grade. Completion of the gap analysis will enable the Curriculum Team to answer the equity and adequacy questions relative to curricular practices. These analyses focus the work of the district in leading change in curriculum and instruction to meet the new Common Core Standards. In addition, the Curriculum Team will determine essential standards. The Essential standards are those grade level/content standards that students must master in order to be successful in school. These standards offer high focus and priority for instructional time, attention, and resources. Essential Standards help teachers to focus on the most important standards for the grade level and subject area. http://digitalsandbox.weebly.com/identifying-gaps.html The main purpose of our Curriculum Team is to develop articulated curriculum frameworks K-8, which is aligned with the Arizona state performance standards and state assessment practices.	
Adopting/Revising Curriculum	
3. What is the Charter Holder's process for adopting or revising curriculum based on its	

evaluation processes?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to II. The CID team process and evaluate curriculum and instruction to ensure students' academic growth progressing to meet AZ Common Core Standards. Last year, Singapore Math textbooks and onsite training and coaching was implemented: **GFSD Curriculum Development Checklist:** Phase 1 •Determine readiness •Conduct Focus Groups •Establish curriculum Team(s) Phase 2 •Locate Arizona program delivery standards •Locate Arizona content standards •Locate English Language Learners (ELL) Phase 3 •Locate local curriculum documents •Locate curriculum consortia documents (if applicable) •Locate other GFSD curriculum documents Phase 4 •Locate other GFSD curriculum documents •Inventory local resources (e.g., educational materials, human resources, technology, schedules, etc.) Phase 5 •Compare local curriculum to Arizona content Common Core standards and ELL •Identify gaps in existing curriculum	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD's Meeting/Agenda Form II. Purchase Order for textbooks and Invoice from Singapore Math

documents Phase 6 •Write or revise the curriculum •Examine learning progressions Phase 7 •Match resources to curriculum •Identify additional resources needed Phase 8 •Curriculum Team submits recommendations and supported documentation to the district. Phase 9 •Create implementation plan •Create professional development plan Phase 10 •Create comprehensive assessment system (formative to summative) •Update curriculum review and revision schedule in Continuous School Improvement Plan and Annual Progress Report. •Provide curriculum to Board of Directors.	
4. Who is involved in the process for adopting or revising curriculum?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of

I. The Curriculum/Instruction Team for the Griffin Foundation, Inc. is the district wide coordinating committee body for our curriculum development system. It evaluates the products and recommends action to the superintendent. The team is composed of one representative from each identified subject area plus the Assistant Principal who shall act as chairman, along with one representative from Future Investment Middle School and one representative from Children Reaching for the Sky elementary school. Their findings are submitted to the Superintendent and district and Broad for review. http://web.lakeland272.org/curriculum_process	implementation of this process: I. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD's Meeting/Agenda Form
5. When adopting curriculum, how does the Charter Holder evaluate curriculum options to determine which curriculum to adopt?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to II. Before the Griffin Foundation, Inc schools including Children Reaching for the Sky Elementary Schools and Future Investment Middle School, understand how to evaluate its curriculum; The CID Team must first know why we should evaluate any curriculum. The reasons are: • Students could be dissatisfied with the	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD's Meeting/Agenda Form II. Training Survey Sheets/feedback from teachers III. Professional Development sign-in sheet

current curriculum and methods of teaching. • Students are not achieving the desired goals set in the curriculum. • There is a change in the student market. • The professional expectations could be changing, which in turn call for a change in the curriculum. • There could also be changes in the time and staff resources. I. to II: The need to evaluate curriculum arises in the district because it is necessary for both teachers and students to determine the extent to which their current curricular program and its implementation have produced positive and curricular suitable outcomes for students. Feedback is given to the CID Team through Professional Development, direct communication to the team members, or recommendations. To evaluate curricular effectiveness, GFSD Curriculum Team (CID) must identify and describe the curriculum and its objectives first and then check its contents for accuracy, comprehensiveness, depth, timeliness, depth	

and quality, with feedback from teachers during professional development and faculty meetings. We first evaluate the results that the curriculum claims to achieve and the teachings that it inculcates in the students. Then we look at the following factors while evaluating a curriculum: • Does the curriculum encourage students to use their own reasoning and thinking to find solutions to real-world problems in a more productive and realistic way? • Does it give them a practical knowledge about the topic being taught? • Does it help students to adopt lateral thinking and form their opinions about a particular topic or concept? • Does the curriculum groom their personality? In order to conduct a thorough curriculum evaluation our curriculum team(s): • Focus on one particular curriculum program or compare two or three programs	

at once. • Use a recognized methodology for evaluation. • Study a large portion of the curriculum that is being evaluated. Now, in order to move forward with evaluation of the curriculum, we need to focus on the evidence gathering and the decisions that must be made for proper evaluation. Our evaluation process involves three stages of visual articulating of program theory, selecting the research design and methodology and some other considerations. We will look at these three stages in detail. Articulating program theory • The first step for evaluation for a GFSD school is to specify and articulate the evaluation questions and elaborate what components will be considered in the evaluation process. • Next, our curriculum team must concentrate on different principles and adopt a different point of view for articulating the different curriculum	

programs. • Students' contribution in the classroom and the methods and strategies they apply to problem solving must be carefully observed. • Students' progress also needs to be measured and their mastery over current and previous topics needs to be assessed. • A clear articulation of the curriculum also helps the decision makers to make an informed judgment. Selecting the research design and methodology There are multiple methodologies for evaluating curriculum, but the main three are, content analysis, case studies and comparative studies. Content Analysis • Content analysis mainly involves evaluating the content of the curriculum and is influenced heavily by the personal values of the people involved in the evaluation process.	

• Curriculum analysis must extend beyond a simple listing of content and should include comparison with other curricula. • Curriculum needs to analyze for alignment between the course content and the goals. • The study material should have a sense of purpose and help in promoting student thinking and engaging them in the subject being taught. The Griffin Foundation conducts a detailed evaluation before adopting a specific curriculum into its schools. http://www.howany.com/how-to-evaluate-curriculum/	

Implementing Curriculum	
6. What is the Charter Holder's process for ensuring consistent implementation of the curriculum across the school(s) operated by the Charter Holder?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to II. An important starting point for the CID team that is the designer of a carefully thought-out curriculum framework that reflects the standards and goals for which our education system is willing to be held accountable. We implemented a standards-based curriculum that is consistently used across our schools, and that has changed the way teachers teach; in doing so, we have taken care in building capacity for all educators and to provide them adequate time for implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the curriculum. The curriculum-development process also provides opportunities for reflection and revision so that the curriculum is updated and improved on a regular basis. Our curriculum framework is composed of three tiers: I. to II. Tier I present content standards and benchmarks for classroom instruction, and sections specific to lesson planning, teaching and learning. Lesson Plans are checked and reviewed weekly. Tier II Provide teachers with the opportunity to	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Curriculum/Instruction/data team: GFSD's Meeting/Agenda Form II. Training Survey Sheets/feedback from teachers III. Professional Development sign-in sheet IV. Lesson Plans V. Lesson Plans Review Checklist

plan subject-area instructional units/lesson plans, design classroom assessments, and maintain a district wide assessment system. Tier III contains specific content-area resources that help clarify the curriculum development process, and to provide Professional Development to our teachers in the area of curriculum implementation, engagement, and assessment to enhance students' academic growth. Major responsibilities of administration to ensure consistent implementation of the curriculum across the school(s): • Revise pre-K–8 curriculum to ensure alignment with AZ Common Core standards and outcomes • Create formative assessment tools to monitor student progress • Develop reading/math intervention and tutoring programs for identified students based on local and state assessments • Provide direct support to schools to facilitate effective implementation of curriculum, assessments, and instructional programs • Provide the leadership for the implementation of standards-based grading and reporting • Support the design and delivery of	

professional development that ensures fidelity of curriculum implementation across all schools. • Refine instructional programs that meet the needs of diverse learners, including students with disabilities, those who are highly able, English language learners and students who are at risk of underachievement because of poverty, Free and Reduced Lunch subgroup. • Maintain formal links with the district office and to ensure consistent delivery of curriculum and instructional programs • Facilitate communication with faculty, staff, parents, and community groups, regarding curriculum, classroom instruction, and school-wide assessments.	
7. What tools exist that identify what must be taught and when it must be delivered? How does	

the Charter Holder ensure that all grade-level standards are covered within the academic year?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to III. Future Investment Middle School and Children Reaching for the Sky Elementary School teachers use a Pacing Guides and curriculum mapping that ensures grade to grade continuity, timely intervention, also confirmation that the school's curriculum is taught and AZ Common Core Standards are met; in addition, it will help in development of lesson plans and close the achievement gap for all enrolled students. Lesson plans are reviewed and checked by administration weekly. Pacing Guides along with Galileo Assessment software (Measures of Academic Progress) provide teachers with powerful information which can be used to improve student learning. The combination of Pacing Guides and Galileo Assessment software will positively impact student performance on classroom and state assessments. Assessments measure student's learning. They help us answer the questions- How much did they learn? How well did they learn? How well did we teach? Pacing Guides are reviewed prior to approval, and they are periodically reviewed by administrators, grade level teachers, and/or content teachers for revision and updates, and	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Curriculum Mapping-Instructional Pacing Guide II. Lesson Plans III. Lesson Plan Review Checklist

Curriculum Instruction Data team discussion.	
8. What is the expectation for consistent use of these tools? How are these expectations communicated?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to II. The expectation for consistent use of these tools are as follows: It will assist teachers in determining student's time on task, the alignment of instruction to standards (lesson plans), breadth of coverage of AZ Common Core Standards, and instructional practices are maximized for all students, then improved student learning is the result. In contrast to curriculum maps, pacing guides are like timelines showing what each teaching team plans to cover over the course of a year. Each subject area follows a logical sequence within a grade level and between grade levels. To help teachers provide the same content to each student no matter which school he or she attends. All students will receive a quality education with equal accommodations and resources. The materials sequence the content standards in a logical and progressive manner. It is the responsibility of both the district and the school to collaboratively review and	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Curriculum Mapping-Instructional Pacing Guide II. Lesson Plans

modify the planning guides. To develop pacing guides for each grade-level academic area, district teams use the following resources: A planning guide, which may include suggestions for pacing instruction. The district benchmark assessment schedule. The expertise of subject-matter teachers. Any developed curriculum maps. The pacing guides include a schedule of when assessments will be administered. The assessments help teachers know what students are learning, who is learning at the suggested pace, and who is not learning at the suggested pace. Although failure is not an option, slowing the pace for struggling students is also not a viable option as it is unfair to proficient and advanced students. It is critical that schools and districts develop a plan to keep students learning at an engaging pace and support those who are not keeping pace by providing appropriate instructional support, such as additional classes, tutoring, and small-group remediation, and before and after school intervention.	
9. What evidence is there to demonstrate usage of these tools in the classroom and alignment with instruction?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:

Aligned Standards-based Curriculum is conducted during grade level Classroom Planning periods: CURRICULUM – is the organization of standards into a plan that describes the manner (sequence, for how long) in which the standards will be taught and assessed. CONTENT STANDARDS – define what students must know and be able to do (as opposed to a list of topics or chapters in a book); define the parameters of the three main components of standards-based education. INSTRUCTION – is the use of various strategies and methods to teach the standards. Instruction is informed by student achievement, learning targets, and other variables that affect learning. ASSESSMENT – is the measurement of student performance based on the expectations outlined in the standards. A comprehensive system of assessment includes a continuum of formative, interim, and summative measures of student progress. Grade level collaboration by teachers is conducted to review standards and to determine what needs to be taught at their level. I. to IV. Teachers write the standards and objectives that are being addressed each week on the whiteboard and incorporated in their lesson plans. That includes formal and informal	I. Classroom Observations

observations and classroom visits by administrators. Administrators conduct one to two formal teacher evaluations per year, as well as classroom observations by administrators. In addition, Lesson Plans must identify AZ Common Core Standards achieved in the teaching of their lesson. Lesson Plans are submitted to administrators every Monday morning before the start of class. Grades are entered by Tuesday of every week. Plans and grades are reviewed and feedback given to teachers	II. Teacher Evaluations III. Lesson Plans IV. Lesson Plan Review Checklist
Alignment of Curriculum	
10. How does the Charter Holder know the curriculum is aligned to standards?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to IV. Students receive three benchmark assessments yearly, using Galileo assessment software. Administrators and faculty utilize these assessments to monitor, evaluate, re-align, and plan classroom instruction and modify curriculum based on the student's needs. The student's growth is monitored to determine if baseline growth has been reached during the scheduled assessment. This process assists administrators and teachers with planning of lessons monitoring of standards that must be met for the upcoming instruction period and ensures that curriculum addresses the need of the students.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. AZ Common Core Standards on Desk II. Lesson Plans III. Curriculum Mapping-Instructional Pacing Guide IV. Lesson Plan Review Checklist

The district completed work on our school wide curriculum bench marks that will be used to guide and pace classroom instruction and create uniformity within grade levels. Teachers use grade level curriculum, while following Arizona Common Core Standards based on school Bench Marks. Teachers must keep a copy of the standards on their desk and their lesson plans must reference the AZ Common Core Standards. Curriculum used in the classrooms: Singapore Math, McGraw-Hill Social Studies, Science, and Language Arts K-5, and McDougal-Littell Social Studies, Science, and Language Arts, and Singapore Math 6-8. Teachers are required to submit their Lesson Plans to Administrators each week, on Monday morning at the start of school. Lesson Plans are reviewed for AZ-ADE compliance and input is provided to teachers after review is completed. Reviews of lesson plans are documented and records kept on file. In addition, grade level teachers work together during their group planning period to share resources, ideas, and methods on classroom instruction that follows AZ Common Core Standards.	

