

**NEVADA STATE PUBLIC CHARTER
SCHOOL AUTHORITY
2026-2027 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	3
Site Evaluation Purpose.....	4
Site Evaluation Process.....	8
Evaluation Requirements and Planning Considerations	8
Pre-Site Evaluation Meeting	8
Differentiated Evaluation Process	9
Evaluations for Distance Education Programs.....	9
Charter Networks and Multi-Campus Evaluations	9
Site Evaluation Team Structure	9
Differentiated Site Evaluation Process	10
During the Site Evaluation	13
Arrival and Setup	13
School Presentation.....	13
Focus Groups	14
Classroom Environment and Instruction Observation & Rubric	14
School Leader Debriefing	22
After The Site Evaluation	23
Site Evaluation Report Components.....	23
Report Development Process	23
Recommendations, Strong Recommendations & Deficiencies	24
Follow-Up Measures	25
Appendix A.....	26
Example of Appendix A	28
Appendix C.....	30

Site Evaluation Overview

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. The electronic version of the handbook contains hyperlinks that are both internal and external to this document.

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.

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).

Pre-Visit Call

- The pre-visit call is intended to explain the site evaluation process and promote smooth collaboration between the school leadership and the SPCSA evaluation team. The meeting includes the site evaluation team and, if monitoring is a part of the school visit, the monitoring team.
- The site evaluation process is explained so that leaders know what to expect on the day of the evaluation.
- The call will begin by reviewing the site evaluation process and verifying the date, time, and schedule for the evaluation day, followed by a question-and-answer session with the school leader.
- EMO/CMO representatives or other affiliated vendors may attend as observers only, at the discretion of the school leader.

Site Evaluation Day

School Presentation & Leadership Focus Group

- These sessions will be led by the school leader.
- While EMO/CMO representatives or other affiliated vendors may assist in preparing materials, the expectation is that school leaders conduct the presentation, as they are most familiar with their school.

Classroom Observations

- Classroom observations will be conducted independently by SPCSA evaluators.
- No school staff will accompany evaluators during this process.

Focus Groups (Staff, Parents, Students, Board)

- Participation in focus groups is limited to one designated role per individual. For example, an individual who is both a staff member and a parent may participate in only one focus group based on their designated role.
- EMO/CMO representatives or other affiliated vendors are not permitted to attend.

End-of-Day Debrief

- EMO/CMO representatives may attend the final debrief session with the school leadership team as observers only.

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
- 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.

Site Evaluation Process: Role of EMO/CMO Representatives

The purpose of the site evaluation process is to ensure that the SPCSA collects accurate and unbiased information directly from schools. To preserve the integrity of this process, the primary point of contact will be the school leadership team. This excludes representatives from Charter Management Organizations (CMOs), Education Management Organizations (EMOs), or other affiliated vendors.

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.

- Both the SPCSA School Support and Finance and Operations teams oversee grant and program compliance. By conducting risk assessments of subrecipients and monitoring visits, the SPCSA evaluates compliance with program and fiscal requirements.

- 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
- Performance analysis of the school as reported by the Nevada School Performance Framework
- 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 the school's model as stated within 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
- 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. The 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@spcsa.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 Meeting
2. On-Site Evaluation
3. Post-Site Evaluation and Reporting

The on-site evaluation typically takes one school day, depending on the size, structure, and location of the school. From the on-site evaluation through the completion of the final report, the process generally takes approximately four to six weeks. Final reports are provided to school leadership, the SPCSA Governing Board Chair, and the charter school's governing board chair and are subsequently published on the SPCSA website.

Evaluation Requirements and Planning Considerations

In accordance with NRS 388A.223, the SPCSA SE Team conducts a comprehensive evaluation 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 point of contact.

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 point of contact 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
- 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 a deficiency that remains outstanding
- 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 Criteria](#). (see *Appendix C*).

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 the board focus group, 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

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, current status, and oversight needs. Schools may receive a modified evaluation process if they meet one or more of the following criteria: T

- Operate without a Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) star rating
- Receive a one- or two-star NSPF rating
- Have received a strong recommendation or identified a deficiency during a previous site evaluation that remains in effect
- Are operating under a Notice of Concern, Notice of Breach, or Notice of Termination

The procedures below describe how the site evaluation process is differentiated under each circumstance.

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

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

A. 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.

B. Collaborate on a Response Plan

The Site Evaluation (SE) Team will review the plan, meet with school leadership, and provide feedback. Both the SE Team and school leadership must agree on the action plan, including clear action steps and a defined timeline. (Appendices A and B include a template and sample plan.)

C. Track and Monitor Progress

Each strong recommendation or deficiency is tracked by the SE Team for follow-up and monitoring purposes.

D. 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.

E. Conduct a Follow-Up Site Evaluation

An additional site evaluation will be conducted during the following school year. This evaluation may be abbreviated and may include a review of progress related to the Response Plan.

F. Close Out Open Issues

When sufficient evidence demonstrates that all strong recommendations or deficiencies have been addressed, SPCSA staff will issue written confirmation that the matter has been closed.

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

Schools receiving a one- or two-star rating under 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.

A. Annual Full Site Evaluations

These schools will undergo full site evaluations annually until they achieve a three-star NSPF rating or are no longer subject to the notice.

B. Formal Notification

Affected schools will be notified in writing at the beginning of each academic year.

C. Ongoing Monitoring of Improvement

The purpose of these evaluations is to document and support progress toward improvement in academic, organizational, and financial performance.

III. 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 performance frameworks (academic, organizational, and financial) are eligible for an abbreviated site evaluation during the third or fifth year of their charter term.

Schools in the fifth year of their charter term that are undergoing renewal will receive a full site evaluation regardless of their performance status.

A. Abbreviated Evaluation Process

The primary difference between an abbreviated and a standard site evaluation is the number of

classroom observations. Abbreviated evaluations include approximately half as many classroom observations as a standard site evaluation.

IV. Evaluations for Distance Education Programs

Schools approved to operate a Distance Education Program are evaluated using the protocol established by the Nevada Department of Education's Distance Education Program (see Appendix C).

V. Charter Networks and Multi-Campus Evaluations

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

VI. Site Evaluation Team Structure

Site Evaluation (SE) Teams are composed of SPCSA Authorizing staff and may include observers from other SPCSA divisions. Team composition is determined based on:

- School size and location
- Academic performance
- Fiscal status
- Leadership and governance needs

Team members bring expertise in instruction, governance, fiscal oversight, curriculum, and other relevant areas to ensure a comprehensive, balanced evaluation process.

During the Site Evaluation

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.

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 require 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.

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 to 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 the 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 & Rubric

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 and provide context for and to provide context to the site evaluators when entering a classroom, 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. Classroom observations are not an evaluation of individual teachers. Instead, the SPCSA is looking for the big picture of classroom instruction. 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 classrooms observed will be recorded by each SE Team member.

The rubric below will be used to evaluate classroom instruction during the site evaluation process. Members of the site evaluation team will conduct approximately 15-minute classroom observations throughout the day of the site evaluation and will record both the number of classrooms observed and the level of instructional implementation demonstrated based on the criteria outlined below.

Classroom Environment Classroom Learning Environment is Conducive to Learning				
Distinguished	Highly Proficient	Proficient	Approaching Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Talk between the teacher and students reflects genuine warmth, caring, and sensitivity to all people in the classroom.	The teacher demonstrates strong knowledge of and genuine care for individual students and their interests, experiences, and needs.	Interactions among teachers and students generally show care, though minor friction occasionally occurs.	The quality of interactions between teachers and students, or among students, is uneven, with occasional insensitivity.	Talk between the teacher and the students is generally uncaring or insensitive.
All students exhibit respect for the teacher and contribute high levels of civility amongst the members of the class. All people in the classroom feel valued and comfortable taking intellectual risks.	The majority of students exhibit respect for the teacher, contribute to classroom civility, and feel comfortable taking intellectual risks	Generally, students exhibit respect for the teacher, contribute to the classroom civility, and feel comfortable taking intellectual risks.	Some students exhibit respect for the teacher, partially contribute to the civility within the class, and show a limited willingness to take intellectual risks.	Few students exhibit respect for the teacher, most do not contribute to classroom civility, and students are unwilling to take intellectual risks.
All Students' body language indicates active participation in the learning, enthusiastic engagement, and an eagerness to share what they are learning with the teacher and their classmates.	The majority of students' body language indicates active participation, steady engagement, and a willingness to participate and share what they are learning with the teacher and their classmates.	Student body language generally indicates participation, with several students sharing what they are learning with peers.	Most students' body language indicates disinterest in the learning, or disengagement from classroom activity, leaving few students participating in the learning.	The majority of students' body language indicates disinterest in the learning, or disengagement from classroom activity. The majority of students do not participate in the learning, nor do they share their work.
Total:	Total:	Total:	Total:	Total:
Not Observed [] The criterion was not observed or rated.				

