

MARIAN UNIVERSITY

Indianapolis

Academy for Teaching and Learning Leadership
School Evaluation

Padua Academy

Prepared For: Office of Education Innovation, Office of Mayor
Gregory A. Ballard, City of Indianapolis

Site Visit Dates: November 18 and 19, 2013

Principal: Cynthia Greer

Evaluators: Cynthia Farren
Sr. Jeanne Hagelskamp
Dr. Jeffery Kauffman
James Larson

DRAFT

Table of Contents

Part I: School Evaluation Overview and Methodology	3
Part II: Padua Academy Background Information	5
Part III: Core Question Four Indicator Ratings	7
Part IV: Findings ¹	8
<i>Indicator 4.1: Curriculum and Supporting Materials</i>	8
<i>Indicator 4.2: Pedagogy</i>	11
<i>Indicator 4.4: Assessment</i>	13
<i>Indicator 4.5: Talent</i>	16
<i>Indicator 4.6: Mission</i>	19
<i>Indicator 4.7: Climate</i>	20
<i>Indicator 4.8: Communication</i>	22
<i>Indicator 4.9: Special Education</i>	24
<i>Indicator 4.10: English as a New Language</i>	26
Part V: Recommendations	28

¹ Because Padua Academy does not serve high school students, Indicator 4.3 (i.e., supporting students for post-secondary options) is not addressed in this report.

Part I: School Evaluation Overview and Methodology

Padua Academy (“Padua”) is a public charter school sponsored by the Indianapolis Mayor’s Office of Education Innovation (“OEI”). Padua is in the fourth academic year of its first charter term with OEI. During the fourth academic year of the first charter term, OEI requires its sponsored schools to undergo a comprehensive review guided by a performance framework. The OEI performance framework includes four core questions:

1. Is the educational program a success?
2. Is the organization in sound fiscal health?
3. Is the organization effective and well-run?
4. Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success?

The school evaluation described herein addresses OEI’s fourth core question. This report includes:

1. An explanation of the school evaluation process
2. An overview of Padua Academy’s demographic and academic performance data
3. Core question four indicator ratings
4. Findings from the school evaluation
5. Recommendations for school improvement

Process

The school evaluation process involved three phases – document review, site visit, and survey analysis. Prior to the site visit, the evaluation team (“team”) reviewed Padua’s mission statement, school improvement plan, and school discipline policy. This review

informed the questions asked during site visit focus groups and one-on-one interviews. After the site visit, staff responses to survey questions aligned to core question four were analyzed. The survey results provided an important additional data point, supporting some preliminary findings from the site visit while challenging others. The site visit occurred over a two-day period and consisted of the following components:

- Document analysis (e.g., scopes and sequences, pacing guides, lesson plans)
- Classroom and shared space observations
- Focus groups
 - Teachers from kindergarten through eighth grade
 - Students from third through eighth grade
 - Family members
- Interviews
 - Principal
 - Archdiocese of Indianapolis Charter Schools Curriculum Director
 - Master teacher
 - Special Education teacher
 - English as a New Language (“ENL”) teacher

- Review of files and supports for Special Education students
- Review of files and supports for ENL students

DRAFT

Part II: Padua Academy Background Information

Padua Academy is a part of the ADI Charter Schools, Inc. network (“ADI”). The Archdiocese of Indianapolis created this network of two schools, both serving grades kindergarten through eight, in 2010. The mission of both schools is to “educate students to become self-sufficient and productive leaders who are ready to succeed in a diverse global society.”

Student Demographics

As reported on the Indiana Department of Education’s “Compass” data center, Padua Academy enrolled 186 students for the 2012-2013 academic year.² 98.4% of students are eligible to receive free or reduced price meals. The ethnic breakdown of the student population is as follows: Black (5.9%), Hispanic (84.4%), Multiracial (1.1%), and White (8.6%). 9.1% of students take part in the school’s Special Education program, while 68.3% of students participate in the school’s English as a New Language program.