Adapted to Meet the Needs of Subgroups*(Address all relevant measures)*	
11. How has the Charter Holder ensured that the curriculum addresses the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): The Griffin Foundation, Inc schools support its students to reach high academic standards. We believe that a key component of our success rests in the schools' ability to cultivate a spirit and culture of academic achievement through students' real life experiences. I. to V. GFSD (Griffin Foundation School District) has developed specific practices and systems to support each student as he or she strives to meet the school's rigorous academic standards, including prerequisites that help to assist in identifying the bottom 25% non-proficient students to implement student support systems such as intervention programs or tutoring; including various complementary programs such as a reading program that prevent students from falling behind while motivating them to set and achieve academic goals; as well as practices that establish a culture of academic achievement among students at the school; in addition to having three ways to support faculty collaboration and communication as they work to learn about student needs and meet them.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. CRS's classroom student file on bottom 25% II. Lower and Upper Result charts, AZ-Dash reporting Services III. Galileo (ATI) assessment reports (High or Moderate Risk students) IV. Math Tutoring Program form and sign-in sheet V. After School Intervention permission form and sign-in sheet

Our staff continues to meet the needs of students, families and the community. This best practice centers around a standards-based, academically challenging curriculum that draws on the cultural assets of our students; the use of data analysis to improve teaching and learning; a supported immersion model for English language learners; the development of individualized education goals for all students; an administrative structure that outsources training services in Mathematics and Common Core Standards; a collaborative staffing model; and mandatory participation in teachers/parent community involvement. Students identified in the bottom 25%/non-proficient category are given individual school file to monitor and track their growth as he/she participate in our before and after school intervention programs, classroom differentiated instruction support, and math tutoring program. The Griffin Foundation, Inc's schools offers before and after school intervention in reading and math to our bottom 25%/non-proficient students, as well as, a pullout Math tutoring program.	

12. How has the Charter Holder ensured that the curriculum addresses the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to VIII. South Central Tucson community encompasses a diverse population mostly of low income minority families with a large part of the population Spanish speaking; The Griffin Foundation's campus was purchased with $6.9 Million dollars (Education Revenue Bonds, Series 2008); with student enrollment ranging from 325 to 400 students yearly. To ensure a quality education programs and work with the needs of each student, the district implemented an assessment system to monitor the academic growth of students. A program was designed to increase academic performance of all students, including sub-groups such as English language learners for students who have a second language influence and Free and Reduced lunch and Special Education (FRL and SPED). The mission the Griffin Foundation Inc.'s district ESL services is to create a learning environment that encourages assimilation into the second language and culture while maintaining respect for and pride in their cultural and linguistic heritage. Our vision of the ESL/ELL program is to deliver comprehensive instruction so that English	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. CRS's classroom student file on bottom 25% II. Lower and Upper Result charts, AZ-Dash reporting Services III. Galileo (ATI) assessment reports (High or Moderate Risk students) IV. Math Tutoring Program form and sign-in sheet V. School Intervention permission form and sign-in sheet VI. Galileo (ATI)-Aggregate Multi-

Language Learners (ELLs) can attain the goals and outcomes as set forth by government regulations. If we remember that students are at the heart of all we do, and each student can realize his or her fullest potential, our ELL program will excel in academic student growth; with the help of high-performing educators and leaders, we will make a difference in student success. Our diversity inspires excellence and innovation. The Griffin Foundation Inc. like many advocates for English-language learners consider the implementation of the common-core academic standards, adopted by almost every state, as promising for raising achievement for English-language learners. Our district (CRS and FIMS) has implemented Galileo and AIMS/AZMERIT State assessment software and AZELLA testing to assess ELL students in reading and math for the common-core standards. These assessments are designed to include ELL's students and ensure that their needs were appropriately assessed. CRS and FIMS receive standardized-assessment scores of ELL students through the use of the Arizona Department of Education, AZ-Dash, AIMS/AZMERIT, and AZELLA as well as assessment assistance with other specified subgroups. School districts are required by the law to meet targets set by the State of Arizona	Test Report ELL Students Math and Reading VII. ESL/ELL Classroom Inventory report VIII. ELL Students' Classification Report: AZ-Dash Reporting Services

for "adequate yearly progress," or AYP, for English-language learners or face sanctions. For measuring accountability, the law requires States, including Arizona, to develop English-language-proficiency standards and implement English-language-proficiency tests. These English-proficiency standards had to be linked to State academic standards. Our ELL Teacher conducts AZMERIT and AZELLA assessments yearly and these assessments are submitted to an assessment processing center funded by the Arizona Department of Education and managed by the Office of English Language Acquisition Services (OELAS). VII: Our ELL department has many resources and Materials for ELL students and the classroom teacher that is helpful in improving the students' English language skills: 2. Unit Guides Books 3. Practice Book 4. Teacher Resource Book 5. Program Guide and Assessment Handbook 6. Songs CD 7. Song Book 8. Alpha Chant Phonics Kit w/CD 9. Photo File Picture Cards 10. Reading Basics Teacher Guide 11. Reading Basics Teacher Script 12. Hooked on Phonics Set 13. Zip Zoom software and Kit	

14. Computer Laptops 15. Star Fall materials/Resources 16. Overhead Projector Note: (see ELL Classroom Inventory sheets)	
13. How has the Charter Holder ensured that the curriculum addresses the needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to VI. The curriculum Team monitors and reviews State and local assessment results, the articulation of FIMS and CRS curriculum, instruction and instructional support services, program improvement activities (ELL, FRL, and SPED), textbooks and technology selection, and program development as Title I eligible schools due to the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch and receive funding in part through the Title I Federal Grant. Information about the use of this grant money is provided annually during faculty meetings and public forums. The district monitors adequate yearly progress data provided by the Arizona Department of Education, and after which, the district identifies if a specific sub-group of students does not make adequate yearly progress or when there is widening gap between student sub-group performances	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. CRS's classroom student file on bottom 25% II. Lower and Upper Result charts, AZ-Dash reporting Services III. Galileo (ATI) assessment reports (High or Moderate Risk students) IV. Math Tutoring Program form and sign-in sheet V. After School Intervention permission form and sign-in sheet VI. Galileo (ATI)-Aggregate Multi-Test Report

when compared against the performance percentages of the entire population. When adequate yearly progress is not attained, the school implements student assistance through tutoring, before and after school intervention, and other support services.	FRL Students Math and Reading
14. How has the Charter Holder ensured that the curriculum addresses the needs of students with disabilities?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to VI. The Griffin Foundations Inc.'s Special Education department will make the decisions regarding the type of special education services to be provided and the educational placement for the provision of such services are based upon a student's individual need. Students with disabilities are educated in the least restrictive environment that is most appropriate for them. A variety of special education services are available beginning with full participation in the general education classroom to the extent possible--often with the provision of supplementary aids and support--as determined by the school's Case Study Committee (CSC) which includes Special Education Specialist, Teachers, administrator, and parents.. Services are provided in the least restrictive environment for each student and may include:	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. CRS's classroom student file on bottom 25% II. Lower and Upper Result charts, AZ-Dash reporting Services III. Galileo (ATI) assessment reports (High or Moderate Risk students) IV. Math Tutoring Program form and sign-in sheet V. After School Intervention permission form and sign-in sheet VI. Galileo (ATI)-Aggregate Multi-Test Report SPED Students Math and Reading

• Consultation provided by special educators to the general education teacher; • Collaborative instruction in the general education classroom through co-teaching by the general and special education teachers; and • Instruction in the special education classroom for part or all of the school day. Related services are those services required for the student to benefit from his or her special education program and may include psychological and counseling services, language, speech, and hearing, transportation, assistive technology, physical and occupational therapy, and medical services that are required for diagnostic or evaluation purposes.	

Area III: Assessment

Assessment System	
1. What types of assessments does the Charter Holder use?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to II. Galileo (ATI) Assessment software and AZ-DASH Reporting Services are used to monitor student academic growth and progress while attending the Griffin Foundation Schools. Assessments are conducted 3 times throughout the school year to assess students' strengths and weaknesses in relationship to the State standards and academic progress, to include academic performance measurements in the various sub-groups such as Math and Reading ELL (English Language Learner, FRL (Free and Reduced Lunch), and SPED (Special education). Students take various assessments to monitor academic	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Galileo (ATI) Assessment Reports II. AZ-DASH Reporting Services

growth: Star Math and Star Reading assessments to determine ability levels on students for instruction grouping. DIBELS assessments are used in grades K-3. Other software that is used from grades 4-8: Renaissance Place, Study Island, Star Reading, Star Math, Help Me To Learn Phonics/reading, and Zip Zoom for ELL Students, and English Language Learners. Track progress, assess at regular intervals and refine goals and objectives as needed. Help keep students motivated to continue working to master goals and objectives throughout the grading period, semester or year by consistently monitoring progress with students. Keep a log for each student on which you can note milestones, areas in which the student is struggling, and standards and skills the student has mastered. Track progress both informally, through observation and questioning, and through formal assessments that measure specific standards and goals.	
2. What was the process for designing or selecting the assessment system?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to II. The Griffin Foundation, Inc.'s school district leading educators and administrators before selecting an assessment system must have clear understandings of the purpose and process for their use. Policymakers within our district consider the following questions before adopting or developing benchmark assessments:	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Galileo (ATI) Assessment Reports II. AZ-DASH Reporting Services

