Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Concordia Charter School, Inc.
School Name: Concordia Charter School
Date Submitted: 5/7/13

Required for: Review - Annual Report

Evaluation Completed: 6/14/13; 2/26/2014

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 does not describe efforts to develop or address 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 growth in Math. **This area of the measure scored Meets because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of Math curriculum as adapted by the school and aligned with Core Knowledge including curriculum maps, pacing guides, and lesson plans with standards identified. The school has revised the delivery pattern for Saxon Math in an effort to increase student growth in Math.** **Instruction:** No description was provided. 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 provided the lesson plan review process and sample lesson plans, but no completed walkthrough observations or formal teacher evaluations were provided. The charter holder did provide blank forms for formal and informal teacher evaluations and how CSFs are allocated but no documentation to support that the forms have been used or that there is a process for conducting informal and formal evaluations.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. . The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Math. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided benchmark assessment data reports on growth and instructional planning but did not provide data from other measures the school uses to monitor student growth in Math, including ALEKS Math. There was no evidence of the process the school uses to review and analyze the data to inform instructional decisions.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			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 growth in Math. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of professional development for teachers and staff members aligned with teacher learning needs which included training on implementing the curricular programs aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, training on how to implement the Renaissance Learning STAR Math assessment program and training on implementing ALEKS Math. However, the charter holder did not provide a professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies or focuses on high-quality implementation.** **Limited data provided demonstrated increased results from Fall benchmark administration to Spring administration using STAR Math. Student growth percentiles demonstrated, for the most part, typical growth for the grade level provided.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to develop or address 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 growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **This area of the measure scored Meets because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of Math curriculum as adapted by the school and aligned with Core Knowledge including curriculum maps, pacing guides, and lesson plans with standards identified. The school has revised the delivery pattern for Saxon Math in an effort to increase student growth in Math.** **Instruction:** No description was provided. 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 provided the lesson plan review process and sample lesson plans, but no completed walkthrough observations or formal teacher evaluations were provided. The charter holder did provide blank forms for formal and informal teacher evaluations and how CSFs are allocated but no documentation to support that the forms have been used or that there is a process for conducting informal and formal evaluations.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Assessment: The narrative describes the beginning stages of a comprehensive 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 increases in student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided benchmark assessment data reports on growth and instructional planning but did not provide data from other measures the school uses to monitor student growth in Math for the bottom 25%, including ALEKS Math. There was no evidence of the process the school uses to review and analyze the data to inform instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of professional development for teachers and staff members aligned with teacher learning needs which included training on implementing the curricular programs aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, training on how to implement the Renaissance Learning STAR Math assessment program and training on ALEKS Math program. However, the charter holder did not provide a professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies or focuses on high-quality implementation.** **Limited data provided demonstrated increased results from Fall benchmark administration to Spring administration using STAR Math. Student growth percentiles demonstrated, for the most part, typical growth for the grade level provided. Growth in Math for students in the bottom 25% was not identified.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to develop or address 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 growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **This area of the measure scored Meets because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of Reading curriculum adopted by the school and aligned with Core Knowledge approach including curriculum maps, pacing guides, and lesson plans with standards identified. In addition to Core Knowledge Reading**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			K-3, the school uses Spalding and My Reading Coach. **Instruction:** No description was provided. 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 provided the lesson plan review process and sample lesson plans, but no completed walkthrough observations or formal teacher evaluations were provided. The charter holder did provide blank forms for formal and informal teacher evaluations and how CSFs are allocated but no documentation to support that the forms have been used or that there is a process for conducting informal and formal evaluations.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a comprehensive 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 increases in student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided benchmark assessment data reports on growth and instructional planning but did not provide data from other measures the school uses to monitor student growth in Reading. There was no evidence of the process the school uses to review and analyze the data to inform instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of professional development for teachers and staff members aligned with teacher learning needs which included training on implementing the curricular programs aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, training on how to implement the Renaissance Learning STAR Reading assessment program and training on Spalding. However, the charter holder did not provide a professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies or focuses on high-quality implementation.** **Limited data provided demonstrated increased results from Fall benchmark administration to Spring administration using STAR Reading. Student growth**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			percentiles demonstrated, for the most part, low growth in Reading for the grade level provided.
2a. Percent Passing *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to develop or address 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 Meets because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of Math curriculum as adapted by the school and aligned with Core Knowledge including curriculum maps, pacing guides, and lesson plans with standards identified. The school has revised the delivery pattern for Saxon Math in an effort to increase student growth in Math.** **Instruction:** No description was provided. 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 provided the lesson plan review process and sample lesson plans, but no completed walkthrough observations or formal teacher evaluations were provided. The charter holder did provide blank forms for formal and informal teacher evaluations and how CSFs are allocated but no documentation to support that the forms have been used or that there is a process for conducting informal and formal evaluations.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a comprehensive 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 provided benchmark assessment data reports on growth and instructional planning but did not provide data from other measures the school uses to monitor student proficiency in Math, including ALEKS Math. There was no evidence of the process the school uses to review and analyze the data to inform instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. 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**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of professional development for teachers and staff members aligned with teacher learning needs which included training on implementing the curricular programs aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, training on how to implement the Renaissance Learning STAR Math assessment program and training on ALEKS Math program. However, the charter holder did not provide a professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies or focuses on high-quality implementation. Limited data provided.