Student Performance

The charts below describe Padua’s results on state assessments and the state’s school accountability model.

² Indiana Department of Education. (2013, Fall). Enrollment Overview. *IDOE: Compass*. Retrieved November 20, 2013, from <http://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/enrollment.aspx?type=school&id=5786>.

IREAD-3 Results ³	Percent Passing - Padua	Percent Passing - Indiana
2011-2012	95.7%	85.5%
2012-2013	91.4%	91.7%

ISTEP+ Results ⁴	Percent Passing Both E/LA & Math	Percent Passing E/LA	Percent Passing Math
2010-2011	63.1%	73.8%	69.2%
2011-2012	70.7%	85.3%	76.0%
2012-2013	52.2%	69.0%	60.3%

ISTEP+ Results	Percent Passing Both E/LA & Math		Percent Passing E/LA		Percent Passing Math	
	Grade	Percent	Grade	Percent	Grade	Percent
2010-2011	3 rd	57.1%	3 rd	81.0%	3 rd	57.1%
	4 th	52.6%	4 th	63.2%	4 th	63.2%
	5 th	73.3%	5 th	73.3%	5 th	86.7%
	6 th	80.0%	6 th	80.0%	6 th	80.0%
2011-2012	3 rd	72.7%	3 rd	86.4%	3 rd	81.8%
	4 th	43.8%	4 th	81.3%	4 th	43.8%
	5 th	73.3%	5 th	80.0%	5 th	80.0%
	6 th	91.7%	6 th	100%	6 th	91.7%
	7 th	80.0%	7 th	80.0%	7 th	80.0%
2012-2013 ⁵	3 rd	70.8%	3 rd	83.3%	3 rd	76.0%

³ Indiana Department of Education. (2013, Fall). IREAD-3 Results Overview. *IDOE: Compass*. Retrieved November 20, 2013, from <http://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/iread3perf.aspx?type=school&id=5786>.

⁴ Indiana Department of Education. (2013, Fall). IREAD+ Overview. *IDOE: Compass*. Retrieved November 20, 2013, from <http://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/istep.aspx?type=school&id=5786>.

⁵ Due to federal privacy laws, student performance data may not be displayed for any group of fewer than 10 students. As such, ISTEP+ data for Padua's 2012-2013 eighth graders cannot be shared.

	4 th	47.8%	4 th	82.6%	4 th	56.5%
	5 th	47.6%	5 th	57.1%	5 th	54.5%
	6 th	47.8%	6 th	65.2%	6 th	52.2%
	7 th	38.5%	7 th	46.2%	7 th	53.8%

State School Accountability Designation	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Letter Grade	A	A	F

Part III: Core Question 4 Indicator Ratings

The fourth core question of the OEI’s performance framework consists of ten indicators⁶ and three possible ratings. The chart below is aligned to these indicators and ratings.

Does not meet standard	School exhibits significant concerns in two or more elements of the indicator
Approaching standard	School exhibits significant concerns in one element of the indicator
Meets standard	School does not exhibit significant concerns in any elements of the indicator

Core Question 4 Indicator	Rating
4.1: Curriculum and Supporting Materials	Meets standard
4.2: Pedagogy	Approaching standard
4.4: Assessment	Approaching standard
4.5: Talent	Approaching standard

⁶ Because Padua Academy does not serve high school students, Indicator 4.3 (i.e., supporting students for post-secondary options) is not addressed in this report.

4.6: Mission	Meets standard
4.7: Climate	Approaching standard
4.8: Communication	Meets standard
4.9: Special Education	Does not meet standard
4.10: English as a New Language	Approaching standard

Part IV: Findings

Indicator 4.1: Curriculum and Supporting Materials	Meets standard
---	----------------

Element	Evaluation
a) <i>Does the curriculum align with state standards?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers are required to submit their weekly lesson plans to the school by Monday morning. These plans must specify the Indiana Academic Standard(s) focused on in each lesson. The curriculum maps provided by ADI and pacing guides from Acuity are also tied to Indiana Academic Standards. 	