1. What purposes do you expect benchmark assessments to serve? 2. What criteria should you use to select or create benchmark assessments? 3. What capacities are needed to support use of benchmark assessments in the Griffin Foundation School District Institution? Benchmark assessment is one component of a comprehensive assessment system that provides the important data needed by teachers or administrators to serve district, school, and classroom improvement needs. The National Research Council defines a quality assessment system as one that is: • coherent • comprehensive • continuous Prior to administration selecting the Galileo Assessment software, educators reviewed the needs of our district, and determined that these elements were met: All components of a *coherent* system are aligned with the key goals (standards) for student learning. A *comprehensive* assessment system addresses a full range of knowledge and skills expected by standards. It provides different users at different levels in the system (district, school, and classroom) with the right kinds of data, at the right level of detail, to help with decision-making. A system that is continuous provides on-going streams of information about student learning throughout the year. Assessment data from a coherent, comprehensive and continuous system help educators monitor student learning by establishing a rich and	

productive foundation for understanding student achievement. GFSD focuses on the interrelationships between three types of assessments: formative, benchmark, and annual—in a comprehensive assessment system. The learning targets assessed by frequent formative assessment in the classroom build toward the longer-term targets addressed by periodic benchmark assessments. Benchmark data inform teaching and learning that occurs prior to the annual assessment, which in turn transfers into subsequent years of teaching, learning and assessment. Notice how the smaller, more frequent assessments build on and support each other to keep learning moving forward. Purpose of selecting an assessment system: Purpose 1: Communicate expectations for learning Purpose 2: Plan instruction Purpose 3: Monitor and evaluate learning Purpose 4: Predict future performance There were several factors that the district considered prior to selecting and/or developing benchmark assessments. Many assessment companies report that their assessments are “aligned” with specific State standards. This may not always be the case, however, so consumers	

of benchmark assessments systems may consider conducting their own analysis. Benchmark alignment analysis begins with having the learning goals clearly in mind. Educators can then evaluate alignment with the following questions: 1. What framework was used to develop the benchmark assessment or items in the assessment? 2. What is the distribution and range of items and content by grade level? 3. What is the distribution and range of cognitive demands by grade level? 4. What is the specific distribution of items on each assessment by content and cognitive demand? 5. What is the range of items for diagnosing specific learning strengths and weaknesses to guide instruction, and how many items are there? Test publishers typically provide reliability indices for benchmark assessments along with other technical information about item difficulty and discrimination. It is essential to review this technical information before purchasing or using benchmark assessments or item banks for benchmark assessment selection and use. Another important point we considered prior to selecting or developing benchmark assessments was the "utility". The overarching question that schools, districts and States should ask to determine a benchmark assessment's utility is: "Will this assessment be useful in helping us to accomplish our intended purposes?" To maximize utility, benchmark assessments must be user-	

friendly, feasible to administer, and should be scored and interpreted in a timely way. Evaluating the utility of a benchmark assessment means revisiting the purpose of the assessment, its intended users, and how teachers are expected to use the results to guide instruction. In the process of selecting or developing benchmark assessments, the Griffin Foundation, Inc. carefully considered the infrastructure and systems needed for the benchmark assessment process to run smoothly and efficiently. Appropriate infrastructure and systems help ensure that educators will be able to make good use of assessment results. Decisions about how, when, and by whom the assessments will be administered, scored, analyzed, and used will influence the kinds of resources and support school personnel need. Remember: it is critical to plan in advance how, for what purpose, and by whom the assessment results will be used. Careful planning and consideration was helpful in getting benchmark assessment systems in place: • ease and efficiency of implementation and scoring procedures • management of information systems that provide easy data access and analysis • organizational supports for appropriate interpretation and use • instructional supports for teachers and students • time for learning, analyzing and interpreting data in collaboration with colleagues	

http://datause.cse.ucla.edu/readmore.php?page=benchmark	
3. How is the assessment system aligned to the curriculum and instructional methodology?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to V. Our Galileo assessment system is aligned to the curriculum through AZ Common Core Standards and classroom lesson plans with the use of an Instructional Pacing Guide. The designers of this software have worked closely with the Arizona Department of Education to meet the needs of schools' assessment requirements. Benchmark alignment describes how well; what are assessed matches both what schools are teaching and the purpose for giving the assessment. For benchmark assessments to provide information for making valid inferences about student learning, the assessment must be aligned with the learning goals, standards, or success criteria from the beginning of the development or adoption process. One way to ensure alignment is "…to create benchmark assessments that enrich student learning opportunities, focus on the big ideas of a content area and counteract curriculum narrowing by designing benchmark assessments that allow students to apply their knowledge and skills in a variety of contexts and formats" (Herman and Baker, 98). The essential issues for benchmark alignment focuses on	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. AZ Common Core Standards II. Lesson Plans III. Lesson Plans Review Checklist IV. Galileo (ATI) Assessments Reports V. Curriculum Mapping-Instructional Pacing Guide

these questions: 1. Do the assessments reflect what is most important for students to know and be able to do? 2. Do the assessments capture the depth and breadth of learning goals? 3. Is the assessment framework consistent with the local curriculum framework? 4. Does the sequence of assessment content on successive tests match that of the curriculum? 5. Which curriculum goals should each assessment be aligned with—those of the prior instructional period, those of subsequent instructional periods, or both? The answers to these questions help to illuminate the importance of selecting and using a benchmark assessment system that aligns well with a school, district or State curriculum. An analysis of student responses can further help to assure that individual benchmark assessments are measuring the identified concepts at the appropriate time during the academic year. Benchmark alignment analysis begins with having the learning goals clearly in mind. Our administrators and educators evaluate alignment with the following questions: 6. What framework was used to develop the benchmark assessment or items in the assessment? 7. What is the distribution and range of items and content by grade level? 8. What is the distribution and range of cognitive	

demands by grade level? 9. What is the specific distribution of items on each assessment by content and cognitive demand? 10. What is the range of items for diagnosing specific learning strengths and weaknesses to guide instruction, and how many items are there? In this example, educators wanted to know how well their quarterly mathematics benchmark assessments aligned with the school learning goals and district and state standards. The table presents a summary of four benchmark assessments and identifies the number of items on each assessment by topic, mathematical "big idea," and intellectual demand of the assessments. Notice the following (information found in the "Mathematics Concept" column): 1. "Data Analysis" receives the most emphasis on the 4th grade benchmark math assessments (28/100, representing 28% of all items) 2. "Patterns and Algebraic Thinking" represent 16% 3. "Measurement" represents 20% 4. "Geometry" represents 10% 5. "Number Sense" represents 27% Is this a reasonable distribution of content? Does the distribution reflect intended learning goals? Is the benchmark assessment aligned with the district's curriculum? There is no right or wrong answer to these questions. This information provides an opportunity for educators to ask themselves if the distribution aligns with what matters most conceptually in 4th grade mathematics in	

their context. If the standards and conceptual analysis indicate that this distribution aligns with the intended learning goals, then they have reasonable assurance that the benchmark assessments are aligned conceptually to their 4th grade mathematics standards. If not, the school, district, or State will need to take steps to improve benchmark alignment with learning goals.	
4. What intervals are used to assess student progress? How does the assessment plan include data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to III. GFSD conducts annual State summative assessments that provide information on how our students are doing relative to annual Arizona Common Core standards, i.e., long-term learning goals. Formative assessment is embedded in classroom instruction and provides immediate information on short-term learning goals. The use of Galileo ATI and Test Building Design allow teachers to perform both formative and summative assessments. Teachers are able to create their own assessments based on classroom instructions and AZ Common Core Standards. Summative vs. Formative Assessments: What's the difference? Some like to think of the two as	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Galileo (ATI) Assessments: Test Building Design II. Pre-test Benchmark, Mid-test Benchmark, and Post-test Benchmark III. AZ Common Core Standards

helping one another out – the formative assessments check progress along the way, while the summative assessment serves sort of as the 'end survey'. While that works as a simplified explanation, there's much more to it. Formative Assessments • Use to check students' progress • The information gained guides the next steps in instruction and helps teachers and students consider the additional learning opportunities needed to ensure success • Formative assessment information must be fed forward into an instructional model that allows for responsiveness to student need Examples of Formative Assessments • Projects and performances • Writing assignments • Tests and quizzes • Asking questions Summative Assessments • Summative assessments provide teachers and students with information about the attainment of knowledge • Often result in a grade which means they have a high point value (ie, they "count a lot") • The goal is to evaluate student learning at the end of an instructional unit by comparing it against some sort of standard or benchmark assessments such as Galileo (ATI), AIMS and	

AZMERIT. Examples of Summative Assessments • A class project • A Final exam • A Midterm exam • A Research paper In addition, formative assessment data can help teachers plan instruction. Benchmark assessments occupy a larger position in the assessment spectrum. They are strategically located and administered outside daily classroom use but inside the school and district curriculum. Typically uniform in timing and content across classrooms and schools, benchmark assessments provide results that can be aggregated at the classroom, grade, school and district levels. At GFSD, we conduct 3 benchmark assessments yearly (Pre-test, Mid-test, and Post-test). This information, when provided to school and district decision-makers and teachers, serves as an interim indication of how well students are learning and raises important questions regarding instructional program and practice impact. It can promote action to accelerate progress toward annual goals and provide more immediate information that can be used to help plan and guide subsequent instruction at the school and classroom level. Formative, benchmark, and annual—in a comprehensive assessment system. The learning targets assessed by frequent formative assessment in the classroom build toward the longer-term targets addressed by periodic benchmark assessments.	

Benchmark data inform teaching and learning that occurs prior to the annual assessment, which in turn transfers into subsequent years of teaching, learning and assessment. Notice how the smaller, more frequent assessments build on and support each other to keep learning moving forward.	
Analyzing Assessment Data	
5. How does the assessment system provide for analysis of assessment data? What intervals are used to analyze assessment data?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to III: Annual State assessments and our school's Galileo ATI assessments provide information on how students are doing relative to annual learning standards, i.e., long-term learning goals. Formative assessment is embedded in our classroom instruction and provides immediate information on short-term learning goals. Formative assessment data help GFSD's teachers plan instruction. Benchmark assessments occupy a middle position in the assessment spectrum. They are strategically located and administered outside daily classroom use but inside the school and district curriculum. Typically uniform in timing and content across classrooms and schools, benchmark assessments provide results that can are aggregated at the classroom (grade, school and district levels). This information, when provided to school and district decision-makers and	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Galileo (ATI) Assessments: Test Building Design II. Pre-test Benchmark, Mid-test Benchmark, and Post-test Benchmark: see data reports and charts III. Analysis of Student/Classroom Data IV. SLO Scoring Template and Sample V. Student Learning Objective

teachers, serves as an interim indication of how well students are learning and raises important questions regarding instructional program and practice impact. It can promote action to accelerate progress toward annual goals and provide more immediate information that can be used to help plan and guide subsequent instruction at the school and classroom level. IV. to IX. Teachers are trained on the 3rd Wednesday of each monthly by our Computer Technology Instructor during our scheduled Professional Development (PD) on Galileo Assessment (ATI), AZ-Dash, AIMS/AMERIT assessments, and Data Review/Analysis. Each Benchmark assessment period (Pre-Test, Mid-Test, and Post-Test), teachers conduct analysis of students/classroom data by completing the Analysis of Student/Classroom Data form and the Student Learning Objective (SLO) and the Baseline Learning Objective (BLO): Baseline and Trend Data Report. These reports are used by educators to direct instruction, intervention programs, differentiated Instruction, extra homework support to assist parents with students below grade level, and develop lesson plans. The BLO reports are submitted to administrator monthly to monitor teachers' classroom instruction progress.	(SLO) Template: Baseline Learning Objectives: Baseline and Trend Data Report Sample VI. AZ Common Core Standards VII. Lesson Plans VIII. Professional Development IX. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD'S Meeting/Agenda Template
6. How is the analysis used to evaluate instructional and curricular effectiveness?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): The evaluation of quality in the Griffin Foundation School District's benchmark assessment system begins with a	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Teacher Evaluation

clear explanation of the purpose(s) of an assessment and serious consideration of a range of issues that tell how well a given assessment or assessment system serves that purpose(s). I. to IV. The dynamic between an assessment's purpose and the resulting data generated by the assessment is key in determining the validity of benchmark assessments during analysis by GFSD's Curriculum Team/Instruction Team/Data Team. This team uses a variety of tools to assist in evaluation of instructional and curricular effectiveness such as Teacher Evaluations, Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans, The evaluation of quality in any benchmark assessment system starts with a clear understanding of the purpose(s) an assessment is intended to serve and consideration of other issues that indicate how well a given assessment or assessment system serves that purpose. Benchmark assessments must: • Be *aligned* with district and school learning goals and intended purpose • Provide *reliable* information for intended score interpretations and uses • Be *instructionally sensitive* • Be *fair and accessible* • Have *high utility* • Provide useful *reporting* for intended users and purposes The validity of benchmark assessments resides in the *evidence* provided by an assessment and its specific use. Some benchmark assessments have a high degree of validity for one purpose, but may have little validity for	II. Classroom Observation III. Lesson Plans IV. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD'S Meeting/Agenda Template

