

NEVADA STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY
2025-2026 School Year

SITE EVALUATION HANDBOOK

A reference for leaders at state-authorized charter schools in Nevada



**Nevada State Public
Charter School
Authority**

Carson City Office
3427 Goni Rd, Suite 103
Carson City, NV 89706
775-531-3384

Las Vegas Office
500 E. Warm Springs Road, Suite 116
Las Vegas, NV 89119
725-281-1367

<https://charterschools.nv.gov/>

Table of Contents

SITE EVALUATION OVERVIEW	4
SITE EVALUATION PURPOSE	5-7
SPCSA SITE EVALUATION PROTOCOL	5
PURPOSE OF SITE EVALUATIONS	5
STRUCTURE AND OVERSIGHT	5-6
SITE EVALUATION PROCESS.....	6
EVALUATION GOALS.....	6
LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES FOR SCHOOLS	7
SITE EVALUATION PROCESS	8-10
EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS AND PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS.....	8
PRE-SITE EVALUATION MEETING	8-9
DIFFERENTIATED EVALUATION PROCESS	9
EVALUATIONS FOR DISTANCE EDUCATION PROGRAMS.....	9
CHARTER NETWORKS AND MULTI-CAMPUS EVALUATIONS	9
SITE EVALUATION TEAM STRUCTURE	9-10
DIFFERENTIATED SITE EVALUATION PROCESS	11-12
SCHOOLS ISSUES STRONG RECOMMENDATIONS OR DEFICIENCY IN PREVIOUS EVALUATION.....	11
SCHOOLS WITH ONE OR TWO STAR NSPF RATINGS	11-12
HIGH PERFORMING SCHOOLS UNDERGOING THIRD OR FIFTH YEAR EVALUATION.....	12
PRE-SITE EVALUATION	13
INITIAL NOTIFICATION.....	13
PRE-SITE EVALUATION MEETING	13
DURING THE SITE EVALUATION	14-21
ARRIVAL AND SETUP.....	14
SITE EVALUATION ACTIVITIES	14
SCHOOL PRESENTATION	14-15
FOCUS GROUPS	15
CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT AND INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION	15-16
CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT AND INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC.....	16-19
SCHOOL LEADER DEBRIEFING.....	20

AFTER THE SITE EVALUATION 21-23

SITE EVALUATION REPORT COMPONENTS21
REPORT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS..... 21-22
STRONG RECOMMENDATIONS AND DEFICIENCIES 22-23
FOLLOW-UP MEASURES23

APPENDICES 24-29

APPENDIX A (SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN)25
APPENDIX B (EXAMPLE OF IMPROVEMENT PLAN)26-27
APPENDIX C (DISTANCE EDUCATION PROGRAM OF THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION)28-29

SITE EVALUATION OVERVIEW¹

The Site Evaluation Protocol Handbook serves as a comprehensive reference for Nevada SPCSA authorized charter schools. Routine site evaluations are a cornerstone of the SPCSA's accountability framework and are crucial to striking a balance between the autonomy and accountability inherent in the charter school model.

Pursuant to NRS 388A.150, the Nevada Legislature has charged the SPCSA with the responsibility to “provide oversight to the charter schools that it sponsors to ensure that those charter schools maintain high educational and operational standards, preserve autonomy and safeguard the interests of pupils and the community.”

Further, NRS 388A.223 mandates that the SPCSA conduct site evaluations for each campus it sponsors during the first, third, and fifth years of a charter school's initial term or renewal. These evaluations must assess pupil achievement and overall school performance and identify any deficiencies. In the event that deficiencies or strong recommendations are found, the SPCSA is required to collaborate with the charter school to develop a corrective action plan.

The SPCSA's approach to site evaluations is grounded in national best practices and reflects the philosophy that rigorous oversight and meaningful autonomy can and should coexist. This protocol draws on guidance from the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) and incorporates effective practices from respected authorizers, including the Colorado Charter School Institute, the District of Columbia Public Charter School Board, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and the SUNY Charter Schools Institute.

¹ Please note that the electronic version of the SPCSA Site Evaluation Protocol Handbook contains hyperlinks that are both internal and external to this document.

SITE EVALUATION PURPOSE

SPCSA Site Evaluation Protocol

The SPCSA Board and staff recognize the many challenges and responsibilities schools, and school leaders face throughout the academic year. We appreciate the collaboration and cooperation of schools in conducting site evaluations. This protocol provides practical and thorough information about the site evaluation process to ensure all stakeholders, particularly charter school leaders and their governing boards, know what to expect, how to best prepare, and how to ensure efficient site evaluations. Familiarity with these protocols, practices, and procedures safeguards smooth, non-disruptive, and effective evaluations by the SPCSA Site Evaluation Team (SE Team).

