Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Developing Innovations in Navajo Education, Inc. (DINE, Inc.)
School Name: Developing Innovations in Navajo Education, Inc. (DINE, Inc.)
Date Submitted: 5/11/13

Required for: Review - Annual Report

Evaluation Completed: 5/14/13, 9/4/13

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) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative did 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 Reading. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading was provided.** **Assessment:** The school is at the beginning stages of developing 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 Reading. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate the implementation of a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Reading was provided.** **Professional Development:** The school is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identifying teacher needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Reading. **At the site visit, although a teacher growth plan with a schedule of activities was provided, it did not demonstrate alignment of teacher learning needs with identified student learning target areas, nor include follow-up and monitoring strategies, and did not provide supportive data or analysis of effectiveness.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*		**I/S**	No narrative and data were submitted for this measure. **Curriculum: No additional documentation to demonstrate a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math was provided at the site visit. The school did provide a Fall 2012 tutoring schedule for Math that documented individual student tutoring hours and AIMS results.** **Instruction: No documentation was provided to demonstrate the school was implementing a plan for monitoring the integration of the standards into instruction in Math.** **Assessment: At the site visit, the school stated that it used teacher created assessments to determine student placement. Evidence of a plan that included clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology as well as data collection from multiple assessments for monitoring and documenting student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math was not provided.** **Professional Development: At the site visit, although a teacher growth plan with a schedule of activities was provided, it did not demonstrate alignment of teacher learning needs with identified student learning target areas, or include follow-up and monitoring strategies, and did not provide supporting documentation or analysis of effectiveness.** **At the site visit, except for the tutoring information, no additional data regarding student growth for students with growth percentiles in the bottom 25% in Math was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*		**I/S**	No narrative and data were submitted for this measure. **Curriculum: No documentation to demonstrate a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading was provided at the site visit.** **Instruction: No documentation was provided to demonstrate the school was implementing a plan for monitoring the integration of the standards into instruction in Reading.** **Assessment: At the site visit, the school stated that it used teacher created assessments to determine student placement. Evidence of a plan that included clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and data collection from multiple assessments was not provided for monitoring and documenting student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading.** **Professional Development: At the site visit, although a teacher growth plan with a schedule of activities was provided, it did not demonstrate alignment of teacher learning needs with identified student learning target areas, or include follow-up and monitoring strategies, and did not provide supporting documentation or analysis of effectiveness.** **At the site visit, no additional data regarding student growth for students with growth percentiles in the bottom 25% in Reading was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative did 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. **At the site visit, no additional documentation was provided to demonstrate implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math was provided. The school did provide a Math tutoring schedule that documented individual student tutoring hours and AIMS results.** **Assessment:** The school is at the beginning stages of developing 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. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math was provided.** **Professional Development:** The school is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identifying 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. **At the site visit, although a teacher growth plan with a schedule of activities was provided, it did not demonstrate alignment of teacher learning needs with identified student learning target areas, or include follow-up and monitoring strategies, and did not provide supporting documentation or analysis of effectiveness.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative did 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. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading was provided.** **Assessment:** The school is at the beginning stages of developing 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. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading was provided.** **Professional Development:** The school is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identifying teacher 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. **At the site visit, although a teacher growth plan with a schedule of activities was provided, it did not demonstrate alignment of teacher learning needs with identified student learning target areas, or include follow-up and monitoring strategies, and did not provide supporting documentation or analysis of effectiveness.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative did not describe efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with 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. **At the site visit, no additional documentation was provided.** **Assessment:** The school is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive 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, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities was provided.** **Professional Development:** The school is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identifying teacher 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, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, very limited additional information was provided to demonstrate a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for subgroups.** No data was submitted for this measure. **At the site visit, no data was provided for this measure.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative did not describe efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with 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, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, no additional documentation was provided.** **Assessment:** The school is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive 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, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities was provided.** **Professional Development:** The school is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identifying teacher 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, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, very limited additional information was provided to demonstrate a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for subgroups.** No data was submitted for this measure. **At the site visit, no data was provided for this measure.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	No narrative and data were submitted for this measure. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Math for ELL students was provided. The school did provide a Fall schedule of tutoring for Math, including participation and AIMS results.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan to monitor the integration of the AZ Academic Standards to increase student proficiency in Math for ELL students was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan to monitor and document student proficiency in Math for ELL students was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	No narrative and data were submitted for this measure. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Reading for ELL students was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan to monitor the integration of the AZ Academic Standards to increase student proficiency in Reading for ELL students was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan to monitor and document student proficiency in Reading for ELL students was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*		**I/S**	No narrative and data were submitted for this measure. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Math for FRL students was provided. The school did provide a Fall schedule of tutoring for Math, including participation and AIMS results.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan to monitor the integration of the AZ Academic Standards to increase student proficiency in Math for FRL students was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan to monitor and document student proficiency in Math for FRL students was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	No narrative and data were submitted for this measure. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Reading for FRL students was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan to monitor the integration of the AZ Academic Standards to increase student proficiency in Reading for FRL students was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan to monitor and document student proficiency in Reading for FRL students was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	No narrative and data were submitted for this measure. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of systems to increase student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan to monitor the integration of the AZ Academic Standards to increase student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan to monitor and document student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	No narrative and data were submitted for this measure. **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan to monitor the integration of the AZ Academic Standards to increase student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a plan to monitor and document student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities was provided.** **At the site visit, no additional documentation to demonstrate implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities was provided.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	**I/S**		**No additional information was provided.**
4a. High School Graduation Rate ***(Traditional and Small Schools)***		**I/S**	The narrative describes limited efforts on the part of the school to implement strategies to ensure students in grades 9-12 graduate on time. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school is increasing the percent of entering ninth graders who graduate from high school in four years. **At the site visit no additional documentation pertaining to graduation rate was provided.** No data was submitted for this measure. **At the site visit, no additional data regarding graduation rate was provided.**