another. For example, a benchmark reading assessment may be valid for identifying students who may not reach the proficiency level on a State test. However the assessment could have little validity for diagnosing and identifying the cause of students' reading challenges.	
7. How is the analysis used to adjust curriculum and instruction in a timely manner? What intervals are used to adjust curriculum and instruction?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to II. FIMS and CRS administrators use benchmark assessments for instructional planning purposes by providing teachers with information needed to develop and adjust curriculum and classroom instruction to meet students' learning needs. To do so, benchmark assessments must be aligned with content and provide feedback on students' strengths and weaknesses relative to specific curriculum goals. Consider, for example, one district's first quarter mathematics benchmark assessment. In the first quarter, fourth grade students learned how whole numbers and decimals relate to fractions. Specifically, students learned about tenths and hundredths in decimal and fraction notations and decimal and fractional equivalents (e.g., 1/2=0.5 or .50). They also studied the conceptual models for how these representations are related. A benchmark assessment that provides good information for planning instruction	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Lesson Plans II. Lesson Plan Review Checklist

would provide data on how well students have learned these concepts. Ideally, the assessment would also diagnose challenges students encountered in each focus area. For example, how well can students convert fractions to decimals and how well they can solve problems that require understanding of proportional reasoning? This benchmark assessment would not include items or concepts not taught, such as negative numbers or the multiplication and division of fractions and decimals. III. Teachers can use the results from the 1st quarter benchmark assessment to plan subsequent math instruction. When administered across classrooms, grade levels, or content areas, benchmark assessment results provide teachers an opportunity for collaborative reflection, analysis, and action. Their Instructional Pacing Guide helps to AZ Common Core Standards assist in the development on instruction and ensuring that the standards are met. At the Griffin Foundation, Inc's schools our Data team, curriculum team, and school administrators use benchmark assessment results to plan and target specific program interventions to support student learning. Our Benchmark assessments are also used to monitor and evaluate learning by providing information on how well current programs, curriculum, or other resources are helping students achieve learning goals. Benchmark assessments help our administrators and educators make mid-course modifications if data show patterns where student performance is lagging or where students	III. Instructional Pacing Guide

are excelling. Benchmark assessment data is also used to highlight areas where a curriculum should be refined or supplemented. For example, benchmark assessment results can help a district or school evaluate the effectiveness of two different approaches to reading or math instruction. It can also serve as an early warning system for an instructional approach that is not meeting its goals. The districts and schools use our benchmark data assessments during Pre-test, Mid-test, and Post-test intervals to evaluate patterns and trends in school-by-school or teacher performance. Such data provide guidance for standardizing or adjusting curriculum and instruction across a district if there are substantial differences in performance.	
Adapted to Meet the Needs of Subgroups *(Address all relevant measures)*	
8. How is the assessment system adapted to meet the assessment needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to II. Our school Benchmark assessments using Galileo ATI system provides data to predict whether students, classes, schools and districts are on-course to meet specific year-end goals. That is, based on their current performance, are students likely to reach proficiency on the end of year state test or other annual assessments? Results that predict end of year performance can be disaggregated, or separated, at the individual student, sub-group, classroom, and school levels to identify who needs help such as the Bottom 25% non-proficient students. Results provide teachers and administrators	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Galileo ATI assessments: Aggregate Multi-Test Report And High or Moderate Risk Students (bottom 25%) II. AZ-Dash Reporting Services: Lower and Upper Results - Lower 30%

with information on how best to go about providing this help. The assessment data Information from Galileo ATI and AZ-DASH reporting services is useful data for teachers in providing specific instruction based on the needs of each student. Once struggling students are identified, steps are taken to provide additional support and resources, such as classroom intervention, differentiated instruction, tutoring, before or after school intervention, or pull-out reading services. Our school or district may use benchmark results to re-allocate resources including time, staff, professional development, technical assistance, and special interventions. On the other hand, benchmark assessment results also identify students or groups who are excelling and may benefit from a more advanced instructional program.	
9. How is the assessment system adapted to meet the assessment needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to III: Technical information regarding fairness and bias was provided by benchmark assessment developers (Galileo ATI and AZELLA assessment systems). This included demographics of the sample as well as assessment scores and other technical evidence for various subgroups (ELL, FRL, and SPED). Additionally, benchmark assessments should be examined prior to their use to ensure that the particular items will not be offensive to students. Guidelines for developing benchmark assessments that	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Galileo ATI assessments: Aggregate Multi-Test Report ELL Students II. AZELLA assessments and classifications III. ELL Reports: Arizona Department of Education, Common Log

are free from bias reflect the same steps outlined above: 1. Developers should be sensitive to the demographic characteristics of the students 2. Documentation describing the steps taken to minimize bias in the assessment items should be provided 3. Organizations should examine how well an item functions for specific subgroups 4. If particular subgroups perform differently, validity of those items for the subgroups should be investigated.	On
10. How is the assessment system adapted to meet the assessment needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. How Galileo ATI, AIMS, AZ-DASH, and AZMERIT assessment systems are used in the Griffin Foundation School District to incorporate instructional teaching methods into the classroom for Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL), English Language Learners (ELL), and Special Education (SPED) students . Assessment systems are used in: 1. Lesson Planning 2. Tutoring 3. Before and After School Intervention 4. Leveled Readers program 5. Accelerated Reading program 6. Small groups/Differentiated Instruction 7. Classroom discussions 8. Students engagement 9. Academic Performance Analysis	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Galileo ATI assessments: Aggregate Multi-Test Report And FRL students

10. Curriculum adoption/revision Our dedicated team of educators provides the highest quality service and support to eligible school communities under the Title I Guidelines. Eighty Seven percent (87%) of GFSD's students qualify for Free or Reduced Lunch under the National School Lunch Program. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) formerly No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is the largest federal assistance program in our nation's schools, although these funds are increasingly getting smaller and smaller. ESEA ensures that all children have significant opportunities to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on rigorous academic achievement standards. Title I Part A focuses on four components: 1. Holding states, districts, and schools accountable for the results of student learning 2. Using proven research-based strategies designed to facilitate school-wide reform and improvement 3. Collaborating with parents and communities to strengthen the school's ability to meet the needs of all students and improve the school, in addition to expanding parental options 4. Allowing states and districts greater control and flexibility in determining the most effective educational environment for their population Often, such as with our schools, Title 1 students lack the financial means to achieve success in the classroom. They don't have the basic supplies or necessities to	

survive, much less successfully attend school. They usually come from single parent homes, where mom or dad works multiple jobs to support the family. Or both parents work long hours to provide the basic necessities for the family to survive. This leaves the oldest child with the responsibility of acting as the parent, providing dinner, helping with homework and ensuring everyone gets to bed. Students struggle in these situations and face temptations since mom or dad is not around to supervise. It's easy for kids to fall in with the wrong crowd and become involved with gangs, drugs, sex and alcohol. Once a student becomes involved with one or more of these activities, the chance of that student dropping out of school becomes higher. These are not the only factors that influence dropout rates. Some students start skipping school because no one monitors their attendance. Others must help their family out financially by obtaining a job. Title 1 students face an upward struggle. It's not uncommon to find students who are homeless, hungry or have children of their own. Yet, it is a teacher's responsibility to meet their student's needs. At times this task can seem overwhelming to some teachers, but knowing your students and what is going on in their lives helps accomplish this task. Teachers focus lesson plans around Arizona established guidelines to prepare students for state assessment. It is essential teachers prepare creative, effective lesson plans that meet the needs of every student. These	

guidelines shouldn't inhibit the teacher. They should serve as a basis for the topics to be covered. As teachers begin to prepare lesson plans, they should consider a student's background knowledge. Often Title 1 students lack background knowledge to make connections between examples and their own lives. Teachers must work to build student's background knowledge, thus increasing their own experiences. FIMS and CRS Title 1 teachers create effective lesson plans; they connect/engage with their students and determine what is important to these students. A key to a successful intervention is consistency by both parents and teachers. During most interventions, a plan of action that meets student's needs is developed and agreed upon by all parties. If parents and teachers consistently enforce the plan of action, a student can be successful in turning things around. However, if there is not consistency by one party, the plan of action may not work. It is important to continuously support a student and encourage them to work hard to attain success. Finding ways to motivate Title 1 students can be a daunting task. Title 1 students face daily struggles just to survive. However, teachers must use student motivation techniques that help these students achieve success in the classroom. Every teacher faces the challenge of getting students to concentrate and work in the classroom. While some students enthusiastically walk into a classroom each day, others need motivation and inspiration to focus on school. Teachers in Title 1 schools encounter students facing life struggles many of us cannot even imagine. Encouraging these students to focus on school can be	

difficult, but it is necessary to overcome the challenge in order for students to academically achieve. The use of leveled readers in our school district was a great step forward in reading instruction for the classroom. No longer did students have to read just one whole class text that may have been above, below, or at their reading level. Teachers now have the ability to target groups of students, and give them texts that will provide the right challenge for their individual reading abilities. However, as with many various concepts, we sometimes forget how to get the best out of what we have. The following techniques are some of the best ways of our schools use leveled reads. The Accelerated Reading program, (often abbreviated as AR), is a motivational program that seeks to reward students for their reading and understanding of a given set of texts. With the AR system, books are given a points value according to length and difficulty of the book. Students look for books in their range to read and take a computer based comprehension quiz to show how well the understood it. The students earn points for the books and tests they take and can exchange these points for prizes that are chosen by the school.	
11. How is the assessment system adapted to meet the assessment needs of students with disabilities?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): The special education teacher's role at the Griffin Foundation School District is to ensure that our methods and strategies are modified to meet the students' special needs.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Galileo ATI assessments: Aggregate Multi-Test Report SPED students

I. It is the responsibility of the Special Education teacher to learn the strengths and weaknesses of their students using Galileo ATI assessment system, so he/she is able to develop effective lesson plans/IEP goals and services that enhance each child's learning experience. To use their best special education teaching methods to focus on individual achievement, individual progress and individual learning. It is a great challenge to focus their special education teaching methods on individual achievement, progress and learning. It entails specific, directed, intensive remedial instruction for individual students struggling because of their disabilities. For example, if you are teaching a child with learning disabilities, modifying the way you present information makes it easier for the child to learn. Books with larger print make it easier for a child to visually process the information. Adjusting the assigned amount of work that a child is able to accomplish without becoming tired needs to be considered. When the student completes the work in the given amount of time, she feels a sense of achievement, helping to improve their self-image and motivation. Types of Tests/assessments Used in Special Education • Developmental assessments • Screening tests • Individual intelligence tests • Individual academic achievement tests • Adaptive behavior scales • Behavior rating scales • Curriculum-based assessments	

• End-of-grade, end-of-course, and alternate assessments Individual Academic Achievement Tests: Most students in special education, and those referred for special education consideration, will be weak in one or more academic areas. In order to determine most precisely which academic areas are of concern, a psychologist or educational evaluator will administer at least one broad ranging, multiple-skill academic achievement test to the child. The results of the test will tell how the child stands in key academic skills such as reading, written expression, mathematics, general information, and specific school subjects. Traditionally, professionals have used norm-referenced academic achievement tests for formal evaluations to help determine a student's special education eligibility, placement, and IEP goals. These tests will also be useful for documenting the academic progress of students over a long period of time. Curriculum-Based Assessment: A school psychologist or teacher can use the norm-referenced tests we have discussed thus far for documenting a student's status at a particular time, but these tests have drawbacks. They are commercially produced and therefore costly, they sample a student's ability across an array of skills but do not hone in on more specific skills, and they report the student's status in comparison to others when often it is more important to know how a student's skills are developing in a relatively brief period of time. For these reasons, teachers often use curriculum-based assessments. These types of assessments are often made by the teacher to determine the student's skill level in specific curriculum areas at a certain point in time. For	

example, if a student has an IEP goal to learn to read on the fifth-grade level, the teacher is not likely to regularly administer a standardized reading test to see if the goal is being achieved. Instead, the teacher might ask the student to read aloud two or three times a week from a fifth-grade reader and answer comprehension questions about the material. At each session, the teacher would record and chart the number of words read correctly, the number misread, and the number of comprehension questions answered. By using this form of curriculum-based assessment, the teacher could determine if the student was making progress toward the goal.	

