Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Founding Fathers Academies, Inc.
School Name: Jefferson Academy of Advanced Learning
Date Submitted: 11/12/13

Required for: Failing School

Evaluation Completed: 11/14/13;12/2/13

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

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Math*		I/S	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math. **Instructional pacing guides for math, aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards (ACCRS), were provided for grades K-6; math pacing guides, aligned with the previous standards, were provided for grades 7 and 8. The high school uses an online curriculum which the school says is aligned with ACCRS though no evidence of alignment was provided. The school did give an explanation of how the elementary math curriculum was selected but it was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Math. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, diagnostic tests for math intervention, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Math. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent.** **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student growth in Math.**
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading. **A scope and sequence chart for reading was provided for grades K-8. No evidence was provided to demonstrate that the core reading program is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum for reading was clearly defined and implemented across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Reading. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Reading. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent.** **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student growth in Reading.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **Instructional pacing guides for math, aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards (ACCRS), were provided for grades K-6; math pacing guides, aligned with the previous standards, were provided for grades 7 and 8. The high school uses an online curriculum which the school says is aligned with**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			ACCRS though no evidence of alignment was provided. The school did give an explanation of how the elementary math curriculum was selected but it was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school. **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, diagnostic tests for math intervention, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent. **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student growth in Math for the lowest 25%.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **A scope and sequence chart for reading was provided for grades K-8. No evidence was provided to demonstrate that the core reading program is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum for reading was clearly defined and implemented across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent.** **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student growth in Reading for the lowest 25%.**
2a. Percent Passing *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math. **Instructional pacing guides for math, aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards (ACCRS), were provided for grades K-6; math pacing guides, aligned with the previous standards, were provided for grades 7 and 8. The high school uses an online curriculum which the school says is aligned with ACCRS though no evidence of alignment was provided. The school did give an explanation of how the elementary math curriculum was selected but it was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, diagnostic tests for math intervention, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for professional development that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent.** **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student proficiency in Math.**
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading. **A scope and sequence chart for reading was provided for grades K-8. No evidence was provided to demonstrate that the core reading program is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum for reading was clearly defined and implemented across the school.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Instruction: The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent.** **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student proficiency in Reading.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **Instructional pacing guides for math, aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards (ACCRS), were provided for grades K-6; math pacing guides, aligned with the previous standards, were provided for grades 7 and 8. The high school uses an online curriculum which the school says is aligned with ACCRS though no evidence of alignment was provided. The school did give an explanation of how the elementary math curriculum was selected but it was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, diagnostic tests for math intervention, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Professional Development: The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent.** **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.**
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **A scope and sequence chart for reading was provided for grades K-8. No evidence was provided to demonstrate that the core reading program is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum for reading was clearly defined and implemented across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent.** **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **Instructional pacing guides for math, aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards (ACCRS), were provided for grades K-6; math pacing guides, aligned with the previous standards, were provided for grades 7 and 8. The high school uses an online curriculum which the school says is aligned with ACCRS though no evidence of alignment was provided. The school did give an explanation of how the elementary math curriculum was selected but it was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, diagnostic tests for math intervention, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent.** **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student proficiency in Math for ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **A scope and sequence chart for reading was provided for grades K-8. No evidence was provided to demonstrate that the core reading program is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum for reading was clearly defined and implemented across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **The school**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent. **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **Instructional pacing guides for math, aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards (ACCRS), were provided for grades K-6; math pacing guides, aligned with the previous standards, were provided for grades 7 and 8. The high school uses an online curriculum which the school says is aligned with ACCRS though no evidence of alignment was provided. The school did give an explanation of how the elementary math curriculum was selected but it was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, diagnostic tests for math intervention, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent.** **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student proficiency in Math for FRL students.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **A scope and sequence chart for reading was provided for grades K-8. No evidence was provided to demonstrate that the core reading program is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum for reading was clearly defined and implemented across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent.** **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **Instructional pacing guides for math, aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards (ACCRS), were provided for grades K-6; math pacing guides, aligned with the previous standards, were provided for grades 7 and 8. The high school uses an online curriculum which the school says is aligned with ACCRS though no evidence**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			of alignment was provided. The school did give an explanation of how the elementary math curriculum was selected but it was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school. **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, diagnostic tests for math intervention, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent. **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **A scope and sequence chart for reading was provided for grades K-8. No evidence was provided to demonstrate that the core reading program is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The school has a reading specialist that works with struggling students including those with disabilities. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum for reading was clearly defined and implemented across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe or describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative did not describe a process for formal evaluations of teachers. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Documentation of informal classroom observation notes was provided by the Teacher Mentor but feedback is verbal and no documentation was provided to support that this occurs in a systematic way. Leadership for grades 9-12 provided documentation of para-professional evaluations. The school stated that it is planning to implement a formal teacher evaluation process. Annual lesson plans are required to be submitted but evidence of review or evaluation of the plans was not provided. In totality, the school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **While the school administers several types of assessment including AIMSweb for math and reading, skills checklists, and individual student goal sheets, no evidence of analysis of the data collected from the various assessments or how the data was used to inform instructional decisions was provided. It was not**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			evident that the school has an assessment approach that is comprehensive and aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **The school provided documentation of agendas and sign-in sheets for school-wide professional development days and a survey of teacher interests for additional learning opportunities. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development but no evidence of a comprehensive professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs or evidence of a well-defined process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school was apparent.** **No data analysis was provided to demonstrate efforts to improve student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System		**I/S**	The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school is increasing student growth and proficiency or meeting targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model. No data was provided.
4a. High School Graduation Rate ***(Traditional and Small Schools)***		**I/S**	The narrative fails to document any effort in place to ensure students in grades 9-12 graduate on time. No data was provided to demonstrate the school's efforts to ensure students graduate on time. **The high school grades provided Education and Career Action Plans that the school maintains for students. The school offers dual enrollment through Northland Pioneer College and students take a placement test, ACT COMPASS, to determine readiness for college level coursework. The school also offers a work-study program. The school has no evidence of participation rate or results for college-readiness tests such as SAT and ACT. No data was provided to demonstrate graduation rates are increasing.**