Element	Evaluation
b) <i>Does the school conduct systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No

Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over the past two years, ADI worked with teachers at each grade level across its schools to conduct a systematic curriculum review, leading to the creation of English/Language Arts and Math scopes tied to both Indiana Academic Standards and Common Core State Standards as well as related end-of-year assessments. ADI plans to continue to work with this group of teachers to develop quarterly pacing guides for each subject and grade level.

Element	Evaluation
<i>c) Does the school regularly review its scopes and sequences to ensure presentation of content in time for testing?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because of the state's delayed implementation of Common Core State Standards, the scopes described in the previous sections are not being used by teachers in grades three through eight and thus, are not yet being regularly reviewed. Instead, in order to ensure core academic standards are taught prior to state assessments, Padua uses Acuity pacing guides for the English/Language Arts and Math that are structured to be predictive of a student's ISTEP+ performance. Thus, following these pacing guides helps ensure students are taught core academic standards before the state tests. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Does the school have a sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas that focuses on core (prioritized) learning objectives?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For English/Language Arts and Math in kindergarten through second grade, teachers follow detailed curriculum maps created by teachers across the ADI network. • For English/Language Arts and Math in third through eighth grade, teachers utilize pacing guides for the Acuity formative assessments, aligned to Indiana Academic Standards. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>e) Does the staff understand and uniformly use curriculum documents and related program materials to effectively deliver instruction?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school leader requires all staff to submit weekly lesson plans that contain, at a minimum, lesson's standard(s), objective(s), activities, assessment, materials, and accommodations. The review team analyzed a sampling of submitted lesson plans, and found that overall, teachers are meeting these expectations. • When looking for evidence that these lesson plans and other program materials 	

were used consistently in classrooms to drive instruction, the review team found this to be the case in more than 90% of classrooms (e.g., objective and standard written on the board, multiple types of program materials effectively used by teachers and students in a lesson).

Element	Evaluation
<i>f) Does the staff have programs and materials to effectively deliver the curriculum?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of respondents to the staff survey reported having the programs and materials needed to effectively deliver their curriculum. • 92% of those respondents described these programs and materials as high quality. • During the staff focus group, teachers identified a few specific areas where additional resources would be helpful (e.g., additional manipulative sets for math, music sheet music), but expressed overall satisfaction with the resources at their disposal. 	

Indicator 4.2: Pedagogy	Approaching Standard
--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Element	Evaluation
<i>a) Is the curriculum implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As described above, the school leader requires teachers to include the following 	

components in their lesson plans: standard(s), objective(s), activities, assessment, materials, and accommodations.

- During the review team’s classroom observations, we looked for specific evidence that these components were being implemented (e.g., standard and objective clearly on the board, activities tied to the standard and objective, informal or formal assessment to check for mastery).
- Overall, the team observed each of these components in 84% of classrooms. The one specific area of concern related to pedagogy is described in the section below.

Element	Evaluation
<i>b) Does the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery possess the appropriate rigor and challenge?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the student focus group, participants across grades three through eight identified a lack of rigor in their classes as an area where they want their school to improve (this ranked as the second most commonly reported area for growth). • While the pacing and rigor of lessons observed during the site visit were more often than not appropriate, these were the two pedagogical elements that received the lowest ratings when averaging scores from all classroom observations. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>c) Is instruction, as delivered, focused on core learning objectives?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In more than 90% of classrooms, instruction as delivered was explicitly tied to a core 	

learning objective(s), written out on the board.

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Do instructional activities possess variety and/or use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities, and learning needs?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the majority of classrooms, the review team observed varied instructional strategies, numerous checks for understanding, reinforcement of previously taught content, as well as whole-class and student-specific refocusing strategies. • Whereas pacing and rigor received the lowest composite ratings from classroom observations, the quality and quantity of varied instructional strategies received the second highest overall score across the review team’s classroom visits. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>e) Does the school supply sufficient feedback to staff on instructional practices?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of survey respondents noted that the feedback they receive through TAP⁷ is timely and helps to improve their instruction. • During the teacher focus group, participants unanimously agreed that the school leader and master teacher conduct observations and follow-up debrief meetings in an ample amount and in a timely and consistent manner. 	