Area IV: Monitoring Instruction

Monitoring the Integration of Standards	
1. What is the Charter Holder's process for monitoring the integration of standards into classroom instruction? How does the Charter Holder monitor whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to V. Administrators at both schools, Future Investment Middle School and Children Reaching for the Sky Elementary School conduct progress monitoring on classroom teachers to evaluate integration of the Arizona State Common Core Standards in relationship to classroom instruction. In addition, Administrators monitor whether or not content teachers implement aligned curriculum with fidelity. Lesson Plans are submitted each Monday before the start of school. These lesson plans are reviewed and feedback provided to teachers. Teachers are also required to develop a Standards Pacing Guides. As well as, follow a Curriculum Mapping Guide.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Lesson Plans II. Lesson Plan Review Checklist III. AZ Common Core Standards IV. Classroom Observations V. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD'S Meeting/Agenda Template

In order from GFSD to meet the higher expectations of current standards-based systems, educators need information that can be used to project how students are doing against the grade-level standards throughout the course of the year; so administrators and faculty can determine what needs to be done to accelerate student progress toward the proficiency standards. Four general categories are listed as benefits and uses of progress monitoring methods and formative data sources: (1) Curriculum-Based Measurement; (2) Classroom assessments (system or teacher-developed); (3) Adaptive assessments; and (4) Large-scale assessments used during the year to monitor growth of individual students and groups of students. We conclude the paper with several recommendations for practice: • Use multiple measures for progress monitoring. • Commit necessary resources to build skills and knowledge of all staff on how progress monitoring is used for improvement. • Find and use available resources. • Specifically articulate and address as a community the contextual issues of standards-based systems. • Apply universal design for learning principles to the design of progress	

monitoring techniques to ensure that individual learner differences are considered from the start. • Be prepared to have an open discussion of whether the benefit of a comprehensive progress monitoring improvement process is sufficiently large to offset the additional time or cost required for implementation, and enlist the partnership of practitioners who have had success. Presently, our schools have conducted and/or scheduled 6 days of Singapore Mathematics training for our teachers. This includes workshops, classroom materials, Classroom coaching, and training materials. To include direct classroom training and feedback by a trained consultant.	
2. How does the Charter Holder monitor the effectiveness of standards-based instruction throughout the year?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to II. GFSD's teachers are required each year to review and print a copy of the current Arizona Common Core Standards and use these standards to develop and implement their classroom lesson plans. The standards and lesson plans are required to be kept on their desk for daily review. IV. to V. The Administrators conduct	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Lesson Plans II. Lesson Plan Review Checklist III. AZ Common Core Standards IV. Classroom Observations

periodical classroom observations and evaluations to evaluate teaching skills, student's engagement, and other checklist requirements to ensure that each teacher has their lesson plans, classroom/Instructional instruction master schedule, and a copy of the state standards on their desk for reference. Lesson Plans are completed online using Task Stream software and can be reviewed by administrators in real time online. AZ Common Core Standards are listed as reference in the system. Students' grades and records are maintained on School Master and Grade Book software, and connected to AZ-Dash Reporting Services and STCC. Standards-based instruction in any content area is designed to help establish what students should learn at each grade level. Standards are more than curriculum frameworks, however. They stipulate the skills, concepts, and knowledge that are achievable. They should be used, in turn, to build criterion for assessments and establish goals for learning. Additionally, standards provide educational communities in Arizona with expected outcomes. To successfully integrate a standards-based approach, teachers need to: 1. Understand the rationale for using standards as a basis for instruction.	V. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD'S Meeting/Agenda Template

2. Know the Arizona Common Core Standards, level, and plan to incorporate them into the instructional plan for the year.	
Evaluating Instructional Practices	
3. What is the Charter Holder's process for evaluating instructional practices? How does this process evaluate the quality of instruction?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to V. Our teachers are given formal and informal observations and classroom visits by administrators. Administrators conduct one to two formal teacher evaluations per year. In addition, informal classroom observations are done on teachers in their classroom. Students' data is reviewed to monitor their academic growth under the instruction of their classroom teacher and is used in Teacher Performance Evaluations. In addition, lesson plans are reviewed and checked weekly. V. to VIII. Teachers are trained on the 3rd Wednesday of each monthly by our Computer Technology Instructor during our scheduled Professional Development (PD) on Galileo Assessment (ATI), AZ-Dash, AIMS/AMERIT assessments, and Data Review/Analysis.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Classroom Observations II. Teacher Evaluations III. Lesson Plans IV. Lesson Plan Review Checklists V. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD'S Meeting/Agenda Template

Each Benchmark assessment period (Pre-Test, Mid-Test, and Post-Test), teachers conduct analysis of students/classroom data by completing the Analysis of Student/Classroom Data form and the Student Learning Objective (SLO) and the Baseline Learning Objective (BLO): Baseline and Trend Data Report. These reports are used by educators to direct instruction, intervention programs, differentiated Instruction, extra homework support to assist parents with students below grade level, and develop lesson plans. The BLO reports are submitted to administrator monthly to monitor teachers' classroom instruction progress. This data is also reviewed by the CID team and administrators. Good benchmark assessments are one component of a quality comprehensive assessment system. A comprehensive system should be coherent and provide a continuous stream of information to guide and improve student learning. For benchmark assessments to function well in an assessment system, they must be purposively designed or selected and used to serve specific purposes. Educators and policy-makers must understand in advance the intended purpose(s) of benchmark assessments, and more importantly, what these assessments can and cannot do. The multiple purposes are addressed below:	VI. Analysis of Student/Classroom Data VII. SLO Scoring Template and Sample VIII. Student Learning Objective (SLO) Template: Baseline Learning Objectives: Baseline and Trend Data Report Sample

• First, for benchmark assessments to communicate expectations for learning, they must be carefully selected and designed to reflect the kind of learning that matters to all stakeholders. • Second, for benchmark assessments to be used to plan and improve instruction, they must be closely aligned with the curriculum. Further, to guide instruction effectively, they must generate results on a timely basis, with adequate professional development and resources dedicated to understanding the data and how to support student learning. • Third, if benchmark assessments are used to monitor and evaluate schools, instructional programs, or teaching approaches, they need to be selected or designed to reflect the instructional practices and strategies in use for results to be helpful. • Fourth, for benchmark assessments to serve predictive purposes they must be closely aligned with learning goals. Provide timely information to help guide the allocation of resources (time, materials, personnel and programs) to support students who need additional assistance and those students who may benefit from extended learning opportunities. • Finally, careful consideration of the	

technical quality of benchmark assessments is critical if the data are to provide valid, reliable information that is free from bias to ensure the quality of instruction.	
4. How does this process identify individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to V. The GFSD has carefully build time into their calendars to make effective use of benchmark data to enhance the quality of data driven instruction and to assist classroom teachers to work with the needs of each student. During Classroom observations and teachers' performance evaluations, administrators also use this opportunity to use this process to identify individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs for the classroom teacher and the students. As well as providing feedback to teachers to improve classroom instruction and student enhancement. VI. to IX. The district and schools also use benchmark data to evaluate patterns and trends in school-by-school or teacher performance. Such data provide guidance for standardizing or adjusting curriculum and	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Classroom Observations II. Professional Development/faculty meetings III. Teacher Evaluations IV. Lesson Plans V. Lesson Plan Review Checklist VI. Analysis of Student/Classroom Data

instruction across the district if there are substantial differences in performance. Each Benchmark assessment period (Pre-Test, Mid-Test, and Post-Test), teachers conduct analysis of students/classroom data by completing the Analysis of Student/Classroom Data form and the Student Learning Objective (SLO) and the Baseline Learning Objective (BLO): Baseline and Trend Data Report. These reports are used by educators to direct instruction, intervention programs, differentiated Instruction, extra homework support to assist parents with students below grade level, and develop lesson plans. The BLO reports are submitted to administrator monthly to monitor teachers' classroom instruction progress. This data is also reviewed by the CID team and administrators. In addition, curriculum input information is given to our Curriculum Team based on classroom observation conducted by administrators. The team ensures that effective resources are in place to enable students to meet the objectives required by AZ Common Core Standards. Consider the following needs for learning in the classroom: • Data users, including assessment and content experts, need time to adequately analyze the data in ways	VII. SLO Scoring Template and Sample VIII. Student Learning Objective (SLO) Template: Baseline Learning Objectives: Baseline and Trend Data Report Sample IX. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD'S Meeting/Agenda Template

that are both meaningful to their context and robust in terms of the analyses. • Planned time to adequately interpret the data if they are to make productive use of benchmark assessment data and plan appropriate next steps. • Provided teachers with needed time for instructional planning to address skills and concepts identified on the assessment as requiring additional work and attention. Time is also needed to plan appropriate responses to benchmark assessment results, including intervention to address the needs of the bottom 25%.	
Providing Analysis and Feedback to Further Develop Instructional Quality	
5. How does the Charter Holder provide feedback on strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs based on the evaluation of instructional practices?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to V. As the Charter Holder, our schools provide feedback based on the evaluation of instructional practices, teaching skills, and classroom engagement through nourishment by the Superintendent and Principal to build trust by supporting their teachers' development and by providing feedback that helps teachers to improve. This is more likely to occur when administrators exercise the collegiality of leadership.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Classroom Observations II. Professional Development/faculty meetings

Administrators/Principals are in the best position to help teachers improve in areas of weakness and can accomplish this through observations and dialogue that shows respect for teachers as professionals (Cooper, Ehrensal, & Bromme, 2005). It is important to evaluate the quality of teaching in order to select and retain good teachers. Our Superintendent and Principal each has over 20 years of educational experience that help our district to build the intellectual structure that is necessary to make good curriculum choices, establish expectations for student work, and provide teachers with opportunities to learn the specifics of teaching well within the academic areas. As administrators, we monitor how the curriculum is taught and participate in how it is developed. The knowledge that we've gained through this process can ensure that teachers understand the curriculum and have access to all the necessary tools and resources. We are confident in our ability not only to assess the quality and effectiveness of teachers but also to take the necessary actions when instruction is weak. Effective principals possess knowledge of	III. Teacher Evaluations IV. Lesson Plans V. Lesson Plan Review Checklist

the curriculum and good instructional practices (Cotton, 2003) and, subsequently, focus their attention in their schools on curriculum and instruction (Mazzeo, 2003). Effective principals monitor the implementation of curriculum standards and make sure they are taught (Schmoker, 2006). We support our teachers' effectiveness through observations and conversations. We also spend time in classrooms in order to effectively monitor and encourage curriculum implementation and quality instructional practices. We conduct Teachers Evaluations yearly. We have trust in our teachers to implement instruction effectively, but we still monitor instruction with frequent classroom visits to verify the results.	

