Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: International Charter School of Arizona, Inc.
School Name: International Charter School of Arizona
Date Submitted: August 13, 2014
Academic Dashboard: FY 2013

Required for: Expansion Request – New Site
Initial Evaluation Completed: August 14, 2014
Final Evaluation Completed: September 4, 2014

I = Result after initial evaluation
S = Result after evaluation of information collected from the site visit

			Initial Evaluation	Final Evaluation
Measure	**Acceptable**	**Not Acceptable**	**Comments**	**Comments**
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes minimally the processes to create, evaluate, and revise curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready (ACCR) Standards, evidenced by curriculum maps and data review teams. The narrative provided describes processes that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student growth in Math on ACCR Standards because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of a fragmented approach that the school uses 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 is initially scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative describes minimally the processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, and informal classroom observations. The narrative provided describes approaches that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers, and provide some analysis and feedback to further develop the system which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided minimal evidence of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes an	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with ACCR Standards. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan.

			assessment approach which includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided describes an approach that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student growth on ACCR Standards for Math because the narrative does not describe a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes a professional development approach that focuses on areas of high importance. The narrative describes a plan that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student growth in Math because the narrative does not describe a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, and supports high quality implementation which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** Limited data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Math. Data must demonstrate improvement as compared to prior years.	**Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Math as compared to prior years.
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes minimally the processes to create, evaluate, and revise curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards, evidenced by curriculum maps and data review teams. The narrative provided describes processes that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student growth in Reading on ACCR Standards because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of a fragmented approach that the school uses 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 is initially scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative describes minimally the processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction and	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with ACCR Standards. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student

			evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, and informal classroom observations. The narrative provided describes approaches that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Reading because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers, and provide some analysis and feedback to further develop the system which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided minimal evidence of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes an assessment approach which includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided describes an approach that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student growth on ACCR Standards for Reading because the narrative does not describe a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes a professional development approach that focuses on areas of high importance. The narrative describes a plan that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student growth in Reading because the narrative does not describe a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, and supports high quality implementation which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** Limited data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Reading. Data must demonstrate improvement as compared to prior years.	proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Reading as compared to prior years.

1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes minimally the processes to create, evaluate, and revise curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards, evidenced by curriculum maps and data review teams, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of students in the bottom 25%. The narrative provided describes processes that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student growth in Math on ACCR Standards for students in the bottom 25% because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math for students in the bottom 25%. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of a fragmented approach that the school uses 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 is initially scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative describes minimally the processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, and informal classroom observations. The narrative provided describes approaches that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math for students in the bottom 25% because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers, and provide some analysis and feedback to further develop the system, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of students in the bottom 25%, which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided minimal evidence of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes an assessment approach which includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of students in the bottom 25%. The narrative provided describes an approach that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student growth on ACCR Standards for Math for students in the bottom 25% because the narrative does not describe a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with ACCR Standards. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Math as compared to prior years for students in the bottom 25%.

			curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes a professional development approach that focuses on areas of high importance. The narrative describes a plan that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student growth in Math for students in the bottom 25% because the narrative does not describe a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of students in the bottom 25%, which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Math for students in the bottom 25%. Data must be disaggregated for the students in the bottom 25% and must demonstrate improvement as compared to prior years.	
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*		**I/S**	This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes minimally the processes to create, evaluate, and revise curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards, evidenced by curriculum maps and data review teams, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of students in the bottom 25%. The narrative provided describes processes that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student growth in Reading on ACCR Standards for students in the bottom 25% because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading for students in the bottom 25%. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of a fragmented approach that the school uses 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 is initially scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative describes minimally the processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, and informal classroom observations. The narrative provided describes approaches that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Reading for students in the bottom 25% because the narrative does not	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with ACCR Standards. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that

			describe a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers, and provide some analysis and feedback to further develop the system, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of students in the bottom 25%, which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided minimal evidence of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes an assessment approach which includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of students in the bottom 25%. The narrative provided describes an approach that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student growth on ACCR Standards for Reading for students in the bottom 25% because the narrative does not describe a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes a professional development approach that focuses on areas of high importance. The narrative describes a plan that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student growth in Reading for students in the bottom 25% because the narrative does not describe a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of students in the bottom 25%, which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Reading for students in the bottom 25%. Data must be disaggregated for the students in the bottom 25% and must demonstrate improvement as compared to prior years.	contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Reading as compared to prior years for students in the bottom 25%.