Purpose of Site Evaluations

SPCSA site evaluations serve as a key accountability mechanism. They help document a school's progress toward its charter goals through both qualitative and quantitative data collection. The SE Team evaluates student achievement, goal attainment, and implementation of the school's mission, vision, and educational program as defined in its charter contract.

These evaluations reflect the legislative intent of charter schools to:

- Improve student learning and educational outcomes,
- Increase opportunities for quality education, and
- Strengthen accountability for student achievement in Nevada.

Site evaluations certify that state-authorized charter schools meet their obligations as public schools while supporting their continued autonomy and success.

Structure and Oversight

The SE Team's work supports schools in achieving and sustaining high performance. By monitoring compliance with charter terms, state and federal regulations, and student performance expectations, the SPCSA helps ensure long-term school viability.

- The SPCSA School Support, Finance, and Operations teams oversee grant and program compliance.
- The SPCSA Authorizing Team conducts routine desktop monitoring and performance updates.
- All evaluation data informs SPCSA staff recommendations to the SPCSA Governing Board,

which makes final decisions regarding charter renewals.

Site Evaluation Process

Site evaluations typically occur during the first, third, and fifth years of a school's charter term. Evaluations involve the collection of data through:

- Classroom observations,
- Conduct focus groups with students, families, board members, staff, and the school's leadership team, including the presentation slides,
- Document review and performance analysis,
- Assessment of compliance with the Nevada School Performance Framework, SPCSA Academic Framework, and Organizational Framework.

All findings are reviewed through the lens of the SPCSA Academic, Organizational and Performance Framework, ensuring alignment with expectations and the school's charter contract.

Evaluation Goals

Site evaluations are an opportunity to:

- Triangulate data from multiple sources,
- Provide an external, objective perspective,
- Strengthen relationships between schools and authorizers,
- Offer actionable feedback to improve outcomes for all students,
- Evaluate alignment between implementation and the approved charter.

The SPCSA is committed to delivering a high-quality site evaluation experience by:

- Communicating effectively with school teams,
- Providing clear, constructive feedback, and
- Building strong, respectful relationships with stakeholders.

The evaluation process consists of three key phases: Pre-Evaluation, On-Site Evaluation, and Post-Evaluation.

Learning Opportunities for Schools

To ensure school leaders are well-prepared, SPCSA staff offer web-based learning sessions at the start of each academic year. These sessions provide an overview of the Instruction and Environment Observation Rubric used during evaluations. Additional annual training is provided for new school leaders.

For information or to register for an upcoming session, please contact Selcuk Ozdemir at selcuk@spsca.nv.gov.

SITE EVALUATION PROCESS

The Nevada State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) conducts site evaluations annually, beginning in September and concluding by May. For each school, the full evaluation process—from the initial pre-call through report delivery—takes approximately two to three months.

Each evaluation includes three distinct phases:

1. Pre-Site Evaluation
2. On-Site Evaluation
3. Post-Site Evaluation and Reporting

The on-site evaluation typically takes one academic day, depending on the school's size, structure, and location. The entire process, from the on-site evaluation to the final report, takes approximately four to six weeks. Final reports are delivered to school leadership, the SPCSA Governing Board, and published on the SPCSA website.

Evaluation Requirements and Planning Considerations

In accordance with NRS 388A.223, the SPCSA SE Team conducts comprehensive evaluations of each campus during the first, third, and fifth years of a school's charter term. Schools scheduled for an evaluation are formally notified in writing by an SPCSA Lead Evaluator.

The SPCSA understands that the timing of evaluations can impact instructional and operational quality. When planning site visits, the SE Team considers factors such as:

- State and federal testing windows
- Holidays and school breaks
- Field trips and special events
- Professional development days
- Evaluator availability

Pre-Site Evaluation Meeting

Prior to the on-site visit, the Lead Evaluator schedules a pre-site evaluation meeting with school leadership. This meeting:

- Reviews required pre-site documentation,

- Outlines on what to expect during the site visit, and
- Explains the post-evaluation and reporting timeline.

Differentiated Evaluation Process

The SPCSA has developed a Differentiated Site Evaluation Process for schools that meet any of the following criteria:

- Operating without a Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) star rating
- Rated one or two stars under NSPF
- Have received a strong recommendation or identified deficiency
- Are under a Notice of Concern, Breach, or Termination

These schools receive a more tailored evaluation that aligns with their individual oversight needs.

Evaluations for Distance Education Programs

For schools approved to operate under a Distance Education Program, the SPCSA follows the evaluation protocol established by the Nevada Department of Education’s Distance Education Program (see *Appendix C*). While many evaluation criteria are consistent with standard SPCSA protocols, a customized one-page slide is added to the school’s presentation to address distance-specific elements.

Charter Networks and Multi-Campus Evaluations

For charter networks with multiple campuses, the SPCSA Authorizing Team works to reduce unnecessary duplication. When appropriate, certain components—such as focus groups—may be conducted jointly for schools within the same network. However, each individual campus will receive its own site evaluation report, with campus-specific strengths, challenges, and recommendations, even when certain findings are shared across schools.

