Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Children's Success Academy, Inc.
School Name: Children's Success Academy
Date Submitted: 5/10/2013

Required for: Review - Annual Report

Evaluation Completed: 2/14/2014

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*		I/S	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The charter holder was in the process of developing curriculum maps aligned with the standards but the maps were not complete. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, pacing guides, a formal process for instructional materials adoption, data review teams, clearly defined and measurable implementation of the curriculum across the school or any other system that contributes to increased student growth in Math.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate instructional practices of the teachers in relation to the standards. The charter holder did provide evidence of teacher evaluation but was unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments or other indicators of an effective monitoring system that contribute to increased growth in Math.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher needs. The narrative provided did not

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Math. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was unable to provide evidence of a comprehensive plan aligned with teacher learning needs and focused on improving student growth in math. The school did provide evidence of sign-in sheets, agendas, and materials from trainings but no evidence of a clearly defined professional development plan for improving growth in Math. There was no evidence of a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.**
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The charter holder was in the process of developing curriculum maps aligned with the standards but the maps were not complete. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, pacing guides, a formal process for instructional materials adoption, data review teams, clearly defined and measurable implementation of the curriculum across the school or any other system that contributes to increased student growth in Reading.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate instructional practices of the teachers in relation to the standards. The charter holder did provide evidence of teacher evaluation but was unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments or other indicators of an effective monitoring system that contribute to increased growth in Reading.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			development plan based on identified teacher needs. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Reading. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was unable to provide evidence of a comprehensive plan aligned with teacher learning needs and focused on improving student growth in Reading. The school did provide evidence of sign-in sheets, agendas, and materials from trainings but no evidence of a clearly defined professional development plan for improving growth in Reading. There was no evidence of a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*		**I/S**	**Did not address this measure in the narrative. No additional information was provided at the site visit.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*		**I/S**	**Did not address this measure in the narrative. No additional information was provided at the site visit.**
2a. Percent Passing *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The charter holder was in the process of developing curriculum maps aligned with the standards but the maps were not complete. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, pacing guides, a formal process for instructional materials adoption, data review teams, clearly defined and measurable implementation of the curriculum across the school or any other system that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate instructional practices of the teachers in relation to the standards. The charter holder did provide evidence of teacher evaluation but was unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments or other indicators of an effective monitoring system that contribute to increased proficiency in Math.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Renaissance Learning STAR Math diagnostic and progress monitoring reports but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or data and analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Math.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for professional development that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was unable to provide evidence of a comprehensive plan aligned with teacher learning needs and focused on improving student proficiency in Math. The school did provide evidence of sign-in sheets, agendas, and materials from trainings but no evidence of a clearly defined professional development plan for improving Math performance. There was no evidence of a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.** Limited data provided. **No additional data to demonstrate proficiency in Math was provided at the site visit. No data analysis was provided.**
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Reading. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The charter holder was in the process of developing curriculum maps aligned with the standards but the maps were not complete. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, pacing guides, a formal process for instructional materials adoption, data review teams, clearly defined and measurable implementation of the curriculum across the school or any other system that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate instructional practices of the teachers in relation to the standards. The charter holder did provide evidence of teacher evaluation but was unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments or other indicators of an effective monitoring system that contribute to increased proficiency in Reading.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Renaissance Learning STAR Reading diagnostic and progress monitoring reports but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or data and analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Reading.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for professional development that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			unable to provide evidence of a comprehensive plan aligned with teacher learning needs and focused on improving student proficiency in Reading. The school did provide evidence of sign-in sheets, agendas, and materials from trainings but no evidence of a clearly defined professional development plan for improving Reading performance. There was no evidence of a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. Limited data provided. **No additional data to demonstrate proficiency in Reading was provided at the site visit. No data analysis was provided.**
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The charter holder was in the process of developing curriculum maps aligned with the standards but the maps were not complete. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, pacing guides, a formal process for instructional materials adoption, data review teams, clearly defined and measurable implementation of the curriculum across the school or any other system that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for all grades and subgroups.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe the monitoring and evaluating of standards and instructional practices. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate instructional practices of the teachers in relation to the standards. The charter holder did provide evidence of teacher evaluation but was unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments or other indicators of an effective monitoring system that contribute to increased proficiency for all grade levels and subgroups in Math.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe an assessment system based on clearly