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to develop or address 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 Reading. **This area of the measure scored Meets because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of Reading curriculum adopted by the school and aligned with Core Knowledge approach including curriculum maps, pacing guides, and lesson plans with standards identified. In addition to Core Knowledge Reading K-3, the school uses Spalding and My Reading Coach.** **Instruction:** No description was provided. 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 provided the lesson plan review process and sample lesson plans, but no completed walkthrough observations or formal teacher evaluations were provided. The charter holder did provide blank forms for formal and informal teacher evaluations and how CSFs are allocated but no documentation to support that the forms have been used or that there is a process for conducting informal and formal evaluations.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a comprehensive 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 provided benchmark assessment data reports on growth and instructional planning but did not provide data from other measures the school uses to monitor student proficiency in Reading. There was no evidence of the process the school uses to**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			review and analyze the data to inform instructional decisions. **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of professional development for teachers and staff members aligned with teacher learning needs which included training on implementing the curricular programs aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, training on how to implement the Renaissance Learning STAR Reading assessment program and training on Spalding. However, the charter holder did not provide a professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies or focuses on high-quality implementation.** Limited data provided. **Limited data provided at the site visit demonstrated increased results from Fall 2012 benchmark administration to Spring 2013 administration using STAR Reading. Student proficiency data provided by the school demonstrated mixed results from 2011 to 2012 AIMS in Reading.**
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative and data 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 Meets because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of Math curriculum as adapted by the school and aligned with Core Knowledge including curriculum maps, pacing guides, and lesson plans with standards identified. The school has revised the delivery pattern for Saxon Math in an effort to increase student growth in Math.** **Instruction:** No description was provided.. 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 provided the lesson plan review process and sample lesson plans, but no completed walkthrough observations or formal teacher evaluations were provided. The charter holder did provide blank forms for formal and informal teacher evaluations and how CSFs are allocated but no documentation to support that the forms have been used or that**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			there is a process for conducting informal and formal evaluations. **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a comprehensive 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 for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided benchmark assessment data reports on growth and instructional planning but did not provide data from other measures the school uses to monitor student proficiency in Math, including ALEKS Math. There was no evidence of the process the school uses to review and analyze the data to inform instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. 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 provided evidence of professional development for teachers and staff members aligned with teacher learning needs which included training on implementing the curricular programs aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, training on how to implement the Renaissance Learning STAR Math assessment program and training on ALEKS Math program. However, the charter holder did not provide a professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies or focuses on high-quality implementation.** Limited data provided.
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with 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 Meets because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of Reading curriculum adopted by the school and aligned with Core Knowledge approach including curriculum maps, pacing guides, and lesson plans with standards identified. In addition to Core Knowledge Reading K-3, the school uses Spalding and My Reading Coach.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Instruction: No description was provided. 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 provided the lesson plan review process and sample lesson plans, but no completed walkthrough observations or formal teacher evaluations were provided. The charter holder did provide blank forms for formal and informal teacher evaluations and how CSFs are allocated but no documentation to support that the forms have been used or that there is a process for conducting informal and formal evaluations.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a comprehensive 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 provided benchmark assessment data reports on growth and instructional planning but did not provide data from other measures the school uses to monitor student proficiency in Reading. There was no evidence of the process the school uses to review and analyze the data to inform instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. 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 provided evidence of professional development for teachers and staff members aligned with teacher learning needs which included training on implementing the curricular programs aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, training on how to implement the Renaissance Learning STAR Reading assessment program and training on Spalding. However, the charter holder did not provide a professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies or focuses on high-quality implementation.** Limited data provided. **Limited data provided at the site visit demonstrated increased results from Fall 2012 benchmark administration to Spring 2013 administration using STAR Reading. Student proficiency data provided by the school**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			demonstrated mixed results from 2011 to 2012 AIMS in Reading.
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative and data 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 Meets because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of Math curriculum as adapted by the school and aligned with Core Knowledge including curriculum maps, pacing guides, and lesson plans with standards identified. The school has revised the delivery pattern for Saxon Math in an effort to increase student growth in Math.** **Instruction:** No description was provided. 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 provided the lesson plan review process and sample lesson plans, but no completed walkthrough observations or formal teacher evaluations were provided. The charter holder did provide blank forms for formal and informal teacher evaluations and how CSFs are allocated but no documentation to support that the forms have been used or that there is a process for conducting informal and formal evaluations.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a comprehensive 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 for ELL students. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided benchmark assessment data reports on growth and instructional planning but did not provide data from other measures the school uses to monitor student proficiency in Math for ELL students, including ALEKS Math. There was no evidence of the process the school uses to review and analyze the data to inform instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			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 provided evidence of professional development for teachers and staff members aligned with teacher learning needs which included training on implementing the curricular programs aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, training on how to implement the Renaissance Learning STAR Math assessment program and training on ALEKS Math program. However, the charter holder did not provide a professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies or focuses on high-quality implementation.** No data specific to ELL students provided.