Indicator 4.4: Assessment

Approaching standard

⁷ TAP stands for The System for Teacher and Student Achievement. Andrew uses TAP to structure its professional learning communities and teacher evaluation system.

Element	Evaluation
<i>a) Are the standardized and/or classroom assessments accurate and useful measures of established learning standards/objectives?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of respondents to the staff survey agreed that Padua’s formative assessments (e.g., Dibels, Star Math, Acuity) are aligned to their classes’ scopes and sequences. • Padua has selected formative assessments that are designed to be predictive of a student’s performance on the summative exam (i.e., Acuity) or to track progress towards the development of core literacy skills (i.e., Dibels) and math skills (i.e., Star Math). • Additionally, for kindergarten through second grade, ADI has developed end-of-year assessments tied to the scopes and sequences for English/Language Arts and math. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>b) Does the school distribute assessment results to classroom teachers in a timely and useful manner to influence instructional decisions?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: “I receive my students’ data from my school’s formative assessments in a timely manner.” • 100% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: “The way I receive my students’ data from my school’s formative assessments makes it easy to determine how I need to modify my instruction.” • During the review team’s interview with the master teacher, he outlined in a clear and detailed manner the steps he takes to ensure teachers receive their students’ formative assessment data in a timely and useful fashion. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>c) Does the school select assessments that have sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Padua utilizes formative assessments with multiple question types (e.g., multiple choice, short answer) to provide teachers with a clear understanding of how students perform on a spectrum of cognitive tasks. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Does the school use assessments with sufficient frequency to inform instructional decisions effectively?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Padua limits its formative assessments to Acuity for grades three through eight and Dibels as well as Star Math for kindergarten through second grade. Both Star Math and Dibels occur three times a year. Acuity also occurs three times before the summative assessment concludes in the spring⁸. Together, these formative assessments ensure the school has ample, but not excessive amounts of data to effectively inform instruction. 	

⁸ Given the presence of a substitute teacher in middle school English/Language Arts or math throughout the 2012-2013 academic year, students also took the final predictive Acuity assessment at the beginning of the 2013-2014 academic year to identify learning gaps.

Element	Evaluation
<p>e) <i>Does the school use assessment results to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum?</i></p>	<p>Yes / <u>No</u></p>
<p>Findings</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff universally report having the training and support necessary to modify their instruction and/or curriculum based on assessment results. • However, there is limited evidence that instruction and/or curriculum are routinely modified based on these results. • Teachers are required to offer tutoring after-school twice a week. Teachers must identify the students who need to stay for tutoring and develop the lessons. While this program could provide students additional opportunities to master core skills, evidence from focus groups and interviews suggest that only a few teachers use this time to systematically close learning gaps identified through assessment results. 	

Indicator 4.5: Talent	Approaching standard
------------------------------	-----------------------------

Element	Evaluation
<i>a) Are the school's hiring processes organized and used to support the success of new staff members?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school has a clear and detailed hiring protocol and timeline. • According to the school leader, the Padua does not have a formal staffing mentoring program. • 69% of respondents on the staff survey do not believe Padua's staff induction program provides them with a clear understanding of the school's mission, policies and procedures, and best practices. • Citing continued questions about their responsibilities (e.g., before school and lunch duty expectations), staff affirmed the need for an improved staff induction program during their focus group. • Staff induction and mentoring was ranked on the staff survey as the school's greatest area for growth. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>b) Does the school deploy sufficient number of faculty and staff to maximize instructional time and capacity?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the school utilizes a sufficient number of staff to maximize instructional time across the school. • This is the ENL teacher's first-year in the classroom. This fact, coupled with the size of the school's ENL population (i.e., 109 students), highlights a staffing gap. 	

- As class sizes continue to rise in the lower grades, additional aides could be required to ensure high-quality instruction.