2a. Percent Passing *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes minimally the processes to create, evaluate, and revise curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready (ACCR) Standards, evidenced by curriculum maps and data review teams. The narrative provided describes processes that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Math on ACCR Standards because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of a fragmented approach that the school uses 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 is initially scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative describes minimally the processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, and informal classroom observations. The narrative provided describes approaches that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers, and provide some analysis and feedback to further develop the system which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided minimal evidence of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes an assessment approach which includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided describes an approach that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Math because the narrative does not describe a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes a professional development approach that focuses on areas of high importance.	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with ACCR Standards. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math as compared to prior years.

			The narrative describes a plan that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Math because the narrative does not describe a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, and supports high quality implementation which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** Limited data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math. Data must demonstrate improvement as compared to prior years.	
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes minimally the processes to create, evaluate, and revise curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards, evidenced by curriculum maps and data review teams. The narrative provided describes processes that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Reading on ACCR Standards because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of a fragmented approach that the school uses 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 is initially scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative describes minimally the processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, and informal classroom observations. The narrative provided describes approaches that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Reading because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers, and provide some analysis and feedback to further develop the system which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided minimal evidence of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes an assessment approach which includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with ACCR Standards. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student

			formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided describes an approach that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Reading because the narrative does not describe a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes a professional development approach that focuses on areas of high importance. The narrative describes a plan that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Reading because the narrative does not describe a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, and supports high quality implementation which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** Limited data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading. Data must demonstrate improvement as compared to prior years.	proficiency in Reading as compared to prior years.
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes minimally the processes to create, evaluate, and revise curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards, evidenced by curriculum maps and data review teams, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of subgroups. The narrative provided describes processes that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Math on ACCR Standards for subgroups because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for subgroups. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of a fragmented approach that the school uses 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 is initially scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative describes minimally the processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction and	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with ACCR Standards. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter

			evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, and informal classroom observations. The narrative provided describes approaches that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math for subgroups because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers, and provide some analysis and feedback to further develop the system, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of subgroups, which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided minimal evidence of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes an assessment approach which includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of subgroups. The narrative provided describes an approach that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Math for subgroups because the narrative does not describe a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes a professional development approach that focuses on areas of high importance. The narrative describes a plan that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Math for subgroups because the narrative does not describe a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of subgroups, which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student	Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math as compared to prior years for students with disabilities.

			proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. Data must be disaggregated for the students in the students with disabilities subgroup and must demonstrate improvement as compared to prior years. The narrative describes that the school has not served any ELL students or FRL students in FY 13 and FY 14.	
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*		**I/S**	This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes minimally the processes to create, evaluate, and revise curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards, evidenced by curriculum maps and data review teams, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of subgroups. The narrative provided describes processes that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Reading on ACCR Standards for subgroups because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for subgroups. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of a fragmented approach that the school uses 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 is initially scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative describes minimally the processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, and informal classroom observations. The narrative provided describes approaches that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Reading for subgroups because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers, and provide some analysis and feedback to further develop the system, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of subgroups, which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided minimal evidence of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes an assessment approach which includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of subgroups. The narrative provided describes an approach that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Reading for subgroups because the narrative does not describe a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with ACCR Standards. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading as compared to prior years for students with disabilities.