6. How does the Charter Holder analyze this information? What does the data about quality of instruction tell the Charter Holder? What has the Charter Holder done in response?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to III. The Griffin Foundation, Inc. as the Charter Holder analyzes data by using various assessment software systems, mostly AIMS/AZMERIT and Galileo (ATI). Most of us are accustomed to getting information about academic results in the form of a score. Whether it's reported as a number or a letter grade, it tells us basically the same thing—how well students have learned certain subject matter or skills at one point in time. However, a score does not typically tell us how far students grew academically to produce that number or grade. We don't know if the score reflects relatively normal progress, if it represents a huge leap forward, or even if students lost ground. This poses a real question for policymakers because of the challenges to our present definition of achievement for school accountability purposes. Since the 1990s, education policy has been mostly focused on results as defined by state academic standards, which all students are expected to	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Professional Development/faculty meetings II. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD'S Meeting/Agenda Template III. Classroom/Content Teacher data review GFSD'S Meeting/Agenda Template2

meet. These standards are the tracks on which school accountability runs. Students are tested on the material described by state standards and schools are held accountable for whether or not students meet those standards. But growth models will shift accountability to include measures for how much progress students make, not *just* whether they meet state standards. Most states had some form of standards-based accountability in place when NCLB was signed into law in 2002. However, NCLB took accountability to a new level by requiring schools to meet specific targets each year—called "Adequate Yearly Progress," or AYP—with all groups of students. AYP targets are based on a status model of achievement, meaning that schools are evaluated on the achievement status of their students, in this case the percent of students scoring at or above a "proficient" level of achievement. Each state establishes AYP targets that must culminate at one hundred percent student proficiency in the year 2014; now, this date is been moved to 2017. The Griffin Foundation, Inc's data shows that FIMS and CRS students showed growth in Math and Reading, but it still failed to meet the required level of achievement established by the State in Math. After analyzing the data, we implemented new Math curriculum for both schools (Singapore	

Math), and provided teachers with 4 days of Math training and 2 days of in the classroom follow-up training; in addition to before and after school Math intervention; we implemented a FIMS Math pull-out tutoring program. As well as a reading pull-out program for CRS students. However, many educators argue that a status criterion alone is an unfair way to measure school effectiveness, particularly for high-poverty urban and rural schools that receive a large proportion of students who enter school already behind their peers who have greater home and community advantages. Under current law, schools can be labeled "in need of improvement" for failing to meet the state's AYP target, even if they produced more sizable gains with their students than more affluent schools. Many educators and an increasing number of policymakers believe that these schools should still be recognized for effecting significant student growth. California's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Jack O'Connell, echoed the sentiments of many educators when he said that "The growth model is a much more accurate portrayal of a school's performance" (Wallis/Steptoe 07). In the current NCLB environment calls for growth models have largely centered on using them for high-stakes school accountability purposes, but some growth	

models, especially value-added models, can also be used to evaluate teacher or program effectiveness and as a tool for school improvement. Most researchers agree that these statistical tools present a more complete picture of school performance. However, they disagree over how precisely various growth models measure student growth and what role they should play in accountability. GFSD's Data sources inform and guide action for the administrators. Without meaningful data it is impossible to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of school initiatives. In addition, Content Teachers review and analyze their students' data to enhance classroom instruction and identify students' needs. FIMS's and CRS's principals skillfully gather information that determines how well our schools' organization is meeting goals and use this information to refine strategies designed to meet or extend the goals. Thus, we find ourselves in a constant state of analysis, reflection, and refinement. We also challenge our staff to reexamine assumptions about their work and how it can be performed. Beyond the ability to successfully gather and analyze school data, our principals posses basic skills for using this data for setting	

directions, developing people, and reinventing the organization. Our administration, faculty, Data teams, and Instruction/Curriculum teams gather Information to diagnose student learning and evaluate teachers' performance, in addition, to prescribe interventions that will best support students in need. At the building level it is vital that principals employ data-gathering processes to determine staff and student needs. The demands that accompany high-stakes testing compel our principals to guide the district to learn from their results and experiences. Doing so will lead to coherence within a school and offer better opportunities to sustain results. Useful and properly mined data can inform staff about the gaps between desired outcomes and the reality of the results. Furthermore, this knowledge should result in changes in practice. Encouraging staff to collect, analyze, and determine appropriate actions based upon the results should be a collective enterprise. When staff members assume an active role in the data analysis process, it promotes solutions and actions for improving results (Zmuda et al., 04).	

Adapted to Meet the Needs of Subgroups*(Address all relevant measures)*	
7. How does the Charter Holder monitor instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to VII. Our various teams and GFSD administration use the data from AIMS/AZMERIT, Galileo ATI, and AZ-DASH board to monitor the bottom 25%, non-proficient students. After review and analyses, students identified in the bottom 25% non-proficient are placed in before or after school intervention and/or Math tutoring, Reading pull-out program, or classroom support group. In addition, Galileo assessment software allows the schools (CRS and FIMS) to assess students on classroom instruction knowledge/standards. This process and classroom data help teachers to plan weekly lessons, re-visit/re-teach lessons, assign intervention, and/or provide differentiated instruction to assist each student. Files are maintained on intervention students identified in the bottom 25% with progress monitoring and goals.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Classroom Observations II. Professional Development/faculty meetings III. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD'S Meeting/Agenda Template IV. AZ-Dash Reporting Services V. Galileo Assessment (ATI) Reports VI. Galileo Test Building Design Assessment VII. Classroom intervention student growth file

8. How does the Charter Holder monitor instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to VIII. Our schools' focus is on achieving high levels of ELL proficiency, and some of our characteristics are typically found in generally high-achieving schools: School-wide focus on English language development and ELL achievement. - This includes an emphasis on data-driven instruction and classroom monitoring and observation by administrators (data driven instructions: AZELLA, Galileo ATI, Evaluation, and Observation). Well-trained staff able to address the unique needs of ELL students. - Staff is supported by sustained, job embedded professional development. Consistent, ongoing language support services across all grade levels. - ELL students with consistent exposure to a coherent program do better than ELL students who are exposed to too many different approaches. Meaningful curriculum aligned with state	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Classroom Observations II. Professional Development/faculty meetings III. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD'S Meeting/Agenda Template IV. AZ-Dash Reporting Services V. Galileo Assessment (ATI) Reports VI. Galileo Test Building Design Assessment VII. Classroom intervention student growth file VIII. AZELLA assessment

standards and assessments. - Effective curriculum incorporates higher order thinking and is grounded in sound theory and best practices. The Griffin Foundation, Inc. continues to monitor ELL's progress even after they have been reclassified as English proficient. The methods currently used to classify and place ELLs may result in some students' are being pulled out of English language support programs too soon. To help these students get back on track, GFSD's monitors the academic progress of our ELLs who exit language support programs and we provide extra help when needed. Helping individual ELLs master academic language is a complex, long-term process, not an event or a program with a clear end date. Teachers need to be aware of these misconceptions and realize that quick and easy solutions are not appropriate for complex problems. Second language learning by school-aged children takes longer, is harder, and involves more effort than many teachers realize". Our district supports both teachers and students in this endeavor by making sure teachers are well prepared, adopting programs that provide sustained and coherent instruction across grade levels, and fostering continuous school improvement	

with a focus on student learning. If an ELL student is determined to be ready to exit the ELL Program, he/she will be considered FLEP (Former Limited English Proficient) and placed on Monitor Status for two full years. Monitoring is especially important at all levels, (elementary, middle and high school) for FLEP students in order to evaluate progress and achievement after ELL services.	
9. How does the Charter Holder monitor instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to V. The AZ Common Core Standards provide clear expectations for instruction, assessment, and student work that will assist teachers in teacher/student engagement and support administrators with monitoring and evaluations. . They define the level of work that demonstrates achievement of the standards, enabling GFSD's teacher to know "how good is good enough." The performance standards isolate and identify the skills needed to use the knowledge and skills to problem-solve reason, communicate, and make connections with other information. These standards also tell the teacher how	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Classroom Observations II. Professional Development/faculty meetings III. Curriculum/Instruction/data team GFSD'S Meeting/Agenda Template IV. AZ-Dash Reporting Services V. Galileo Assessment (ATI) Reports VI. Galileo Test Building Design Assessment VII. Classroom intervention student growth file

to assess the extent to which the student knows the material or can manipulate and apply the information. Our schools have many resources to help students prepare for standardized tests (Galileo, Test Building Design, Star Math, Star Reading, etc.). Math Tutoring is tutoring pull-out program and academic enrichment services offered to failing or underperforming students/bottom 30% to increase academic achievement. VI. to VII. The School Intervention Program (SIP) is designed to serve students who are at risk of not reaching or maintaining academic grade level. Teachers maintain a student's intervention file on the student's progress/growth. The purpose of the School Intervention Program is to provide additional instructional resources to help students who are performing below grade level obtain the necessary academic skills to reach grade level performance in the shortest possible time Response to Intervention (RTI) is a learning process that matches general education classroom instruction to each student's learning needs. In other words, educators respond to a student's academic and/or behavior challenge with	

the right amount of intensity in classroom learning supports.	
10. How does the Charter Holder monitor instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with disabilities?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to IV. Besides classroom evaluations, monitoring, and observations by administrators to improve classroom instruction; we allow our teachers to work collaboratively. In a collaborative model the general education and special education teacher each bring their skills, training, and perspectives to the team/PD meetings. Resources are combined to strengthen teaching and learning opportunities, methods, and effectiveness for Special Education Students. Typically the primary responsibility of general education/SPED teachers is to use their skills to instruct students in curricula dictated by the school system. Whereas the primary responsibility of special education teachers is to provide instruction by adapting and developing materials to match the learning styles, strengths, and special needs of each of their students. In special education situations, individual learners' needs often	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process I. Classroom Observations II. Professional Development/faculty meetings III. IEPs/goals setting/special education services IV. Curriculum/Instruction/Data team

dictate the curricula. V. to VI. General educators bring content specialization, special education teachers bring assessment and adaptation specializations. Both bring training and experience in teaching techniques and learning processes. Their collaborative goal is that all students in their class are provided with appropriate classroom and homework assignments so that each is learning, is challenged, and is participating in the classroom process. Galileo ATI and Test Building Design Assessment allow all teachers to assess SPED students to grade level work and curriculum taught, prior to the scheduled assessment. At GFSD, collaboration involves commitment by the teachers who will be working together, by their school administrators, by the school system, and by the community. It involves time, support, resources, monitoring, and, above all, persistence. However, the biggest issue is time--time for planning, time for development, and time for evaluating. Planning at the district helps ensure that all resources will be available, including time, money, and professional assistance. District-level planning will take into consideration the effect change in one place will have on other settings. Building-level planning will assist the teams in being sure adequate support is in	V. Galileo Assessment (ATI) VI. Galileo Test Building Design Assessment

place to sustain new initiatives. Our Superintendent/Assistant Principal plays an extremely important leadership role in facilitating collaborative efforts by instructional personnel.	

Area V: Professional Development

Professional Development System	
1. What is the Charter Holder's professional development plan?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:
I. to IV. The Griffin Foundation School District's Professional development activities take many forms in our schools and draw on knowledge, skills, perspectives, talents, and contributions of K-8 educators, both locally and nationally. Professional development focuses on the knowledge and skill our Curriculum/Instruction/Data Team needs to create high levels of learning for all students. The district's Professional Development office will ensure opportunities that provide appropriate professional growth for its employees. Employees provide feedback during PD trainings using our district training survey, and provide additional comments during PD meetings. Annual district surveys are completed by all employees (teachers, support staff, and administration, including students and parents). A Professional Development Plan is also a part of our Continuous Improvement Plan in ALEAT as	I. Professional Development/faculty meetings II. Professional Development Sign-in sheet III. PD/workshop training survey IV. Employees/parents/students annual survey

part of our Title I requirements. VISION STATEMENT The vision of GFSD Professional Development Plan is that all employees will be offered and engage in continuous professional growth opportunities that enable them to improve their ability and skills in education services or support services. MISSION STATEMENT The mission of the Professional Development Program at Griffin Foundation School District is to improve student learning by supporting professional development activities that are closely related to the work of teaching and the process of learning. Based on research studies, professional opportunities will be provided to all employees that positively impact student achievement, and enhance the skills needed to successfully perform their responsibilities. We believe all employees: engage in the endeavor of student learning, can improve their knowledge base, performance skill level, and their commitment to the profession, must be life-long learners, must be made to provide effective support that offers learning opportunities, should engage in professional development that is sustained, intensive, continuous, and job	

embedded, and use self-assessment and reflection as an integral part of professional growth and improvement. Professional development at GFSD has three structures that guide and inform activities. The first of these is the overreaching district plan, which currently consists of 4 long-range goals for professional development: 1. use data-based decision making, 2. design and implement student-involved classroom assessments, 3. develop and implement standards-based and technology infused curriculum, and 4. implement diverse education for all students. Responsibilities of the Professional Development office: Design a high quality, continual professional development program which is responsible to participant needs and focused on student achievement and education improvement; develop procedures for the submission of professional growth proposals; review proposals for appropriateness and quality; recommend the most effective professional growth opportunities; develop a yearly calendar for professional development; maintain a plan for continued professional development based on the focus of the district. As well as, oversee the implementation of the professional development program; communicate the program's purpose and procedures; develop	

a method to inform staff of professional development opportunities; assist with planning and designing activities that meet the needs of the district's employees; and monitor the funding available for professional development.	
2. How was the professional development plan developed?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to VI. The Griffin Foundation School District uses several concepts in its Professional Development Plan that includes SMART goals and W4RS goals as a template. These are templates that are widely used when creating professional development plans for teachers. The plan was developed by administrators and our CID team. Here is a shorthand way of identifying the key factors that must be present if any training is to be successful: • W - Why? • W - Who? • W - When? • R - Resources? • S - Success? • Specific? • Measurable?	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP): Located in ALEAT II. Professional Development/Workshop Survey III. Employees/parents/students survey IV. Galileo (ATI) Assessment Reports V. Classroom observation VI. Teacher's Evaluation