Element	Evaluation
<i>c) Are faculty and staff certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All teachers are certified in the content areas and grade levels they are assigned, except the art, music, and middle school math teachers. The middle school math teacher started the year as the middle school Title I specialist, but moved into this new role due to a sudden staffing change. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Is professional development related to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Padua offers its staff professional development throughout the school year – directly or indirectly related to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement. • Staff participated in two days of technology professional development before the start of the school year. • ADI requires teachers in its network of schools to participate in six days of professional development during the school year. • Teachers meet as an entire faculty for professional development every other week. Topics for these sessions are based on demonstrated school-wide challenges (e.g., bullying) and school improvement goals (e.g., Character Counts). • Given the rollout of iPads in many classrooms across ADI’s schools, much of their professional development has focused on technology. 	

- Through the survey and focus group, teachers shared their concerns about the amount of professional development time dedicated to technology, especially because some of the training has been duplicative and the technology varies from classroom to classroom.

Element	Evaluation
<i>e) Are professional development opportunities determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed by analyses of student data and classroom observations (as well as the TAP rubric), the TAP master teacher identifies professional development topics for weekly TAP teacher cluster meetings. • Teachers have recently received a book about ENL strategies and are hopeful that substantive professional development time will be dedicated to training them on how to utilize these best practices. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>f) Does the school explicitly and regularly implement its teacher evaluation plan with a clear process and criteria?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey respondents unanimously agreed that Padua is clearly and consistently implementing TAP. • Teacher evaluation was ranked as the school's greatest strength on the staff survey. 	

Indicator 4.6: Mission	Meets the standard
Element	Evaluation
<i>a) Does the school have a mission that is shared by all stakeholders?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the staff survey, all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they have a clear understanding and deep commitment to Padua’s mission. • When asked on the survey to describe Padua’s mission in their own words, all respondents accurately summarized the actual mission statement. • During the family member focus group, participants spoke enthusiastically about the school’s mission and goals. 	
Element	Evaluation
<i>b) Do stakeholders possess widespread knowledge and commitment to the intentions of the school’s mission?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the staff survey, 62% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that all key stakeholders possess widespread knowledge and commitment to the intentions of the school’s mission. Only two respondents who disagreed specified a stakeholder group that they believe lacks pervasive commitment to the intentions of the school’s mission – students. 	

Indicator 4.7: Climate	Approaching standard
-------------------------------	-----------------------------

Element	Evaluation
<i>a) Does the school have clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school's discipline policy has clear rules that set a high bar for positive student behavior. • In all but three classrooms, school rules are posted. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>b) Does the school's discipline approach possess high expectations for student behavior?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During focus groups, students, family members and staff all expressed concerns that school rules are not enforced consistently, particularly in the middle school. The majority of family members and staff called out as significant and worrisome, the difference in student behavior between the lower and upper grades (i.e., kindergarten through fifth grade versus sixth through eighth grade). However, students across grades three through eight cited behavior as the area they most want their school to improve upon. • Only 38% of respondents on the staff survey agreed or strongly agreed that the school consistently follows-through on student rules and consequences. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>c) Are interactions between faculty and students respectful and supportive? Are faculty and students clear about processes for conflict resolution?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 85% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that interactions between faculty and students are respectful and supportive. • During classroom visits, the review team did not observe a disrespectful faculty-student interaction. • However, nearly half of survey respondents do not believe Padua has a clear process for resolving conflicts between staff and students. Additional evidence from the survey and focus groups suggests this is especially the case for conflicts in the middle grades. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Are interactions between faculty and administration professional and constructive?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 92% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that interactions between staff and school administrators are professional and constructive. • During the site visit, observed interactions and between staff and school administrators were polite and congenial. • The staff focus group also affirmed that Padua has an amiable, professional culture 	

amongst adults.