Site Evaluation Team Structure

Each school is assigned a Lead Evaluator, who serves as the primary point of contact. SE Teams are composed of SPCSA Authorizing staff and may include observers from other SPCSA teams. Team composition is determined based on:

- School size and location

- Academic performance
- Fiscal status
- Leadership and governance needs

Team members bring diverse expertise in areas such as instruction, governance, fiscal oversight, and curriculum, ensuring a comprehensive and balanced evaluation process.

DIFFERENTIATED SITE EVALUATION PROCESS

The Nevada State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) differentiates the site evaluation process based on a school's performance history and current status. The procedures outlined below describe specific conditions under which differentiated evaluations apply.

1. Schools Issued a Strong Recommendation or Deficiency in a Previous Evaluation

A strong recommendation indicates a serious concern requiring immediate attention. Schools that receive a strong recommendation or deficiency are required to take the following steps:

1. **Submit a Site Evaluation Response Plan**
Schools must submit a completed Site Evaluation Response Plan (see *Appendix A*) within four weeks of receiving the Site Evaluation Report. A written request may be submitted if an extension is needed.
2. **Collaborate on a Corrective Action Plan**
The SE Team will review the plan, meet with school leadership, and provide feedback. Both the SE Team and the school leadership must agree on an action plan, including clear steps and a defined timeline. (*Appendices A and B include a template and a sample plan.*)
3. **Track and Monitor Progress**
Each strong recommendation or deficiency is logged by the SE Team for tracking and follow-up purposes.
4. **Schedule Follow-Up Meetings**
Once the plan is approved, routine check-ins will occur at least quarterly, or more frequently if required by the plan.
5. **Conduct a Follow-Up Site Evaluation**
An additional site evaluation will be conducted during the following school year. This evaluation may be abbreviated and will focus specifically on progress related to the Response Plan.
6. **Close Out Open Issues**
When sufficient evidence is provided that all recommendations have been addressed, SPCSA staff will issue written confirmation that the matter is closed.

2. Schools with a One- or Two-Star NSPF Rating or Under Notice of Concern, Breach, or Termination

Schools receiving a one- or two-star rating according to the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) or operating under a Notice of Concern, Notice of Breach, or Notice of Termination will follow a more intensive evaluation process:

1. Annual Full Site Evaluations
These schools will undergo full site evaluations annually until they reach a three-star status or are no longer subject to the notice.
2. Formal Notification
Affected schools will be notified in writing at the beginning of each academic year.
3. Ongoing Monitoring of Improvement
The purpose of these evaluations is to document and support progress toward improvement in academic, organizational, and financial performance.

3. High-Performing Schools Undergoing a Third or Fifth-Year Evaluation

Schools rated four- or five-stars under the NSPF and in good standing across all SPCSA frameworks (academic, organizational, and financial) are eligible for an abbreviated evaluation during the third or fifth year of their charter term. However, schools in year five and up for renewal will receive a full site evaluation regardless of status.

Key differences in the abbreviated evaluation process:

1. Focus Groups
Only the student focus group is required. If the school has administered the Nevada Climate and Social Emotional Learning (NV-SCEL) Survey and the results show acceptable student satisfaction levels, the student focus group may also be waived.
2. Classroom Observations
The number of classroom observations will be approximately half that of a standard evaluation.

PRE-SITE EVALUATION

Initial Notification

At the beginning of each semester, the SPCSA SE Team will notify schools scheduled for an upcoming evaluation of their assigned site evaluation date. Schools will be asked to either confirm the proposed date or request an alternative. The SPCSA will make every effort to accommodate rescheduling requests if received within one week of the original notification. After that time, the date will be considered confirmed.

The notification will also include:

- A list of required documents to be uploaded to SPCSA Epicenter.
 - The due dates for submission of those documents.
-

Pre-Site Evaluation Meeting

Several weeks before the scheduled evaluation, school leadership will be invited to attend a Pre-Site Evaluation Meeting with the SPCSA SE Team. This meeting serves as an opportunity for introductions, setting expectations, and confirming logistics.

During the meeting, the following will be addressed:

- **Evaluation Date Confirmation:**
The evaluation date will be reviewed and finalized.
- **Document Review:**
The SPCSA will verify that all required items have been uploaded to Epicenter. The school will be notified of any missing or incomplete submissions.
- **Evaluation Day Schedule:**
A draft schedule for the on-site evaluation will be shared with school leaders in advance of the meeting. During the pre-site call, school leaders may request adjustments. The evaluation team will collaborate with the school to finalize a schedule that ensures both structure and flexibility.
- **On-Site Logistics:**
Entry procedures for the evaluation team and designated parking arrangements will be confirmed to ensure a smooth arrival on the day of the visit.

DURING THE SITE EVALUATION

Arrival and Setup

On the day of the evaluation, the SPCSA SE Team will arrive according to the previously agreed-upon schedule. Upon arrival, the SE Team will:

- **Meet with the Designated School Liaison**
A designated point person should be available throughout the visit to assist with navigation, troubleshooting (e.g., Wi-Fi, facilities access), and serve as a central contact for the SE Team.
- **Settle into the Assigned Workspace**
The SE Team requires a private meeting space for team discussions and focus groups. Ideally, the room should accommodate up to 15 people.
- **Access Wi-Fi and Power**
The SE Team will use laptops and requires access to reliable Wi-Fi, power outlets, and extension cords, as needed.
- **Receive School Materials**
The team should be provided with a map of the school and a list of substitute teachers for that day.

Site Evaluation Activities

Throughout the day, the SE Team will gather qualitative and quantitative data related to the school's performance in implementing its approved charter, achieving academic goals, and supporting its mission. Activities will include:

- A school presentation and leadership focus group
- Multiple stakeholder focus groups
- Classroom observations and campus walkthroughs
- Data analysis and documentation review

All findings will be triangulated across team members and used to develop a comprehensive site evaluation report.

School Presentation

The school leadership team will lead a 30–45-minute presentation, followed by a 30-minute

question and answer period, based on questions from the SE Team. The presentation should follow the slide deck template previously submitted in Epicenter and is intended to provide the SE Team with important context for assessing the school's performance in relation to its approved charter and the SPCSA Academic and Organizational Frameworks.

Focus Groups

Focus groups offer essential insight into the school's performance and climate. Each session typically lasts 30 - 45 minutes and includes up to 15 participants per group. Participants should reflect on the diversity of the school community, including grade levels, ethnicity, special populations (e.g., EL, IEP, FRL), and tenure at the school.

Key Focus Group Guidelines

- Participants must not be immediate family members of school employees (for student and family groups).
- Focus groups are conducted by one to three SE Team members.
- Questions are tailored to each school and based on multiple data sources (e.g., prior evaluations, climate survey, charter documents).

Focus Group Categories

- **Teachers and Staff:** Randomly selected by the SE Team from the staff roster. Representation across grade levels, years of experience, and key roles (e.g., SPED, EL) is expected.
- **Governing Board Members:** Self-selected to avoid quorum issues; may meet virtually or in person. The SPCSA may also request recordings or links to recent board meetings for review.
- **Students:** Selected by the school according to SPCSA-provided criteria (e.g., academic diversity, enrollment history). School leaders should exclude children of staff to avoid potential bias.
- **Parents/Guardians:** Selected to represent a cross-section of grade levels and years of enrollment. Parents employed by the school should not participate.
- **School Leadership/Administration:** Depending on context, this may include a 1:1 interview or a small group session with administrators. Topics include curriculum, instruction, SPED, school culture, operations, and SPP updates.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT AND INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION

The classroom environment and instructional practices observed during site evaluations provide

essential insights into the school's current teaching and learning conditions. To support a comprehensive analysis, the SE Team utilizes the Classroom Environment and Instruction Observation Rubric to assess instructional delivery, curriculum implementation, and student engagement.

In addition to classroom observations, SE Team members may observe operational procedures in common areas, including classroom transitions, hallway traffic flow, lunch routines, and playground activities. These operational observations offer valuable context about how schoolwide systems and routines support—or hinder—effective instruction.

Each observation provides evidence to help the SE Team identify the school's strengths, areas for growth, and key recommendations for the final SE report.

To facilitate this process, teachers are asked to place clearly labeled lesson plans in an accessible location within the classroom. Teachers and students should continue with their regular routines and instructional practices during the observation window. Teachers are not expected to greet or engage with SE Team members during visits. Observations are intended to reflect a typical school day, and deviations from regular practice may impact the accuracy of the evaluation.

During classroom visits (typically lasting 10–15 minutes), SE Team members observe:

- Instructional delivery
- Teacher and student actions
- Student work (on display, in journals, folders, etc.)

Team members may speak briefly with students or teachers outside of active instruction but will not interrupt teaching. Observers are mindful to minimize disruption and maintain the natural classroom rhythm.

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT AND INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC

The SE Team utilizes the Classroom Environment and Instruction Observation Rubric to assess instructional delivery, curriculum implementation, and student engagement. This rubric is used consistently across all evaluations to ensure reliability and comparability. The number of students observed will be recorded by each SE Team member.

Below is the rubric that will be used to measure the following:

- Classroom Environment
 - Classroom Learning Environment is Conducive to Learning
 - Establishing a Culture for Learning

A total of # elementary, # middle, and # high school classrooms were observed for approximately 15 minutes on the day of the site evaluation.