• Attainable? • Realistic? • Timeframe? To develop our Action Plan, we used the SMART and W4RS model by ensuring all of our goals and action steps are Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and within a specific Timeframe, and answered the W4RS goals. Notice the question marks after each word. If we can't answer these questions clearly there is every chance the plan we're considering this goal and will not succeed. What? Is the first part of the plan because it focuses on the precise action step that a teacher will take to improve their professional competence? This might be directly related to subject knowledge: for example a teacher may decide to study for a higher degree, such as a Master's degree in their subject area. The specific individual may focus on developing a particular pedagogical skill that is directly related to their subject: for example, a teacher may want to develop their expertise in teaching literacy or working with learners with special needs such as, for example, ADHD or autism. The 'What?' may focus on developing or	

expanding classroom strategies and techniques rather than subject – specific knowledge or student-needs skills: for example, teachers may want help with behavior management techniques or could have as their focus being able to use digital technology more effectively in the classroom? The Why? of professional development plans for teachers used to be overlooked in the old days – schools and other authorities were often quite indulgent and assumed that any training was good for teachers, particularly if that training was initiated by the teacher. With today's budgets cuts in education and from the State legislators, school districts regime and culture are much more hard-nosed: not only are funds tight so training has to show value for money but the advantages for teachers and the schools employing them have to be completely transparent. If you can't say why you think this training is important to you, you won't be able to do it. An old saying is; when saying yes or no to requests from teachers for training, 'No why, no way.' Who? Lists all the people involved in delivering the training. As well as the	

individual teacher concerned, it's useful to be able to identify the other players. So it may be that the training is delivered by an outside expert or it may take the form of a peer group, possibly from different schools, working together on a development program which may be supervised by a university professor. This kind of on-going collaboration among fellow professionals is becoming more and more popular because the 'cross pollination' of ideas is usually well received by teachers – we like to learn from each other – and also because these kinds of plans seem to make it easier to embed new practices widely across the school. When? Makes clear the timescale of the training, not only the dates of specific training sessions but also the period of time the training might take. So, for example, a training initiative might take place over a whole school year or it may be limited to a much shorter time period or even a single one-off event. In addition, a successful professional development plans for teachers is the R which stands for Resources. This part of the plan contains information about all the resources needed to enable the planned professional development activities	

to take place. These resources might include the cost of hiring experts to deliver targeted training in the form of lectures or seminars. The resources might be channeled into enabling a group of teachers to meet regularly over the course of a school year to share ideas. Sometimes resources might be provided for an individual teacher to undertake further academic or professional training that leads to a higher degree qualification, and as such might represent a lot of money as this type of professional development activity for teachers does not come cheap. One key factor when considering resources is the cost of the time involved to complete the training. For example, if teachers need to be away from the classroom on several different occasions their classes will need to be covered by a substitute teacher. There will be costs involved in hiring a substitute teacher. The final part of the successful professional development for teachers is, along with the 'Why', the most important. This final dimension of the plan is Success, as well as, making the goals SMART.	
3. How is the professional development plan aligned with instructional staff learning needs?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Continuous Improvement Plan

I. to V. Based on survey results completed annually by our employees, analysis of student data, and perceived educational needs of the District, the Professional Development office offers the following topics that will guide the district's selection for professional development activities during this 3 year period and the plan is aligned with instructional staff learning needs: 1. Demonstrate high expectations for student learning 2. Use of student assessment and data to guide instruction and evaluations 3. Implement Arizona Curriculum Standards and Common Core Standards to classroom instruction 4. Eliminate the achievement gap of subgroups 5. Provide appropriate, researched-based interventions for all learners through Response to Intervention (RTI) 6. Use Professional Learning Communities as the foundation for enhanced instruction	(CIP): Located in ALEAT II. Professional Development/Workshop Survey III. Employees/parents/students survey IV. Classroom observation V. Curriculum/Instruction/Data team: GFSD's Agenda/Meeting

7. Continue development of Diverse Education for All 8. Using technology as an educational tool 9. Providing a safe, orderly, and positive school environment 10. Students and teachers are given an academic achievement goal and timeframe before the next scheduled review.	
4. How does this professional development plan address areas of high importance?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to IV. The Griffin Foundation Schools, FIMS/CRS focus on and address professional development areas using such sources as CIP, PD surveys, Employees, parents, students, and CID team and assessments to indentify high importance Professional Development goals: GOALS OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN : The desired goals of our Professional Development Plan include the following: Improve ability to analyze and interpret student performance data, and implement intervention strategies and differentiated	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP): Located in ALEAT II. Professional Development/Workshop Survey III. Employees/parents/students survey IV. Galileo (ATI) Assessment Reports

instruction. Understand and implement the Arizona Curriculum Standards and Arizona Common Core Standards. Increase knowledge and skills of a diverse education for all into the curriculum Participate in professional development opportunities in areas that are specific to the employee's job description. Although there are many elements of professional development, the yearly school calendar indicates specific days established for professional development. Some of those days are designated for site level planning, while others are the responsibility of the district's Professional Development office. An individual's request for participation at an additional professional development activity requires the submission of a form identifying the activity, requests funding, and a leave request if needed. Educators seeking additional professional development opportunities are encouraged to seek assistance from the District's or Site's Professional Development office, or the site administration. License renewal credit can be offered for most professional development activities. In many cases, participants at an off-site	

conference may be requested to share the knowledge gained with his/her peers. Thus, a trainer-of trainer's model promotes the implementation of best practices as appropriate. At the completion of all professional development opportunities, evaluations may be conducted to monitor the success and efficiency of each opportunity. At the completion of all professional development opportunities (in-house offerings and off site workshops) evaluations will be conducted to monitor the success and efficiency of each opportunity.	
Supporting High Quality Implementation	
5. How does the Charter Holder support high quality implementation of the strategies learned in professional development sessions?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to IV. In general, implementation of strategies learned in PD sessions/workshops is the job of the PD office. As well as teachers, we believe in teachers sharing their training experiences and knowledge gained with co-workers and other educators during Professional Development (PD) time	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Classroom observation II. Curriculum/Instruction/Data team: GFSD's Agenda/Meeting

scheduled every Wednesday for two and half hours. To include feedback from teachers informing administration and teachers how he/she has implemented skills or resources acquired during training. We support high quality implementation when we have the interest of our faculty and staff. A Survey is issued to participants at each PD workshop. With the support of our employees, we move forward with implementation. Administrators at the school will use an already-scheduled faculty meeting or schedule a special one to have teachers meet in departments/ grade levels to share and discuss how the workshops they attended on PD can be implemented or used at the school level. PD workshops will have their individual in-service follow-up plan completed on the day of the workshop and turned in to the provider at that time. Follow-up for most workshops on PD will not entail additional in-service points, unless the Site In-service Representative plans formalized follow-up sessions with in-service procedures at FIMS and/or CRS. Information meetings – designed to help target groups do a better job, but not designed to be implemented with students in a classroom. Classroom implementation training, content, methods, or specialized training designed to be implemented in the	III. PD surveys IV. Teachers training Teachers

classroom by teachers. For classroom implementation training, student data must be collected and reported after the date of the workshop and during or after implementation in the classroom by teachers. Monitoring PD strategies implemented in the classroom is conducted through yearly classroom observations from administrators.	
6. How does the Charter Holder provide the resources that are necessary for high quality implementation?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): The first step of GFSD is to create a vision and definition of professional development for learning: 1. Establish a common understanding of the professional development program's content and results. 2. Solve time, logistics, and sequencing issues. 3. Design and implement professional development tasks and activities that align to school and district goals.	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:

4. Measure your progress and reflect on individual and group improvement. 5. Evaluate the impact of professional development and sharing your success. 6. Determine the cost and resources needed to implement strategies school-wide and/or district-wide. 7. Next, the budget is approved by the Superintendent and submitted to the business office for processing, and once resources have arrived, training is conducted if necessary and resources distributed to the classrooms. I. to II. Because the needs of our schools and district are unique, this is the ideal process for developing a customized plan that leads to a successful and effective professional development program. When resources are identified as necessary for the improvement of Professional Development, the request is submitted to the Business Office for review and approval by an administrator and processing by the Business Office.	I. Curriculum/Instruction/Data team: GFSD's meetings II. Business Office and district admin. office (ie. Invoices of resources, training and Math textbooks)
Monitoring Implementation	
7. How does the Charter Holder monitor the implementation of the strategies learned in professional development sessions?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:

I. to V. The Griffin Foundation has learned that developing an effective strategic plan is only "half the battle." Getting it implemented is the other, and generally the tougher, half; and an important part of strategy implementation is monitoring – taking a periodic look at "how it's going." Monitoring is conducted in many forms, classroom observations, Teacher's evaluations, Teachers training Teachers presentations, and review of classroom assessments and classroom performance. First, monitoring our implementation of the strategic plan learned in professional development sessions is important for a number of reasons. First, it helps to assure that our efforts are to conform to the plan. That we actually perform the action steps intended. That we are "on track." Second, We have to be sure that the results achieved align with our mission, goals, plans, or objectives. That we accomplished what is intended to accomplish. Monitoring helps here too. Also, monitoring allows for corrective action. For making the necessary changes along the way. To "fine tune," not only our strategies, but our plan, as well. And since monitoring is part of a control process, it encourages improved	I. Classroom observation II. Teacher's Evaluation III. Curriculum/Instruction/Data team: GFSD's Agenda/Meeting IV. Lesson Plans V. Lesson Plans Review Checklist

performance. Knowing they'll be measured stimulates employees to do a better job. Finally, and most importantly, monitoring provides the essential link between the written plan and the day-to-day operation of our schools. It demonstrates to all that "we really are managing our schools according to our plan". Monitoring the plan makes our entire planning effort a tangible reality rather than a once-a-year academic exercise Monitoring and controlling the plan includes a periodic look to see if we are on course. It also includes consideration of options to get a strategy once derailed back on track. Just as a teacher has to create conditions that support and encourage student success, school districts have to support teachers' professional development opportunities. Today, professional development runs the gamut from one-shot workshops to more intensive job-embedded professional development, which has teachers learn in the day-to-day environment in which they work rather than getting pulled out to attend an outside training. Professional development for teachers can fall short in numerous ways, including: Too many (and sometimes conflicting) goals and priorities competing for teachers' time,	

energy, and attention. Unrealistic expectations of how much time it will take schools and teachers to adopt and implement goals. Professional development training events that is inappropriate in size, scope, or structure to support learning new ideas or skills. Gathering 100 teachers into one room for a training event will never give them the time they need to reflect on the material, ask questions, listen to their peers, or go through activities to enhance their comprehension. Lack of support for teachers' implementation of new instructional practices. Sometime there may be an implementation gap in teachers' professional development. They may learn, understand, and agree with a new idea or technique presented in a workshop, but it's hard for them to implement that idea without ongoing support. Failure to provide teachers with feedback about how implementing new skills, instruction, and/or curriculum impact student learning. A significant benefit of the monitoring process is that it serves as an "early warning system." It gives us the opportunity to communicate how we are doing. Where the	

problems and opportunities lie. And what's changed.	
8. How does the Charter Holder monitor and follow-up with instructional staff to support and develop implementation of the strategies learned in professional development?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to VI. The Griffin Foundation School District has various methods of follow-up that may be any of the following, depending on the type of in-service activity and instructor preference: Structured Coaching/Mentoring (may include direct observation, conferencing, or lesson demonstration – the coach or mentor uses a printed document - Observation Checklist or lesson plan - and this instrument is turned in to the in-service provider as evidence of follow up and as evaluation for the training). Action Research related to training (may be the Action Research Project tied to their Professional Development Plan – the teacher writes a SMART objective, teaches to it, and measures student achievement, providing the report to the in-service provider as evidence of follow up and as evaluation for the training). Collaborative Planning related to training (a	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Classroom observation II. Teacher's Evaluation III. Curriculum/Instruction/Data team: GFSD's Agenda/Meeting Template IV. Lesson Plans V. Lesson Plans Review Checklist VI. Classroom Coaching/Follow-up training (quote for scheduled Classroom Math Coaching)

document is provided by the in-service instructor, and the participants complete the document "back home" with collaboration of someone at the school on how they can use the training – the document is completed and returned to the in-service provider as evidence of follow-up and as evaluation for the training). Participant Product related to training (may include lesson plans, written reflection, audio/videotape, case study, or samples of student work – the teacher teaches a lesson plan, collects data on students in her classroom and records it, completes a tape or case study, or analyzes student work and completes a report – evidence is returned to the in-service provider as evidence of follow-up and as evaluation for the training). Study Group Participation ("back home", teachers participate in professional learning communities using information from the training as a starting point and adding to the knowledge base in the school on the topic – a report is given to the in-service provider as evidence of follow up and as evaluation for the training). Electronic – Interactive ("back home", teachers participate in online follow-up via discussion boards or web site postings and share with each other – the in-service provider uses the postings as evidence of	

follow up and as evaluation for the training). Electronic – Non-interactive ("back home", teachers implement the training in their classroom and post data as requested in an email or discussion board to the in-service provider, who uses the postings as evidence of follow up and as evaluation for the training). The current usage of "professional development evaluation" refers to STUDENT DATA showing success of the "training objectives" for which the training program was ultimately designed. This terminology and these procedures are to be used with training programs involving classroom application and involve measuring student responses to new teaching methods or strategies. If student responses are deemed positive, then the workshop or training program is determined to be "successful" and a worthwhile use of the district's resources. If student responses are less than desired, then the workshop or training program is suspect and may be discontinued.	