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			defined performance measures. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Renaissance Learning STAR Math diagnostic and progress monitoring reports but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or data and analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Math.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was unable to provide evidence of a comprehensive plan aligned with teacher learning needs and focused on improving student proficiency in Math. The school did provide evidence of sign-in sheets, agendas, and materials from trainings but no evidence of a clearly defined professional development plan for improving Math performance. There was no evidence of a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.** No data was provided for this measure. **No additional data or analysis was provided.**
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The charter holder was in the process of developing curriculum maps aligned with the standards but the maps were not complete. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, pacing guides, a formal process for instructional materials adoption, data review teams, clearly defined and measurable implementation of the curriculum across the school or any other system that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for all grades and subgroups.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Instruction: The narrative does not describe the monitoring and evaluating of standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate instructional practices of the teachers in relation to the standards. The charter holder did provide evidence of teacher evaluation but was unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments or other indicators of an effective monitoring system that contribute to increased proficiency in Reading for all grades and subgroups.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Renaissance Learning STAR Reading diagnostic and progress monitoring reports but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or data and analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Reading.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was unable to provide evidence of a comprehensive plan aligned with teacher learning needs and focused on improving student proficiency in Reading. The school did provide evidence of sign-in sheets, agendas, and materials from trainings but no evidence of a clearly defined professional development plan for improving Reading performance. There was no evidence of a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.** No data was provided for this measure. **No additional data or analysis was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards. The provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The charter holder was in the process of developing curriculum maps aligned with the standards but the maps were not complete. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, pacing guides, a formal process for instructional materials adoption, data review teams, clearly defined and measurable implementation of the curriculum across the school or any other system that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for English Language Learners.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe the monitoring and evaluating of standards and instructional practices. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate instructional practices of the teachers in relation to the standards. The charter holder did provide evidence of teacher evaluation but was unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments or other indicators of an effective monitoring system that contribute to increased proficiency in Math for English Language Learners.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Renaissance Learning STAR Math diagnostic and progress monitoring reports but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or data and analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Math for English Language Learners.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was unable to provide evidence of a plan aligned with teacher learning needs and focused on improving ELL student proficiency in Math. The school did provide evidence of sign-in sheets, agendas, and materials from trainings and teachers stated they have had SEI training but no evidence of a clearly defined professional development plan for improving proficiency in Math for ELL. There was no evidence of a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.** No data was provided for this measure. **No additional data or analysis was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The charter holder was in the process of developing curriculum maps aligned with the standards but the maps were not complete. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, pacing guides, a formal process for instructional materials adoption, data review teams, clearly defined and measurable implementation of the curriculum across the school or any other system that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for English Language Learners.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe the monitoring and evaluating of standards and instructional practices. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate instructional practices of the teachers in relation to the standards. The charter holder did provide evidence of teacher evaluation but was unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments or other indicators of an effective monitoring system that contribute to increased proficiency in Reading for English Language Learners.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Assessment: The narrative does not describe an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Renaissance Learning STAR Reading diagnostic and progress monitoring reports but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or data and analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Reading.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was unable to provide evidence of a plan aligned with teacher learning needs and focused on improving ELL student proficiency in Reading. The school did provide evidence of sign-in sheets, agendas, and materials from trainings and teachers stated they have had SEI training but no evidence of a clearly defined professional development plan for improving proficiency in Reading for ELL students. There was no evidence of a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.** No data was provided for this measure. **No additional data or analysis was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Did not address this measure in the narrative.** **Curriculum: This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The charter holder was in the process of developing curriculum maps aligned with the standards but the maps were not complete. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, pacing guides, a formal process for instructional materials adoption, data review teams, clearly defined and measurable implementation of the curriculum across the school or any other system that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Instruction: This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate instructional practices of the teachers in relation to the standards. The charter holder did provide evidence of teacher evaluation but was unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments or other indicators of an effective monitoring system that contribute to increased proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **Assessment: This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Renaissance Learning STAR Reading diagnostic and progress monitoring reports but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or data and analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Reading for FRL students.** **Professional Development: This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was unable to provide evidence of a plan aligned with teacher learning needs and focused on improving student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. The school did provide evidence of sign-in sheets, agendas, and materials from trainings but no evidence of a clearly defined professional development plan to improve performance in Reading. There was no evidence of a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.** No data was provided for this measure. **No separate data for this subgroup since almost all students at the school are FRL eligible.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The charter holder was in the process of developing curriculum maps aligned with the standards but the maps were not complete. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, pacing guides, a formal process for instructional materials adoption, data review teams, clearly defined and measurable implementation of the curriculum across the**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			school or any other system that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe the monitoring and evaluating of standards and instructional practices. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate instructional practices of the teachers in relation to the standards. The charter holder did provide evidence of teacher evaluation but was unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments or other indicators of an effective monitoring system that contribute to increased proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Renaissance Learning STAR Math diagnostic and progress monitoring reports but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or data and analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Math for students with disabilities.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was unable to provide evidence of a plan aligned with teacher learning needs and focused on improving proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. The school did provide evidence of sign-in sheets, agendas, and materials from trainings but no evidence of a clearly defined professional development plan to improve performance in Math for students with disabilities. There was no evidence of a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			No data was provided for this measure. **No additional data or analysis was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The charter holder was in the process of developing curriculum maps aligned with the standards but the maps were not complete. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, pacing guides, a formal process for instructional materials adoption, data review teams, clearly defined and measurable implementation of the curriculum across the school or any other system that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe the monitoring and evaluating of standards and instructional practices. The narrative did not describe a process for formal evaluations of teachers. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate instructional practices of the teachers in relation to the standards. The charter holder did provide evidence of teacher evaluation but was unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments or other indicators of an effective monitoring system that contribute to increased proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Renaissance Learning STAR Reading diagnostic and progress monitoring reports that were**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or data and analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Reading for students with disabilities. **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was unable to provide evidence of a plan aligned with teacher learning needs and focused on improving proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. The school did provide evidence of sign-in sheets, agendas, and materials from trainings but no evidence of a clearly defined professional development plan to improve performance in Reading for students with disabilities. There was no evidence of a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.** No data was provided for this measure. **No additional data or analysis was provided.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System		**I/S**	The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school is increasing student growth and proficiency or meeting targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model. **No additional information or data was provided for this measure.**