Classroom Environment Establishing a Culture for Learning				
Distinguished	Highly Proficient	Proficient	Approaching Proficient	Unsatisfactory
The teacher communicates a deep, infectious passion for the subject matter, prompting students to ask questions that demonstrate a desire to understand the content deeply.	The teacher clearly communicates the vital importance of the content, conveying a strong conviction that all students can master the material through hard work.	The teacher shows positive engagement with the subject matter, successfully encouraging students to value the content and recognize its importance.	The teacher's energy for the work remains entirely neutral, resulting in a mechanical delivery that fails to convey personal value or enthusiasm for the content.	The teacher conveys that there is little or no purpose for the work, indicating that any reasons for doing it are strictly due to external factors.
The teacher conveys an expectation of exceptionally high levels of effort, inspiring students to maintain high expectations for themselves and their peers.	The teacher establishes a clear expectation of high student effort, pushing students to put in consistent work to master the challenges of the lesson.	The teacher expresses clear, achievable expectations for student achievement and effort, which most students successfully meet through steady application.	The teacher conveys high expectations for only some students, leaving others without the necessary high standards or push for academic growth.	The teacher explicitly conveys to at least some students that the work is too challenging for them, effectively lowering the bar for achievement.
Students exhibit very high levels of pride in their assignments, collaborate proactively to help classmates understand the content, and remain deeply committed to learning.	Students exhibit strong levels of pride in their assignments, putting in consistent effort to complete high-quality work entirely independently.	Students exhibit pride in their assignments and remain committed to completing high-quality work with only minimal guidance from the teacher.	Students exhibit a limited commitment to completing their work on time, showing minimal ownership over the final quality of their products.	Students exhibit little or no pride in their work, showing a complete lack of investment in their assignments or learning goals.
Total:	Total:	Total:	Total:	Total:
Not Observed [] The criterion was not observed or rated.				

Classroom Instruction Communication with Students				
Distinguished	Highly Proficient	Proficient	Approaching Proficient	Unsatisfactory
The teacher's explanation of the learning purpose is exceptionally clear and imaginative, with all students anticipating the lesson's relevance and enthusiastically connecting it to prior knowledge.	The teacher clearly communicates the learning purpose and expectations. The majority of students understand the goals of the lesson and actively connect them to their previous experiences.	The teacher's communication of the learning purpose is generally clear, though minor clarity issues occasionally occur or require slight redirection for a few students.	The teacher's explanation of the learning purpose is uneven or confusing, leaving some students unsure of the expectations or showing limited understanding of the goals.	The teacher's communication regarding the learning purpose is generally unclear, insensitive to student needs, or entirely absent. Students are left confused about expectations.
Explanations of content are vivid, precise and invite intellectual risk-taking. The teacher explicitly models high expectations, and all students confidently apply concepts to their own work.	Explanations of content are clear and accurate. The teacher successfully models concepts, and the majority of students show steady understanding and a willingness to apply the material.	Explanations of content are generally accurate, and teacher modeling allows most students to follow along, with several students successfully applying what they are learning.	Explanations of content are fragmented or partially unclear. Teacher modeling is inconsistent, leaving some students struggling to follow or participate effectively.	Explanations of content are unclear, inaccurate or poorly delivered. The teacher does not model concepts, and the majority of students do not understand or participate in the learning.
The teacher's use of high-quality questions and dialogue spark rich student-led discussion. All students contribute civilly, eagerly build on each other's ideas, and drive their own learning.	The teacher uses effective questioning strategies that prompt meaningful responses. The majority of students actively participate in dialogue and share their thinking with peers and the teacher.	The teacher utilizes questioning to guide dialogue, and student responses generally indicate participation, with several students sharing their thoughts during the lesson.	The teacher's questions are primarily low-level or unevenly directed, resulting in a limited willingness from students to engage in dialogue or take intellectual risks.	The teacher's communication does not invite dialogue, or questions are dismissive. Most students indicate disinterest, and few to no students participate in the discussion.
Total	Total:	Total:	Total:	Total:
Not Observed [] The criterion was not observed or rated.				

Classroom Instruction Using Questions and Discussion Strategies				
Distinguished	Highly Proficient	Proficient	Approaching Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Students autonomously initiate higher-order, open-ended questions designed to challenge thinking and advance the class's collective depth of knowledge.	The teacher regularly poses high-quality, open-ended questions that invite students to think critically, analyze concepts deeply, and analyze multiple valid solutions.	The teacher utilizes a deliberate balance of open-ended and closed questions, successfully prompting student thinking across all areas of the classroom.	The teacher frames some questions designed to promote basic student thinking, but many remain convergent with only a single correct response expected.	Questions are rapid-fire, low-level, and strictly convergent, meaning they are restricted to a single correct answer without students explaining their thinking.
The teacher dynamically builds upon and incorporates authentic student responses to significantly deepen the overall conceptual understanding of the classroom community.	Classroom discussions enable students to talk directly to one another to share perspectives without ongoing or restrictive mediation by the teacher.	The teacher successfully facilitates student-to-student discourse across the room, requiring only occasional mediation, redirecting, or minor teacher scaffolding.	The teacher invites students to respond directly to one another's unique ideas, but very few individuals actually engage or build upon peer comments.	The teacher completely dominates the room or acts as a barrier to dialogue, failing to ask students to explain their reasoning or talk to peers.
Virtually all students are actively, meaningfully engaged in the discussion and/or within groups, autonomously extending and enriching the topic with high investment.	Many students across different groups actively engage in the discussion by contributing their personal thoughts and listening to classmates.	A clear majority of students participate actively in the established question-and-answer routines and whole-class discussions.	The teacher calls on many different students, but only a small, select number of individuals choose to actively voice their thoughts or participate	A few dominant students completely hijack the conversation, leaving the remaining majority of the class entirely uninvolved, passive, or checked out.
Total:	Total:	Total:	Total:	Total:
Not Observed [] The criterion was not observed or rated.				

Classroom Instruction Engaging Students in Learning				
Distinguished	Highly Proficient	Proficient	Approaching Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Virtually all students are deeply, intellectually engaged in the lesson, tackling complex learning tasks that require high-level student thinking and verbal explanations of their reasoning.	Most students are intellectually engaged in the lesson through tasks that offer multiple correct responses or approaches, successfully encouraging higher-order thinking.	A majority of students are engaged with meaningful learning tasks that maintain an appropriate balance between conceptual thinking and procedural operations.	Some students are intellectually engaged in the lesson, but engagement for others is largely passive due to an uneven mix of tasks requiring genuine thinking and rote recall.	Few students are intellectually engaged in the lesson, as the assigned learning tasks, materials, and activities require only simple recall or demand a single correct response.
Students have dedicated, structured opportunities to reflect and find closure on the lesson, successfully consolidating their own individual understanding of the concepts.	Students are consistently invited and expected to thoroughly explain their internal thinking as an integral part of completing tasks.	Students are generally prompted by the teacher to rationalize their answers, ensuring they vocalize some of the logic behind their work.	Students are rarely asked to reflect on or justify their work, allowing them to complete steps without examining their own understanding.	Students receive zero opportunities to explain their thought processes, reflect on the concepts, or seek meaningful closure on what they did.
The pacing of the lesson is highly flexible and dynamically driven by the students' immediate and long-term learning needs and depth of understanding.	The pacing of the lesson provides all students with deliberate, sufficient time based on students' learning needs to be fully and intellectually engaged in the concepts.	An acceptable, steady pace is maintained throughout the entire instructional period, keeping the progression of the lesson moving forward efficiently.	The pacing of the lesson is distinctly uneven, proving suitable in some parts but feeling noticeably rushed or dragging in others, which hinders continuous engagement.	The lesson either drags on excessively or rushes through critical components, completely preventing genuine intellectual engagement from occurring.
Total:	Total:	Total:	Total:	Total:
Not Observed [] The criterion was not observed or rated.				

Classroom Instruction Using Assessment in Instruction				
Distinguished	Highly Proficient	Proficient	Approaching Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Students are fully aware of the criteria for success and actively monitor their own progress against those criteria to adjust their learning behaviors.	The teacher clearly shares the criteria for success and routinely checks student understanding across the room to ensure the group remains on track.	The teacher shares the criteria for success at the beginning of the lesson and checks for basic understanding with a majority of the students.	The teacher monitors student work closely, but focuses heavily on individual completion rather than measuring actual conceptual understanding.	The teacher rarely monitors student understanding or work during the lesson, resulting in zero clarity on whether students are meeting the goals.
Students consistently use specific, timely feedback from the teacher to independently revise, improve, and elevate the quality of their work.	The teacher provides specific, accurate, and timely feedback that clearly guides students on how to take the next concrete steps in their learning.	The teacher provides constructive feedback during the lesson, though it occasionally focuses more on procedural correctness than conceptual growth.	The teacher offers global or vague feedback that lacks the specific details students need to fix mistakes or deepen understanding.	The teacher offers no actionable feedback during the instruction, leaving students entirely unaware of how to correct their errors or improve.
The teacher seamlessly alters the lesson structure in real-time, utilizing an extensive repertoire of strategies to address immediate student misconceptions.	The teacher actively pivots the instructional delivery based on immediate assessment data, successfully clarifying confusion for groups of students.	The teacher adjusts the lesson when a widespread misconception becomes obvious, steering the class back toward the core objectives.	The teacher recognizes that students are struggling but continues forward with the planned lesson, offering only minor individual adjustments.	The teacher ignores obvious student confusion and pushes rigidly through the planned lesson, failing to make any instructional adjustments.
Total:	Total:	Total:	Total:	Total:
Not Observed [] The criterion was not observed or rated.				

School Leader Debriefing

At the conclusion of the site evaluation, typically at the end of the day, the SE Team will conduct a 30–45-minute debriefing with the school leaders 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 site evaluation contact 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 four to six 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: school/ network strengths, challenges, recommendations, strong recommendations (if applicable), and deficiencies (if applicable)
3. Focus Group Summaries
4. Classroom Environment and Instruction Observation Rubric
5. Classroom Observation Comments
6. Measures of progress from the previous site evaluation, if applicable
7. Operational compliance checks: working fire extinguisher, nurse's station, McKenney-Vento poster, evacuation plans in classrooms, food permit, and elevator permit, if applicable
7. 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 point of contact 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 days from the date the initial draft was emailed to identify misspellings, numerical inaccuracies, and factual errors for correction.
- Schools may submit an official written response to the report, which will be included in Appendix A of the final report and made public with the published report.

The final Site Evaluation Report is distributed to:

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

It is also publicly posted on the SPCSA website.

Recommendations, 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.

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	- Strong Recommendation - 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</u> <u>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:

DRAFT

Example of 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	ABC Academy
Name and Title of School Leaders	Dr. Principal// School Administrator & Executive Director
Date	March 1, 2025
Type of Recommendation	- Strong Recommendation - Deficiency
<u>SPCSA’s recorded strong recommendation(s) 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:
--	--

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 Criteria:](#)

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 1. Data elements & student information systems | 4. Targeted populations |
| 2. Curriculum & instruction | 5. Staff |
| 3. Student services | 6. Coordination & linkages |

1	DATA ELEMENTS & STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS
1.1	The program has a functional SIS program that allows students to be enrolled in 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 who have 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.