Adapted to Meet the Needs of Subgroups*(Address all relevant measures)*	
9. How does the professional development plan ensure that instructional staff receives the type of development required to meet the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to V. The Griffin Foundation School District's Students identified in the bottom 25%/non-proficient category are given individual school file to monitor and track their growth as he/she participate in various school programs, such as, our Math and Reading before and after school intervention programs, classroom differentiated instruction support, small group pull-out reading program, and math tutoring program. Teachers are also monitored through Classroom Observations and Teacher Evaluations. Employees provide feedback through our Annual Employees Surveys. Teachers are provided Professional Development training on data analysis and training on data systems such as: Galileo Assessment (ATI), AZ-Dash, and AZMERIT systems. In addition, teachers review	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Classroom observation II. Teacher's Evaluation III. Professional Development Meetings IV. Annual Employees Surveys V. Classroom Students assessments and intervention files and teacher's performance

academic data on the district as well as on their classroom. Furthermore, teachers are shown how to monitor students in the bottom 25%, non-proficient students.	
10. How does the professional development plan ensure that instructional staff receives the type of development required to meet the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to IV. The Griffin Foundation's schools professional development plan incorporates several concepts/strategies adapted from a sample plan created by Dr. Carlos Lopez. The plan is based around a series of educationally sound ideals: using comprehensible input, increasing verbal interaction among ELLs, contextualizing language during instruction, reducing student anxiety, and getting learners actively involved in the classroom. Teachers are also monitored through Classroom Observations and Teacher Evaluations. Employees provide feedback through our Annual Employees Surveys, and review of ELL students' AZELLA assessment and achievement of the English Language Proficiency Standards. Content focused professional development plan:	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Classroom observation II. Teacher's Evaluations III. ELL AZ Arizona English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards IV. ELL Trainings/Professional Development

1. Time is allotted for all staff and faculty members to share, talk about, and apply the knowledge and strategies gained through professional development. 2. The district ELL program administrator supports and contributes to the school plan and professional development agenda. 3. Professional development is continuous and builds on previous successful efforts. 4. Incentives are provided for participation in professional development activities (time, money, academic credit). 5. The professional development plan includes leadership training on leadership in linguistically and culturally diverse settings for the principal, ELL Teacher, and other leaders. Mainstream classroom teachers play a vital function in the education of English language learners (ELLs). Our Professional Development Plan is intended to assist mainstream classroom teachers who have not been trained in ESL or bilingual education with useful methodology and wants to get started in transforming their classroom into a learning environment where all learners can learn.	

Areas of focus are: 1. I Don't Know Where to Start • Developing Our Understanding of Diversity • Building Trust in the Classroom • Welcoming English Language Learners • Environmental Elements that Promote Acceptance • Nurturing Relationships with Families 2. Getting Your Message Across • Gestures • Visuals • Modeling • Putting It All Together • Respite 3. Bringing Language Alive! • Introduction and Language Acquisition • Comprehensible Input • The Silent Period • The Affective Filter Our faculty and Staff values multiculturalism, diversity, tolerance, cultural sensitivity, and appreciation for respecting differences thrive.	

We incorporate Sheltered Content Instruction *that* signifies the teaching of content area knowledge and skills in a more understandable way: 1. Comprehensible input 2. Warm, affective environment 3. High levels of student interaction, including small-group and cooperative learning 4. Student-centered 5. More hands-on tasks 6. Careful, comprehensive planning, including selecting concepts from core curriculum 7. Time on Task 8. Checking for understanding 9. Explicitly stated lesson objectives	
11. How does the professional development plan ensure that instructional staff receives the type of development required to meet the needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): I. to III. Our Schools provide professional development opportunities on a regular basic to faculty and staff to ensure that we meet the needs of our Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students. Assessment data and	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Classroom observation II. Teacher's Evaluation

State assessments (AIMS-AZMERIT) are reviewed and analyzed periodically by administrators and teachers to revise, update, or adopt changes to classroom instruction or curriculum. Teachers are also monitored through Classroom Observations and Teacher Evaluations. Employees provide feedback through our Annual Employees Surveys and review of FRL students' assessments. Content-focused professional development plan: 1. Time is allotted for all staff and faculty members to share, talk about, and apply the knowledge and strategies gained through professional development. 2. The district FRL/ELL/SPED program administrator supports and contributes to the school plan and professional development agenda. 3. Professional development is continuous and builds on previous successful efforts. . Content focused professional development opportunities time is available for our faculty and instructional staff during our Wednesday's PD trainings/meetings. • Allow instructional staff opportunity to use PD time to share and discuss their action research projects,	III. AZ Common Core Standards and ELL Standards

instructional strategies that work for them, and how they utilize student data to drive instruction and adopt curriculum. • Allocate time for instructional staff to meet weekly in grade level teams, content area teams, and in curriculum teams to discuss instructional practices. • Plan to incorporate our faculty meeting time into the school improvement time to maximize the amount of time to focus on how to improve instruction. • Allocate time for teachers to visit each other to observe instructional practices that work. • Allocate time for mentoring teachers to meet with new teachers on a regular basis to ensure that new teachers receive the support they need to be successful. • Allocate time to meet with teachers weekly to discuss student progress and other school related matters. • Allocate time to sustain professional dialogue through text-based discussions, critical friends groups, and other types of collegial collaborative work. • Allocate time for teachers to meet bi-weekly in study groups to explore topics of interest based on student data results.	

• Allocate time for teachers to meet regularly to review student data, make decision pertaining to classroom modifications needed, and to discuss ways to put the new ways into practice. • Allocate time for instructional staff to reflect on best practices and new strategies for altering student achievement. • Allocate time for teachers to do the adaptive work needed in order to get the work done. • Allocate time for instructional staff to meet in inquiry groups to discuss ways of improving student learning for all subgroups. • Allow time for instructional staff as a group to make 15 minute presentations on strategies, practices and methods that are research-based and helping them to get results. • Allocate time for instructional staff to meet in cooperative teams to discuss strategies and effective content-focused ways of doing things. • Allocate time for teachers to meet with university faculty during school hours to discuss new strategies and methodology. • Allocate time for instructional staff to conduct a curriculum audit,	

curriculum planning, and other curriculum related matters. • Allocate time for instructional staff to meet with central office curriculum personnel on a regular basis to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented effectively. • Allocate time for grade level or content teams to meet with curriculum representatives from the publishers to discuss how teachers can modify instructional practices for improved student learning. • Allocate time for instructional staff to meet with parents to discuss student progress and how they can help their children succeed.	
12. How does the professional development plan ensure that instructional staff receives the type of development required to meet the needs of students with disabilities?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words): The Griffin Foundation School District provides professional development opportunities for our Special Education Teacher on a regular basic that allows he/she to meet with faculty and staff during PD time to ensure that the needs of our Special Education (SPED) students are met. Assessment data and State assessments (AIMS-AZMERIT) are reviewed and analyzed	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: I. Classroom observation II. IEP goals and services report III. AZ Common Core Standards IV. SPED Classroom Monitoring

periodically by administrators and teachers to revise, update, or adopt changes to classroom instruction or curriculum. I. to IV. Special Education teacher with the collaboration of the classroom teacher create an individualized professional development plan/IEP based on the age of students in his or her classroom, the subject taught or any specialized knowledge he or she desires to learn, such as instruction techniques for special education students. These personalized plans usually detail the teacher's goals, the resources necessary to gain these new skills and the expected outcome. Monitoring of services is performed through classroom observations and compliance of Special Education Standards. Often, the professional development plan/IEP must align with the district and State standards, and the disability needs and goals of the students. A supervisor, such as the school principal, or the Superintendent approves each plan. Because the plan can vary from student to student, there isn't one clear-cut path to providing professional development to teachers. Content focused professional development opportunities time is available for our faculty and instructional staff during our Wednesday's PD trainings/meetings and	

planning time. • Allow instructional staff opportunity to use PD time to share and discuss their action research projects, instructional strategies that work for them, and how they utilize student data to drive instruction and adopt curriculum. • Allocate time for instructional staff to meet weekly in grade level teams, content area teams, and in curriculum teams to discuss instructional practices. • Plan to incorporate our faculty meeting time into the school improvement time to maximize the amount of time to focus on how to improve instruction. • Allocate time for teachers to visit each other to observe instructional practices that work. • Allocate time for mentoring teachers to meet with new teachers on a regular basis to ensure that new teachers receive the support they need to be successful. • Allocate time to meet with teachers weekly to discuss student progress and other school related matters. • Allocate time to sustain professional dialogue through text-based discussions, critical friends groups, and other types of collegial	

collaborative work. • Allocate time for teachers to meet bi-weekly in study groups to explore topics of interest based on student data results. • Allocate time for teachers to meet regularly to review student data, make decision pertaining to classroom modifications needed, and to discuss ways to put the new ways into practice. • Allocate time for instructional staff to reflect on best practices and new strategies for altering student achievement. • Allocate time for teachers to do the adaptive work needed in order to get the work done. • Allocate time for instructional staff to meet in inquiry groups to discuss ways of improving student learning for all subgroups. • Allow time for instructional staff as a group to make 15 minute presentations on strategies, practices and methods that are research-based and helping them to get results. • Allocate time for instructional staff to meet in cooperative teams to discuss strategies and effective content-focused ways of doing things. • Allocate time for teachers to meet	

with university faculty during school hours to discuss new strategies and methodology. • Allocate time for instructional staff to conduct a curriculum audit, curriculum planning, and other curriculum related matters. • Allocate time for instructional staff to meet with central office curriculum personnel on a regular basis to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented effectively. • Allocate time for grade level or content teams to meet with curriculum representatives from the publishers to discuss how teachers can modify instructional practices for improved student learning. • Allocate time for instructional staff to meet with parents to discuss student progress and how they can help their children succeed.	

Area VI: Graduation Rate (if applicable)

Ensuring Students in Grades 9-12 Graduate On Time	
1. How does the Charter Holder monitor and follow up on student progress toward completing courses to meet graduation requirements?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:
2. How does the Charter Holder identify students that are not successfully progressing through required courses?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:
3. How does the Charter Holder provide additional academic supports to remediate academic problems for struggling students?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:
4. What data can the Charter Holder provide to demonstrate that these strategies are effective?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:

Area VII: Academic Persistence (if applicable)

System for Keeping Students Motivated and Engaged in School	
1. How does the Charter Holder identify students who are at risk of dropping out or failing?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:
2. What strategies does the Charter Holder utilize to address student challenges to completing/continuing their education?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process:
3. How does the Charter Holder evaluate these strategies to determine effectiveness?	
Answer (suggested word count is 400 words):	List documents that serve as evidence of implementation of this process: