Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Concordia Charter School
School Name: Concordia Charter School – Navajo Mission
Date Submitted: December 13, 2013
Academic Dashboard: FY13/FY12 (Note: School not in operation for FY13)
I = Result after initial evaluation
S = Result after evaluation of information collected from the site visit

Required for: 4th Year Review
Initial Evaluation Completed: February 26, 2014
Final Evaluation Completed: June 25, 2014

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Saxon Math and ALEKS. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Math. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Math. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments,	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth for Math. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Saxon Math and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Math. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided and does not demonstrate improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources to show increased student growth in Math.	**Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Math based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Core Knowledge. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Reading.	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			Assessment: This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Reading. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth for Reading. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Core Knowledge and Renaissance Learning, and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Reading. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided and does not demonstrate improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources to show increased student growth in Reading.	evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Reading based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Saxon Math and ALEKS. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%. **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Math. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Math. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth for Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Saxon Math and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided and does not demonstrate improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources to show increased student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%.	pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Core Knowledge. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Reading. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Reading. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth for Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Core Knowledge and Renaissance Learning, and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided and does not demonstrate improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources to show increased student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%.	25%.based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
2a. Percent Passing *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Saxon Math and ALEKS. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Math. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Math. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency for Math. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Saxon Math and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math.	instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Core Knowledge. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading. **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Reading.	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			Assessment: This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Reading. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency for Reading. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Core Knowledge and Renaissance Learning, and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading.	plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Saxon Math and ALEKS. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency to expected performance levels for ELL, FRL and student with disabilities in Math as compared to similar schools. **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments.	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Math. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Math. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math for students in one or more of the following categories: ELL, FRL and students with disabilities. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Saxon Math and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math for students in one or more of the following categories: ELL, FRL and students with disabilities.	the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for students in one or more of the following categories: ELL, FRL and students with disabilities based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Core Knowledge. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency to expected performance levels for ELL, FRL and student with disabilities in Math as	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			compared to similar schools. **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Reading. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Reading. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math for students in one or more of the following categories: ELL, FRL and students with disabilities. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Core Knowledge and Renaissance Learning, and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Reading for students in one or more of the following categories: ELL, FRL and students with disabilities.	**Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for students in one or more of the following categories: ELL, FRL and students with disabilities based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Saxon Math and ALEKS. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Math. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Math. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Saxon Math and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** The charter holder stated that they currently serve no children in the ELL subgroup.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. 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.	
2c. Subgroup Comparison ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Core Knowledge. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Reading. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Reading. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			Professional Development: This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Core Knowledge and Renaissance Learning, and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. 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.	of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** The charter holder stated that they currently serve no children in the ELL subgroup.
2c. Subgroup Comparison FRL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Saxon Math and ALEKS. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Math. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Math. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Saxon Math and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students.	**Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
2c. Subgroup Comparison FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Core Knowledge. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Reading. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Reading. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Core Knowledge and Renaissance Learning, and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.	charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
2c. Subgroup Comparison Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Saxon Math and ALEKS. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Math. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Math. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Saxon Math and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. 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. **Data**: No data specific to students with disabilities was provided.	**Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
2c. Subgroup Comparison Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that the school adopted Core Knowledge. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **Instruction:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum aligned to with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes a system to create/adopt, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction**: This area was scored as Approaches. The charter holder provided

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			teachers review student assessments and work on differentiation of instruction. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Reading. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states that student benchmark assessments are completed using STAR Reading. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative states the staff has been trained on Core Knowledge and Renaissance Learning, and that staff in-service is held weekly. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. 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. **Data**: No data specific to students with disabilities was provided.	evidence of monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers through monitoring daily pacing guides aligned to ACCR standards and informal classroom observations, but did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of an approach to monitoring the integration of ACCR standards into instruction and evaluating the instructional practices of teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Meets. The charter holder provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Specifically, the charter holder provided evidence of comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology that includes data collection from multiple assessments. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of a professional development plan that usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** Limited data and analysis was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
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 or meeting targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model.	Limited data and analysis was provided which did not demonstrate that the school is increasing student growth or meeting targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model.