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **This area of the measure scored Meets because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of Math curriculum as adapted by the school and aligned with Core Knowledge including curriculum maps, pacing guides, and lesson plans with standards identified. The school has revised the delivery pattern for Saxon Math in an effort to increase student growth in Math.** **Instruction:** No description was provided. 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 provided the lesson plan review process and sample lesson plans, but no completed walkthrough observations or formal teacher evaluations were provided. The charter holder did provide blank forms for formal and informal teacher evaluations and how CSFs are allocated but no documentation to support that the forms have been used or that there is a process for conducting informal and formal evaluations.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a comprehensive 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 for FRL students. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided benchmark assessment data reports on growth and instructional planning but did not provide data from other measures the school uses to monitor student**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			proficiency in Math, including ALEKS Math. There was no evidence of the process the school uses to review and analyze the data to inform instructional decisions. **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. 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 FRL students. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of professional development for teachers and staff members aligned with teacher learning needs which included training on implementing the curricular programs aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, training on how to implement the Renaissance Learning STAR Math assessment program and training on ALEKS Math program. However, the charter holder did not provide a professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies or focuses on high-quality implementation.** **Limited data provided demonstrated increased results from Fall benchmark administration to Spring administration using STAR Reading. Student growth percentiles demonstrated, for the most part, low growth in Reading for the grade level provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with 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 students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Meets because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of Reading curriculum adopted by the school and aligned with Core Knowledge approach including curriculum maps, pacing guides, and lesson plans with standards identified. In addition to Core Knowledge Reading K-3, the school uses Spalding and My Reading Coach.** **Instruction:** No description was provided. 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 provided the lesson plan review process and sample lesson plans, but no completed walkthrough observations or formal teacher evaluations were provided. The charter holder did provide blank forms for formal and informal teacher evaluations and how CSFs are**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			allocated but no documentation to support that the forms have been used or that there is a process for conducting informal and formal evaluations. **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a comprehensive 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 FRL students. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided benchmark assessment data reports on growth and instructional planning but did not provide data from other measures the school uses to monitor student proficiency in Reading. There was no evidence of the process the school uses to review and analyze the data to inform instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. 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 FRL students. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of professional development for teachers and staff members aligned with teacher learning needs which included training on implementing the curricular programs aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, training on how to implement the Renaissance Learning STAR Reading assessment program and training on Spalding. However, the charter holder did not provide a professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies or focuses on high-quality implementation.** **Limited data provided at the site visit demonstrated increased results from Fall 2012 benchmark administration to Spring 2013 administration using STAR Reading. Student proficiency data provided by the school demonstrated mixed results from 2011 to 2012 AIMS in Reading.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards The narrative and data 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 Meets because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of Math curriculum as adapted by the school and aligned with Core Knowledge including curriculum maps, pacing guides, and lesson plans with standards identified. The school has revised the delivery pattern for Saxon Math in**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			an effort to increase student growth in Math. **Instruction:** No description was provided. 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 provided the lesson plan review process and sample lesson plans, but no completed walkthrough observations or formal teacher evaluations were provided. The charter holder did provide blank forms for formal and informal teacher evaluations and how CSFs are allocated but no documentation to support that the forms have been used or that there is a process for conducting informal and formal evaluations.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. The narrative and data 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 provided benchmark assessment data reports on growth and instructional planning but did not provide data from other measures the school uses to monitor student proficiency in Math, including ALEKS Math. There was no evidence of the process the school uses to review and analyze the data to inform instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. 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 students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of professional development for teachers and staff members aligned with teacher learning needs which included training on implementing the curricular programs aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, training on how to implement the Renaissance Learning STAR Math assessment program and training on ALEKS Math program. However, the charter holder did not provide a professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies or focuses on high-quality implementation.** Limited data provided.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with 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 students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Meets because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of Reading curriculum adopted by the school and aligned with Core Knowledge approach including curriculum maps, pacing guides, and lesson plans with standards identified. In addition to Core Knowledge Reading K-3, the school uses Spalding and My Reading Coach.** **Instruction:** No description was provided. 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 provided the lesson plan review process and sample lesson plans, but no completed walkthrough observations or formal teacher evaluations were provided. The charter holder did provide blank forms for formal and informal teacher evaluations and how CSFs are allocated but no documentation to support that the forms have been used or that there is a process for conducting informal and formal evaluations.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. The narrative and data 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 provided benchmark assessment data reports on growth and instructional planning but did not provide data from other measures the school uses to monitor student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. There was no evidence of the process the school uses to review and analyze the data to inform instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum. 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 students with disabilities. **This area of the measure scored Approaches because, at the site visit, the charter holder provided evidence of professional development for teachers and staff members aligned with teacher learning needs. Activities included training on**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			implementing the curricular programs aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, training on how to implement the Renaissance Learning STAR Reading assessment program, training on Spalding, and professional development to support students with disabilities. However, the charter holder did not provide a professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies or focuses on high-quality implementation. Limited data provided. **No additional data specific to students with disabilities was provided.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System		**I/S**	The narrative and data 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. **The school's letter grade dropped from C in 2012 to D in 2013.**