Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Desert Sky Community School, Inc. Required for: Review - Annual Report
School Name: Desert Sky Community School
Date Submitted: 5/7/2013 Date Due: 5/5/2013 Evaluation Completed: 6/21/13; revised 10/25/13

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 a 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. **At the site visit, curriculum maps, pacing guides, curriculum overview, and clearly defined and measurable implementation across the school was presented that demonstrated increased student growth in Math.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, or standards based assessments. 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. **At the site visit, a system to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers was demonstrated by lesson plans, informal classroom observations and teacher evaluations. A Waldorf Curriculum Standards Alignment to Arizona Mathematic Standards document was provided, however no additional documentation to demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction was demonstrated.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly define performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Math. **At the site visit the diagnostic assessment data for Woodcock Johnson was provided as a placement test. A comprehensive assessment system in which data is collected from formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments was not demonstrated. Data review teams and formative data is not used to make instructional decisions.** **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. **At the site visit a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Math was demonstrated through summer intensives, specified trainings, mentor work, and colleague support.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a 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. **At the site visit, curriculum maps, pacing guides, curriculum overview, and clearly defined and measurable implementation across the school was presented that demonstrated increased student growth for the students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, or standards based assessments. 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. **At the site visit, a system to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers was demonstrated by lesson plans, informal classroom observations and teacher evaluations. A Waldorf Curriculum Standards Alignment to Arizona Mathematic Standards document was provided, however no additional documentation to demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction was demonstrated.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly define performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. 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. **At the site visit the diagnostic assessment data for Woodcock Johnson was provided as a placement test. A comprehensive assessment system in which data is collected from formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments was not demonstrated. Data review teams and formative data is not used to make instructional decisions.** **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 for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **At the site visit a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math was demonstrated through summer intensives, specified trainings, mentor work, and colleague support.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a 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. **At the site visit, curriculum maps, pacing guides, curriculum overview, and clearly defined and measurable implementation across the school was presented that demonstrated increased student growth for the students with the growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, or standards based assessments. 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. **At the site visit, a system to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers was demonstrated by lesson plans, informal classroom observations and teacher evaluations. A Waldorf Curriculum Standards Alignment to Arizona Mathematic Standards document was provided, it was stated the charter is in the process of completing one for Reading as well. No additional documentation to demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction was demonstrated for Reading.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly define performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. 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. **At the site visit the diagnostic assessment data for Woodcock Johnson was provided as a placement test. A comprehensive assessment system in which data is collected from formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments was not demonstrated. Data review teams and formative data is not used to make instructional decisions.** **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 for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **At the site visit a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading was demonstrated through summer intensives, specified trainings, mentor work, and colleague support.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a 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. **At the site visit, curriculum maps, pacing guides, curriculum overview, and clearly defined and measurable implementation across the school was presented that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, or standards based assessments. 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. **At the site visit, a system to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers was demonstrated by lesson plans, informal classroom observations and teacher evaluations. A Waldorf Curriculum Standards Alignment to Arizona Mathematic Standards document was provided, however no additional documentation to demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction was demonstrated.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly define performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math. **At the site visit the diagnostic assessment data for Woodcock Johnson, was provided as a placement test. A comprehensive assessment system in which data is collected from formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments was not demonstrated. Data review teams and formative data is not used to make instructional decisions.** **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 plan for professional development that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math. **At the site visit a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math was demonstrated through summer intensives, specified trainings, mentor work, and colleague support.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a 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. **At the site visit, curriculum maps, pacing guides, curriculum overview, and clearly defined and measurable implementation across the school was presented that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, or standards based assessments. 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. **At the site visit, a system to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers was demonstrated by lesson plans, informal classroom observations and teacher evaluations. A Waldorf Curriculum Standards Alignment to Arizona Mathematic Standards document was provided, however no additional documentation to demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction was demonstrated.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly define performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. 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. **At the site visit the diagnostic assessment data for Woodcock Johnson, was provided as a placement test. A comprehensive assessment system in which data is collected from formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments was not demonstrated. Data review teams and formative data is not used to make instructional decisions.** **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. **At the site visit a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities was demonstrated through summer intensives, specified trainings, mentor work, and colleague support.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a 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. **At the site visit, curriculum maps, pacing guides, curriculum overview, and clearly defined and measurable implementation across the school was presented that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, or standards based assessments. 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. **At the site visit, a system to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers was demonstrated by lesson plans, informal classroom observations and teacher evaluations. A Waldorf Curriculum Standards Alignment to Arizona Mathematic Standards document was provided, however no additional documentation to demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction was demonstrated.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly define performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. 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. **At the site visit the diagnostic assessment data for Woodcock Johnson, was provided as a placement test. A comprehensive assessment system in which data is collected from formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments was not demonstrated. Data review teams and formative data is not used to make instructional decisions.** **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. **At the site visit a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students was demonstrated through summer intensives, specified trainings, mentor work, and colleague support.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a 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. **At the site visit, curriculum maps, pacing guides, curriculum overview, and clearly defined and measurable implementation across the school was presented that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, or standards based assessments. 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. **At the site visit, a system to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers was demonstrated by lesson plans, informal classroom observations and teacher evaluations. A Waldorf Curriculum Standards Alignment to Arizona Mathematic Standards document was provided, it was stated the charter is in the process of completing one for Reading as well. No additional documentation to demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction was demonstrated in Reading for ELL students.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly define performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. 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. **At the site visit the diagnostic assessment data for Woodcock Johnson, was provided as a placement test. A comprehensive assessment system in which data is collected from formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments was not demonstrated. Data review teams and formative data is not used to make instructional decisions.** **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. **At the site visit a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students was demonstrated through summer intensives, specified trainings, mentor work, and colleague support.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a 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. **At the site visit, curriculum maps, pacing guides, curriculum overview, and clearly defined and measurable implementation across the school was presented that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, or standards based assessments. 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. **At the site visit, a system to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers was demonstrated by lesson plans, informal classroom observations and teacher evaluations. A Waldorf Curriculum Standards Alignment to Arizona Mathematic Standards document was provided, however no additional documentation to demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction was demonstrated in Math for FRL students.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly define performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. 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. **At the site visit the diagnostic assessment data for Woodcock Johnson, was provided as a placement test. A comprehensive assessment system in which data is collected from formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments was not demonstrated. Data review teams and formative data is not used to make instructional decisions.** **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 FRL students. **At the site visit a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students was demonstrated through summer intensives, specified trainings, mentor work, and colleague support.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a 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. **At the site visit, curriculum maps, pacing guides, curriculum overview, and clearly defined and measurable implementation across the school was presented that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system to monitor and evaluate 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. **At the site visit, a system to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers was demonstrated by lesson plans, informal classroom observations and teacher evaluations. A Waldorf Curriculum Standards Alignment to Arizona Mathematic Standards document was provided, however no additional documentation to demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction was demonstrated in Math for students with disabilities.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly define performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. 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. **At the site visit the diagnostic assessment data for Woodcock Johnson, was provided as a placement test. A comprehensive assessment system in which data is collected from formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments was not demonstrated. Data review teams and formative data is not used to make instructional decisions.** **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 students with disabilities. **At the site visit a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was demonstrated through summer intensives, specified trainings, mentor work, and colleague support.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	**I/S**		