DRAFT

Indicator 4.8: Communication	Meets standard
Element	Evaluation
<i>a) Does the school have active and ongoing communication with parents?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Padua sends home school-wide and classroom-specific newsletters each month, holds quarterly family activity nights, and hosts a back to school night in the fall. 	
Element	Evaluation
<i>b) Does the school utilize communications that are both timely and relevant to parental concerns?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family members present for the focus group expressed that their questions and concerns are generally addressed in a timely, accessible manner. However, the group also shared their desire for the school to deploy at least one additional form of bilingual communication, particularly one for urgent messages (e.g., automated call system). 	
Element	Evaluation
<i>c) Does the school communicate student academic progress and achievement in reports that are understood by parents?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Padua provides family members with eight student academic progress reports a year – four progress reports and four report cards. During fall and spring family-teacher conferences, Padua hires additional 	

translators to help ensure family members understand their child’s academic progress and achievement.

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Are the school’s communication methods designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All written communication from the school to family members is provided in English and Spanish. • Additional translators are hired for major family engagement events (e.g., report card nights, back to school night). • During the school day, staff rely on the assistance of the ENL teacher or school secretary for verbal communication in Spanish with family members. The lack of phones in classrooms presents an additional challenge to staff-family communication. 	

Indicator 4.9: Special Education	Does not meet standard
---	-------------------------------

Element	Evaluation
Findings	
<p>a) Do services outlined within Individualized Education Plans (“IEPs”) adequately match the exceptional needs of the student?</p>	Yes / No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the special education teacher, there are 22 students receiving special education services at Padua, yet the review team could only find 14 IEPs in the designated IEP cabinet. • There was one additional file in the drawer, but it was a student’s psychological file and thus it should be relocated to the administrator’s office and protected under lock and key. • The 14 IEPs reviewed can be categorized as such: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Compliant: 4 ○ Non-compliant, past due for case conference: 2 ○ Non-compliant, did not hold move-in conference: 2 ○ Non-compliant, IEP is not current (i.e., written at least one and a half years ago) • Least restrictive environment (“LRE”) requirements are not being met. • Only one student identified with speech needs has an IEP. It is the speech-language pathologist’s responsibility to provide such documentation. • Through psychological assessments, one student was identified as having Specific Learning Disabilities based on auditory processing and language deficits. However, this student’s IEP does not have any speech goals or outline services from a speech-language pathologist. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>b) Do each of the needs identified within the IEPs have a corresponding goal and plan for assessment?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IEP goals are not written in measurable terms and thus, cannot be effectively assessed. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>c) Are the goals outlined in IEPs rigorous and based on state and national learning standards?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IEP goals are not rigorous or based on state and national learning standards. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Does explicit evidence exist to demonstrate that goals have evolved each year as the student develops?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no evidence of progress monitoring or goal completion for each student. Thus, even if goals are evolving each year, they are not doing so based on a student's demonstrated progress. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>e) Is a specifically designed curriculum outlined in each IEP?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>

Findings

- IEPs provide some description of curriculum, but it is not clear how the curriculum is specifically designed to support the achievement of rigorous, measurable goals.

DRAFT

Indicator 4.10: English as a New Language	Approaching standard
--	-----------------------------

Element	Evaluation
<i>a) Do the appropriate staff have a clear understanding of current legislation, research and effective practices relating to the provision of ENL services?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ENL teacher has a clear understanding of current ENL legislation, research, and best practices. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>b) Are relationships with students, parents, and external providers well-managed and comply with law and regulation?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school secretary can fluently communicate with family members in Spanish and English. The ENL teacher sends home a weekly progress report in Spanish with each ENL student. The school is hiring an additional Spanish-speaking aide to support the ENL teacher. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>c) Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations regarding ENL students?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In terms of documentation, communication with family members, provision of 	

services, and assessment, the school is fulfilling its legal obligations regarding ENL students.

