Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: American Leadership Academy, Inc.
School Names: American Leadership Academy (Gilbert), ALA San Tan, ALA Mesa, ALA QC Elem

Date Submitted: 05/7/13
Required for: Expansion - Enrollment Cap, New School Site

Initial Evaluation Completed: 05/28/13
Final Evaluation Completed: 07/02/2013

I = Result after initial evaluation
S = Result after evaluation of information collected from the site visit

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Math*	**S**	**I**	The narrative described systems on a district basis for implementation of curriculum, monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction, assessment, and professional development that contribute to increased student growth in Math. However, data did not demonstrate sufficient progress for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations in 2012, including schools in their first year of operation. **After further review of documentation, benchmark data provided by the charter holder demonstrated sufficient progress in student growth in Math at three of the four elementary campuses.**
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	The narrative described systems on a district basis for implementation of curriculum, monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction, assessment, and professional development that contribute to increased student growth in Reading. However, data did not demonstrate sufficient progress for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations in 2012, including schools in their first year of operation. **After further review of documentation, benchmark data provided by the charter holder demonstrated sufficient progress in student growth in Reading at three of the four elementary campuses.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*	**S**	**I**	The narrative described systems on a district basis for implementation of curriculum, monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction, assessment, and professional development that contribute to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. However, data did not demonstrate sufficient progress for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations in 2012, including schools in their first year of operation. **After further review of documentation, benchmark data provided by the charter holder demonstrated sufficient progress in student growth in Math for students in the lowest 25% in all four elementary campuses.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*	**S**	**I**	The narrative described systems on a district basis for implementation of curriculum, monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction, assessment, and professional development that contribute to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%in Reading. However, data did not demonstrate sufficient progress for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations in 2012, including schools in their first year of operation. **After further review of documentation, benchmark data provided by the charter holder demonstrated student growth in Reading for students in the lowest 25% in all four elementary campuses.**
2a. Percent Passing *Math*	**S**	**I**	The narrative described systems on a district basis for implementation of curriculum, monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction, assessment, and professional development that contribute to increased student proficiency in Math. However, data did not demonstrate sufficient progress for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations in 2012, including schools in their first year of operation. **After further review of documentation, benchmark data provided by the charter holder demonstrated sufficient student proficiency in Math at three of the four elementary campuses.**
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*	**S**	**I**	The narrative described systems on a district basis for implementation of curriculum, monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction, assessment, and professional development that contribute to increased student proficiency in Reading. However, data did not demonstrate sufficient progress for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations in 2012, including schools in their first year of operation. **After further review of documentation, benchmark data provided by the charter holder demonstrated sufficient student proficiency in Reading at the ALA Mesa campus. Both the Gilbert and San Tan Valley campuses met the Board's academic performance expectations for this measure in 2012.**
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*	**S**	**I**	Data was not provided for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations, including schools in their first year of operation, specific to ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math. **After further review of documentation, data provided by the charter holder demonstrates sufficient student proficiency in Math for all four elementary campuses in comparison to expected performance levels.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	Data was not provided for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations, including schools in their first year of operation, specific to ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Reading. **After further review of documentation, data provided by the charter holder demonstrates sufficient student proficiency in Reading at San Tan and Mesa campuses in comparison to expected performance levels. The Gilbert campus met the Board's academic performance expectations for this measure in 2012.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **After further review at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students was demonstrated.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices that contribute to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **Based on review of documentation a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **After further review a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher needs that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **After further review a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students was demonstrated.** Data was not provided for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations, including schools in their first year of operation, specific to student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **After further review of documentation, benchmark data provided by the charter holder demonstrated sufficient progress in student proficiency in Math for ELL students at the Gilbert and Mesa campuses, but did not demonstrate improved student proficiency in Math for ELL students at the San Tan Valley and Queen Creek Elementary campuses.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **After further review at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students was demonstrated.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices that contribute to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **Based on review of documentation a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **After further review a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher needs that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **After further review a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students was demonstrated.** Data was not provided for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations, including schools in their first year of operation, specific to student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **After further review of documentation, benchmark data provided by the charter holder did not demonstrate sufficient progress in student proficiency in Reading for ELL students at any of the four elementary campuses.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **After further review at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for FRL students was demonstrated.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices that contribute to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **Based on review of documentation a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **After further review a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher needs that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **After further review a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students was demonstrated.** Data was not provided for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations, including schools in their first year of operation, specific to student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **At the site visit, the charter holder stated that they do not participate in the Free and Reduced Price Lunch Program, and do not report FRL students for any of the four elementary campuses.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **After further review at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for FRL students was demonstrated.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices that contribute to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **Based on review of documentation a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for FRL students that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **After further review a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for FRL students was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher needs that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **After further review a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students was demonstrated.** Data was not provided for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations, including schools in their first year of operation, specific to student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **At the site visit, the charter holder stated that they do not participate in the Free and Reduced Price Lunch Program, and do not report FRL students for any of the four elementary campuses.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher needs that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **After further review a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was demonstrated.** The narrative described systems on a district basis for implementation of curriculum, monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction, and assessment that contribute to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. However, data did not demonstrate sufficient progress for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations in 2012, including schools in their first year of operation. **After further review of documentation, benchmark data provided by the charter holder demonstrated improved Math proficiency for students with disabilities at the three of the four elementary campuses.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher needs that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **After further review a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities was demonstrated.** The narrative described systems on a district basis for implementation of curriculum, monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction, and assessment that contribute to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. However, data did not demonstrate sufficient progress for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations in 2012, including schools in their first year of operation. **After further review of documentation, benchmark data provided by the charter holder demonstrated sufficient student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities at all four elementary campuses.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	**S**	**I**	The narrative described systems on a district basis for implementation of curriculum, monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction, assessment, and professional development that contribute to meeting student growth and proficiency targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model. However, data did not demonstrate sufficient progress for each site not meeting the Board's academic performance expectations in 2012, including schools in their first year of operation. **After further review at the site visit, the charter holder provided benchmark data that demonstrated that three of the four elementary campuses were making progress towards meeting student growth and proficiency targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model.**