Classroom Environment

	Distinguished	Highly Proficient	Approaching Proficient	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
Classroom Learning Environment is Conducive to Learning	<p>The teacher demonstrates knowledge and caring about individual students' lives beyond the class and school.</p> <p>When necessary, students respectfully correct one another.</p> <p>Students participate without fear of put-downs or ridicule from either the teacher or other students.</p> <p>The teacher respects and encourages students' efforts.</p>	<p>Talk between the teacher and students and among students is uniformly respectful.</p> <p>The teacher successfully responds to disrespectful behavior among students.</p> <p>Students participate willingly but may be somewhat hesitant to offer their ideas in front of classmates.</p> <p>The teacher makes general connections with individual students.</p>	<p>The quality of interactions between teachers and students, or among students, is uneven, with occasional disrespect or insensitivity.</p> <p>The teacher attempts to respond to disrespectful behavior among students with uneven results.</p> <p>The teacher attempts to make connections with individual students, but student reactions indicate that these attempts are not entirely successful.</p>	<p>The teacher is disrespectful toward or insensitive to students' ages, cultural backgrounds, and developmental levels.</p> <p>Students' body language indicates feelings of hurt, discomfort, or insecurity.</p> <p>The teacher displays no familiarity with, or care about, individual students.</p>	<p>This criterion was not observed or rated.</p>
	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #
Establishing a Culture for Learning	<p>The teacher communicates passion for the subject.</p> <p>Students indicate through their questions and comments a desire to understand content.</p> <p>Students assist their classmates in understanding the content.</p>	<p>The teacher communicates the importance of the content and the conviction that with hard work all students can master the material.</p> <p>The teacher conveys an expectation of high levels of student effort.</p> <p>Students expend good effort to complete work of high quality.</p>	<p>The teachers' energy for the work is neutral.</p> <p>The teacher conveys high expectations for only some students.</p> <p>Students exhibit a limited commitment to completing the work on their own.</p> <p>The teacher's primary concern appears to be to complete the task at hand.</p>	<p>The teacher conveys that there is little or no purpose for the work, or that the reasons for doing it are due to external factors.</p> <p>The teacher conveys to at least some students that the work is too challenging for them.</p> <p>Students exhibit little or no pride in their work.</p>	<p>This criterion was not observed or rated.</p>
	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #

- Classroom Instruction
 - Communicating with Students

- Using Questioning and Discussion Strategies
- Engaging Students in Learning
- Using Assessment in Instruction

A total of # elementary, # middle, and # high school classrooms were observed for approximately 15 minutes on the day of the site evaluation

Classroom Instruction

	Distinguished	Highly Proficient	Approaching Proficient	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
Communicating with Students	<p>If asked, students can explain what they are learning and where it fits into the larger curriculum context.</p> <p>The teacher explains content clearly and imaginatively.</p> <p>The teacher invites students to explain the content to their classmates.</p> <p>Students use academic language correctly.</p>	<p>The teacher states clearly, at some point during the lesson, what the students will be learning.</p> <p>The teacher's explanation of content is clear and invites student participation and thinking.</p> <p>The teacher makes no content errors.</p> <p>Students engage with the learning task, indicating that they understand what they are to do.</p>	<p>The teacher provides little elaboration or explanation about what students will be learning.</p> <p>The teacher's explanation of the content consists of a monologue, with minimal participation or intellectual engagement by students.</p> <p>The teacher may make minor content errors.</p> <p>The teacher must clarify the learning task.</p>	<p>At no time during the lesson does the teacher convey to students what they will be learning.</p> <p>Students indicate through body language or questions that they don't understand the content being presented.</p> <p>Students indicate through their questions that they are confused about the learning task.</p>	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #
Using Questioning and Discussion Strategies	<p>Students initiate higher-order questions.</p> <p>The teacher builds on and uses student responses to questions to deepen student understanding.</p> <p>Students extend the discussion, enriching it.</p> <p>Virtually all students are engaged.</p>	<p>The teacher uses open-ended questions, inviting students to think and/or offer multiple possible answers.</p> <p>Discussions enable students to talk to one another without ongoing mediation by the teacher.</p> <p>Many students actively engage in the discussion.</p>	<p>The teacher frames some questions designed to promote student thinking, but many have a single correct answer.</p> <p>The teacher invites students to respond directly to one another's ideas, but few students respond.</p> <p>The teacher calls on many students, but only a small number participate.</p>	<p>Questions are rapid-fire and convergent with a single correct answer.</p> <p>The teacher does not ask students to explain their thinking.</p> <p>Only a few students dominate the discussion.</p>	This criterion was not observed or rated.

	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #
Engaging Students in Learning	<p>Virtually all students are engaged in the lesson.</p> <p>Lesson activities require high-level student thinking and explanations of their thinking.</p> <p>Students have an opportunity for reflection and closure on the lesson to consolidate their understanding.</p>	<p>Most students are intellectually engaged in the lesson.</p> <p>Most learning tasks have multiple correct responses or approaches and/or encourage higher-order thinking.</p> <p>Students are invited to explain their thinking as part of completing tasks.</p> <p>The pacing of the lesson provides students with the time needed to be intellectually engaged.</p>	<p>Some students are intellectually engaged in the lesson.</p> <p>Learning tasks are a mix of those requiring thinking and those requiring recall.</p> <p>Student engagement with the content is largely passive.</p> <p>The pacing of the lesson is uneven—suitable in parts but rushed or dragging in others.</p>	<p>Few students are intellectually engaged in the lesson.</p> <p>Learning tasks, activities, and materials require only recall or have a single correct response.</p> <p>The lesson drags on or is rushed.</p>	<p>This criterion was not observed or rated.</p>
	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #
Using Assessment in Instruction	<p>Students indicate they clearly understand the characteristics of high-quality work.</p> <p>The teacher uses multiple strategies to monitor student understanding.</p> <p>Students monitor their own understanding.</p> <p>Feedback comes from many sources.</p>	<p>The teacher makes the standards of high-quality work clear to students.</p> <p>The teacher elicits evidence of student understanding.</p> <p>Students are invited to assess their own work and make improvements.</p> <p>Feedback includes specific and timely guidance.</p>	<p>There is little evidence that the students understand how the work is evaluated.</p> <p>The teacher monitors understanding through a single method, without eliciting evidence of understanding from students.</p> <p>Feedback to students is vague.</p>	<p>The teacher does not indicate what quality work looks like.</p> <p>The teacher makes no effort to determine whether students understand the lesson.</p> <p>Students receive no feedback, or feedback is global or directed to one student.</p>	
	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #	TOTAL: #

SCHOOL LEADER DEBRIEFING

At the conclusion of the site evaluation, the SE Team will conduct a 30–45 minute debriefing with the school leader and any additional individuals the leader wishes to include. During this meeting, the SE Team will share a preliminary analysis that includes a high-level summary of observed strengths, challenges, and initial recommendations. If any critical or urgent findings are identified during the visit, these will be communicated at this time.

If the school leader is unavailable on the day of the evaluation, the lead evaluator will schedule a virtual debriefing via teleconference within approximately three to seven business days following the visit.

It is important to note that this debriefing provides a general summary of the team’s observations and insights from the evaluation day. It is not the final report. Evaluators will continue to review field notes and conduct additional analysis after the site visit. The final Site Evaluation Report may include further findings or refined recommendations based on this extended review.

Post-visit, the SE Team will:

- Triangulate team field notes to ensure accuracy and comprehensive reporting
- Revisit outstanding questions or clarify data points as needed
- Determine the appropriate level of findings (e.g., strong recommendation, deficiency) based on the collective evidence
- Provide more detailed analysis and actionable recommendations to support school improvement
- Deliver a first draft of the Site Evaluation Report to the school leader within 4–6 weeks of the evaluation date

AFTER THE SITE EVALUATION

Site evaluations conducted by the SPCSA are grounded in the Nevada State Performance Framework, the SPCSA Academic Framework, and the SPCSA Organizational Framework. These evaluations are designed to assess school performance comprehensively and transparently.

Following the site evaluation, the SE Team produces a formal written report based on observations, focus group input, document review, and schoolwide procedures. This report is typically completed within four to six weeks of the site visit.

SITE EVALUATION REPORT COMPONENTS

Each Site Evaluation Report includes the following components:

1. Executive Summary
2. Site Evaluation Findings – including strengths, challenges, recommendations, strong recommendations, and deficiencies (if applicable)
3. Focus Group Summaries
4. Classroom Environment and Instruction Observation Rubric
5. Classroom Observation Comments
6. Reference Links and Appendices

All site evaluation reports follow the most current APA formatting and citation standards. The findings presented in the report are based on a critical evaluation of the entire school program rather than the performance of any individual teacher, staff member, grade level, or content area. Names are not included in the report. However, references to specific roles or positions (e.g., special education coordinator) may be made when necessary for clarity or context.

REPORT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Throughout the evaluation process, SE Team members collaborate before, during, and after the site visit. They consolidate observation notes, focus group feedback, and operational data to ensure a holistic and accurate report.

- The Lead Site Evaluator is responsible for compiling the final draft.
- All SE Team members review the draft to ensure accuracy and alignment with observed

findings.

- The initial draft is emailed directly to the school leader within four to six weeks of the site visit.
- School leaders have seven working days to identify factual inaccuracies, propose corrections, or request a meeting to discuss the findings.
- School leaders may also submit a written response to be included with the final report when it is made public.

The final Site Evaluation Report is distributed to:

- The school leader
- The school's governing board
- The SPCSA Governing Board

It is also publicly posted on the SPCSA website.

STRONG RECOMMENDATIONS & DEFICIENCIES

Per NRS 388A.223, site evaluations must assess student achievement and school performance and must identify deficiencies if present. When a deficiency is identified, the SPCSA is required to create a plan with the charter school to correct it.

The site evaluation report will contain:

1. Recommendations

Recommendations are based on data collected during focus groups, classroom observations, and document review. They intend to offer schools a third-party perspective to support ongoing improvement. These are not mandatory but will be followed up during the next site evaluation.