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Do Individual Learning Plans (“ILPs”) contain all required information and incorporate best practices, such as measurable learning goals?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILPs do not consistently include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Learning goals, including numeric standardized test goals, along with cut scores ○ Progress monitoring plans ○ Student’s grade level • To improve the organization of all ILPs, the review team recommends utilizing a color-coding process to denote different levels. • Clear, detailed assessment procedures for ENL students are needed. To develop this protocol, the review team recommends utilizing Chapter Six and Appendix C of the Indiana Assessment Program manual.⁹ 	

⁹ Indiana Department of Education. (2013, Fall). IDOE. *Office of Student Assessment*. Retrieved November 21, 2013. <http://www.doe.in.gov/assessment>.

Part V: Recommendations

The review team’s recommendations are tiered into urgent and high priorities as well as aligned to OEI’s Core Question 4 indicators.

Indicator 4.1: Curriculum and Supporting Materials	Meets standard
High Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Padua’s ISTEP+ results from the 2012-2013 academic year dropped in both core subject areas and in all grades except fourth. In fifth, sixth, and seventh grades, the changes were severe – ranging from a 26% to nearly 42% decline in student pass rates from year-to-year. • Informed by these significant declines, the school should develop and implement a system to ensure English/Language Arts and math teachers in grades three through eight are sequencing their lessons to ensure <i>all</i> core learning objectives are taught and mastered before the state exam. 	

Indicator 4.2: Pedagogy	Approaching standard
High Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize TAP cluster meetings and classroom observations to strengthen the rigor of lessons taught across the school. • Be sure to consider the roles that increased rigor and pacing can play in developing and implementing the aforementioned system to ensure all core learning objectives are taught and mastered before the state exam. While it may seem counterintuitive to do so, heightened pacing and rigor could increase student engagement and thus reduced the frequency of classroom disruptions. 	

Indicator 4.4: Assessment	Approaching standard
High Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The benefits of a renewed emphasis on pacing, rigor, and sequencing will be stunted if there are not clear and measurable expectations for modifying and supplementing instruction to address individual, group, or whole-class learning gaps. • One way to achieve this objective is to codify strategies and expectations for the tutoring program so that it is consistently used to target gaps identified through assessment results. • Since the steepest drops in ISTEP+ results occurred in the middle grades, how teachers structure and implement their lessons during blocked class periods warrants particular reflection and improvement. 	
Indicator 4.5: Talent	Approaching standard
High Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A formal staff induction and mentoring program should be developed before the start of the 2014-2015 academic year. 	
Indicator 4.7: Climate	Approaching standard
Urgent Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns raised by students, staff, and family members about student behavior, must be addressed as a school-wide issue, with particular attention paid to the unique challenges in the middle grades. • Systems to address challenging student behavior should be developed and deployed in concert with efforts to improve pacing and rigor. • While increasing student engagement is likely to decrease instances of negative 	

student behavior, it will not be a panacea.

- Feedback from the student and teacher focus groups as well as some site visit observations highlight that school rules are not being consistently implemented.
- Recognizing there will always be nuances, school-wide expectations need to be followed through on to ensure classrooms are places of learning.

Indicator 4.8: Communications

Meets standard

High Priorities

- Select and implement a prompt method for communicating with all family members (e.g., automated call system).
- Continue to troubleshoot and brainstorm additional, efficient manners for teachers to communicate verbally with non-English speaking family members between formal family engagement events.

Indicator 4.9: Special Education

Does not meet standard

Urgent Priorities

- Locate missing IEPs.
- Address all compliance issues with IEPs, including but not limited to, holding past due case and move-in conferences; setting measurable, rigorous goals aligned to state and national standards; setting assessment goals and progress monitoring plans; and developing a specialized curriculum tied to each student's needs and IEP goals.
- Ensure LRE requirements are consistently met.

Indicator 4.10: English as a New Language

Approaching standard

High Priorities

- Hire an additional ENL staff member.
- Address all gaps in ILPs, including but not limited to, learning goals that include

numeric standardized test goals, progress monitoring plans, and the student's grade level.

- Develop and implement clear, detailed assessment procedures for ENL students.
- Ensure curriculum and interventions for ENL students are aligned with the core learning objectives assessed by the Las Links English Proficiency Assessment.

DRAFT