			curriculum and instructional methodology which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes a professional development approach that focuses on areas of high importance. The narrative describes a plan that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Reading for subgroups because the narrative does not describe a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of subgroups, which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. Data must be disaggregated for the students in the students with disabilities subgroup and must demonstrate improvement as compared to prior years. The narrative describes that the school has not served any ELL students or FRL students in FY 13 and FY 14.	
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*	**n/a**		**The narrative describes that the school has not served any ELL students in FY 13 and FY 14.**	**The narrative describes that the school has not served any ELL students in FY 13 and FY 14.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*	**n/a**		**The narrative describes that the school has not served any ELL students in FY 13 and FY 14.**	**The narrative describes that the school has not served any ELL students in FY 13 and FY 14.**

2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*	**n/a**		**The narrative describes that the school has not served any FRL students in FY 13 and FY 14.**	**The narrative describes that the school has not served any FRL students in FY 13 and FY 14.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*	**n/a**		**The narrative describes that the school has not served any FRL students in FY 13 and FY 14.**	**The narrative describes that the school has not served any FRL students in FY 13 and FY 14.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes minimally the processes to create, evaluate, and revise curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards, evidenced by curriculum maps and data review teams, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of students with disabilities. The narrative provided describes processes that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Math on ACCR Standards for students with disabilities because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of a fragmented approach that the school uses 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 is initially scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative describes minimally the processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, and informal classroom observations. The narrative provided describes approaches that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math for students with disabilities because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers, and provide some analysis and feedback to further develop the system, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of students with disabilities, which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided minimal evidence of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices.	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with ACCR Standards. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student

			Assessment: This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes an assessment approach which includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of students with disabilities. The narrative provided describes an approach that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Math for students with disabilities because the narrative does not describe a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes a professional development approach that focuses on areas of high importance. The narrative describes a plan that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities because the narrative does not describe a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of students with disabilities, which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. Data must be disaggregated for the students in the students with disabilities subgroup and must demonstrate improvement as compared to prior years.	proficiency in Math as compared to prior years for students with disabilities.
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes minimally the processes to create, evaluate, and revise curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards, evidenced by curriculum maps and data review teams, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of students with disabilities. The narrative provided describes processes that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Reading on ACCR Standards for students with disabilities because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with ACCR Standards. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of the

			contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of a fragmented approach that the school uses 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 is initially scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative describes minimally the processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, and informal classroom observations. The narrative provided describes approaches that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Reading for students with disabilities because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers, and provide some analysis and feedback to further develop the system, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of students with disabilities, which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided minimal evidence of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes an assessment approach which includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of students with disabilities. The narrative provided describes an approach that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Reading for students with disabilities because the narrative does not describe a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes a professional development approach that focuses on areas of high importance. The narrative describes a plan that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities because the narrative does not describe a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is	beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading as compared to prior years for students with disabilities.

			adapted to meet the needs of students with disabilities, which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. Data must be disaggregated for the students in the students with disabilities subgroup and must demonstrate improvement as compared to prior years.	
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes minimally the processes to create, evaluate, and revise curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards, evidenced by curriculum maps and data review teams. The narrative provided describes processes that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading on ACCR Standards because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of a fragmented approach that the school uses 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 is initially scored as Falls Far Below. The narrative describes minimally the processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, and informal classroom observations. The narrative provided describes approaches that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math and Reading because the narrative does not describe a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers, and provide some analysis and feedback to further develop the system which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided minimal evidence of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes an assessment approach which includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with ACCR Standards. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. Through the DSP process the Charter Holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder's evidence demonstrated that the Charter Holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student

			formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided describes an approach that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student growth and proficiency on ACCR Standards for Math and Reading because the narrative does not describe a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth and proficiency. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** This area is initially scored as Approaches. The narrative describes a professional development approach that focuses on areas of high importance. The narrative describes a plan that, even if supported by evidence, cannot demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading because the narrative does not describe a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, and supports high quality implementation which would have provided evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading. Rather, the Charter Holder provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** Limited data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading. Data must demonstrate improvement as compared to prior years.	growth and proficiency in Math and Reading as compared to prior years.