The site evaluation report may contain two other types of feedback:

2. Strong Recommendations

A strong recommendation indicates a serious concern that requires immediate attention. Schools receiving a strong recommendation must submit a Site Evaluation Response Plan within four weeks of receiving the report. Extensions may be requested in writing. The SE Team will review the plan, meet with school leadership, and collaboratively finalize a course of action, including documented steps and a timeline. See Appendix A (template) and Appendix B (example).

3. Deficiencies

A deficiency indicates a critical issue that must be addressed without delay. Schools must submit a Site Evaluation Response Plan within four weeks, unless a written extension is granted. The same collaborative process is followed with strong recommendations. See Appendix A and B for guidance documents.

FOLLOW-UP MEASURES

Once a Site Evaluation Response Plan is approved, the SE Team will:

- Schedule regular follow-up meetings with school leadership, occurring at least once every three months
- Conduct targeted site visits during the following school year to monitor progress
- Provide feedback and support as the school addresses the identified areas
- Formally close out recommendations once the school provides sufficient evidence of resolution

These follow-up activities ensure transparency, accountability, and continuous improvement.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

NRS 388A.223 states, “Such evaluations must include, without limitation, evaluating pupil achievement and school performance at each campus of the charter school and identifying any deficiencies relating to pupil achievement and school performance. The sponsor shall develop a plan with the charter school to correct any such deficiencies” ([NRS-388A.223i](#)). Plans are developed in cases considered Strong Recommendations or Deficiencies.

SPCSA School Plan for Improvement for a Deficiency or Strong Recommendation

*It is strongly recommended to use your School Performance Plan (SPP) if the same information applies and update the progress to your governing board with the plan.

School Name and Campus	(click to add text)	
Name and Title of School Leaders	(click to add text)	
Date	(click to add text)	
Type of Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong Recommendation <input type="checkbox"/> Deficiency	
<u>SPCSA's recorded strong recommendation and/ or deficiency?</u> For the first meeting, fill out the SMART goal overall plan and the 3-month plan. [SPCSA completes this with the Strong Rec or Deficiency]		
<u>School Solution Response</u> Place the recommendation into a SMART Goal -specific -measurable -attainable -realistic -time-limited	SMART goal(s):	
	Overall Plan: Please provide the overall plan in a clear, concise, well-developed paragraph.	
	3-month plan:	
	6-month update:	
	9-month update:	
	1-year update:	
<u>Who will lead the efforts and support them?</u> leader (task) Ex: Principal (hold parent conferences)		
<u>How will you measure progress?</u> Provide a short narrative and links to tracking systems and spreadsheets		

SPCSA Follow-up Questions and Notes:

APPENDIX B

Example of an Improvement Plan

NRS 388A.223 states, “Such evaluations must include, without limitation, evaluating pupil achievement and school performance at each campus of the charter school and identifying any deficiencies relating to pupil achievement and school performance. The sponsor shall develop a plan with the charter school to correct any such deficiencies” ([NRS-388A.223i](#)). Plans are developed in cases considered Strong Recommendations or Deficiencies.

SPCSA School Plan for Improvement for a Deficiency or Strong Recommendation

*It is strongly recommended to use your School Performance Plan (SPP) if the same information applies and update the progress to your governing board with the plan.

School Name and Campus	(click to add text)
Name and Title of School Leaders	(click to add text)
Date	(click to add text)
Type of Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong Recommendation <input type="checkbox"/> Deficiency
<u>SPCSA’s recorded strong recommendation and/ or deficiency?</u> For the first meeting, fill out the SMART goal , overall plan and the 3-month plan. Reduce chronic absenteeism rates in elementary school.	
<u>School Solution Response</u> Place the recommendation into SMART Goal (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-limited)	SMART goal: ABC Academy will decrease chronic absenteeism rates in ES from 15.6% to 10% from the Fall semester of 2025 to the Spring semester of 2026 as measured by data pulled from Infinite Campus.
	Overall Plan: Please provide the overall plan in a clear, concise, well-developed paragraph. To decrease chronic absenteeism during the 2025–2026 school year, the school will implement a comprehensive plan focused on consistent communication, family engagement, and targeted interventions. Beginning in August 2025, staff will print weekly absence reports by grade level and share them with families during carline, while also launching an incentive program to encourage regular attendance among students and parents. In September, the school will begin home visits and parent conferences for students with significant absences, and for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, staff will make ongoing phone calls to share academic data and discuss the negative impact of chronic absenteeism on achievement. These conversations will also serve as opportunities to coach families by asking how the school can support them and their child. Additionally, the school will educate parents throughout the year using monthly face-to-face meetings and consistent communication via newsletters, Infinite Campus, MyEducationData, and Class Dojo to reinforce the importance of daily attendance
	3-month plan: -(August 2025) Begin printing out absent students by grade level and discussing with families in carline. -(August 2025) Begin incentive program for students and parents. -(September 2025) begin home visits and parent conferences -(Ongoing) Educate parents through monthly face to face meetings, newsletter, and communication through Infinite Campus, MyEducationData, and Class Dojo.
	6-month update:

	9-month update:
	1-year update:
<p><u>Who will lead the efforts and support them?</u> leader (task) Ex: Principal (hold parent conferences)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Principal (roll out plan to staff and hold parent conferences) -Assistant principals (set monthly attendance meetings and collect relevant data, hold parent conferences) -Front office staff (fill in data on tracker daily, make phone calls/ texts) -Attendance clerk (fill in data on tracker daily, make phone calls/ texts, make home visits) -Grade-level lead teachers (lead attendance meeting for the grade level monthly and communicate data with assistant principals) -Department chair leads (lead attendance meeting for the grade level monthly and communicate data with assistant principals) -All teachers on campus (educate parents in their classroom, alert clerks to 2 or more absences each week) -All support staff (Monitor carline for students on attendance list)
<p><u>How will you measure progress?</u> Provide a short narrative and links to tracking systems and spreadsheets.</p>	<p>Progress will be measured by a school-wide attendance data tracker (link), which divides each student into three tiers based on the number of absences each student has and trends in absence data for each student. Progress will also be measured by real- time Infinite Campus data on chronic absenteeism percentages. Final progress will be measured by Nevada School Performance Framework data that is updated in September of 2026.</p>

SPCSA Follow-up Questions and Notes:

APPENDIX C

Distance Education Program of the Nevada Department of Education

Note: Only applicable for those schools that have applied to the Nevada Department of Education to operate their school as a Distance Education School.

*If you have not applied for this through NDE, there is no need to prepare for any items located in this document.

Nevada Department of Education's:

DISTANCE EDUCATION EVALUATION CRITERIA

DISTANCE EDUCATION EVALUATION CRITERIA (FROM THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION/ADULT EDUCATION/DISTANCE LEARNING

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. DATA ELEMENTS & STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS
2. CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION STUDENT SERVICES
3. TARGETED POPULATIONS
4. STAFF
5. COORDINATION & LINKAGES

1 DATA ELEMENTS & STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS
1.1 Program has a functional SIS program that allows students to be enrolled into appropriate classes.
1.2 Students' attendance records are maintained.
1.3 An Individual Alternative Education Plan is in place for each student. Is each student's Plan of Study developed and updated as necessary?
1.4 The school has a schedule that provides the minimum number of minutes for the school day/class time.
1.5 Does the school operate a Distance Education Program as part of the Alternative Education Program of studies?
1.6 The School has written guidelines and policies regarding the distance education program.
1.7 The school operates an Independent Study Program.
1.8 The program has a plan to provide assistance to students having difficulty or not making progress.
1.9 Teachers in all subject areas have proper endorsements or are Alt Ed endorsed.
2 CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
2.1 Instruction includes course assessment adequate to determine that participants have achieved substantial learning goals.
2.2 Teaches essential components of Nevada Academic Content Standards.
2.3 Provides career and technical education courses leading to a competency certificate (if applicable).
2.4 Provides an opportunity to obtain credit for work experience and/or provides career readiness skills curriculum.
2.5 Utilizes blended learning concepts.
2.6 Offers flexible schedules.

2.7	Allows students to pursue credits through independent study.
2.9	Provides the opportunity to enroll in dual-credit courses.
3 STUDENT SERVICES	
3.1	Provides guidance and counseling services.
3.2	Requires participation in intake interview and/or orientation. Requires participation in exit survey/interview.
3.3	Has written discipline policies in place.
3.4	Provides student transportation.
3.5	Aids with access to computers if needed.
3.6	Holds recognition/graduation ceremonies and activities.
4 TARGETED POPULATIONS	
4.1	Collects and disaggregates data on student progress, attendance and success rates, graduation rate, course pass rate, attendance % etc.
4.2	Serves persons with learning disabilities.
4.3	Serves individuals with limited English proficiency.
4.4	Please provide the number of students served in the prior school year by grade level, with the number of diplomas granted.
5 STAFF	
5.1	Staff are adequately supervised to ensure quality instruction.
5.2	Program distributes agency and program information to staff about policies and procedures regarding teacher responsibilities and expectations.
5.3	Staff has the opportunity to participate in appropriate local and state professional development specific to their assignment in an alternative/distance education setting.
6 COORDINATION & LINKAGES	
6.1	Coordinates program with other school district programs.
6.2	Coordinates with business, industry and labor.
7 MANAGEMENT	
7.1	Has access to a facility adequate for teaching and learning and is accessible for all.
7.2	There is an effective strategic plan with measurable outcomes that guides program management and improvements.
7.3	Program has an adequate administrative mechanism that meets regularly and that includes appropriate stakeholders.