Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Ira H. Hayes Memorial Applied Learning Center

Required for: Review - Annual Report

School Name: Ira H. Hayes High School

Evaluation Completed: 9/4/13; 2/3/14

Date Submitted: 5/9/13 (due 5/8/13)

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 aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness with other school improvement efforts. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student growth in Math.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Assessment: The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices; data is not used to make instructional decisions. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Math. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Math.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Math. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student growth in Math.** No data was provided. **Limited data and no analysis were provided to demonstrate increased 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 aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness with other school improvement efforts. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading that was clearly defined and measurable**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			across the school. **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student growth in Reading.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices; data is not used to make instructional decisions. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Reading. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Reading.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Reading. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student growth in Reading. No data was provided. **Limited data and no analysis were provided to demonstrate increased 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 aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative 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. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math for the Bottom 25% that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student growth in Math for the Bottom 25%.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices; data is not used to make instructional decisions. The narrative provided did not demonstrate

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			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. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Math for the Bottom 25%.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative 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. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student growth in Math for the Bottom 25%.** No data was provided. **No data and analysis were provided to demonstrate student growth in Math for the Bottom 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 aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative 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. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading for the bottom 25% that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Instruction: The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student growth in Reading for the bottom 25%.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices; data is not used to make instructional decisions. The narrative 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. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Reading for the Bottom 25%.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative 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. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student growth in Reading for the Bottom 25%. No data was provided. **No data and analysis were provided to demonstrate student growth in Reading for the Bottom 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 aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices; data is not used to make instructional decisions. The narrative provided did not demonstrate

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Math.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for professional development that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math.** No data was provided. **Limited data and no analysis were provided to demonstrate 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 aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices; data is not used to make instructional decisions. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Reading.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading.** No data was provided. **No data and analysis were provided to demonstrate 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 aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities .** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices; data is not used to make instructional decisions. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.** No data was provided. **No data and analysis were provided to demonstrate 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 aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities .** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices; data is not used to make instructional decisions. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. No data was provided. **No data and analysis were provided to demonstrate 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 does not describe that the school uses a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe that the school integrated a system of monitoring and evaluating the Arizona Standards into instruction or describe the evaluation of the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe that the school developed a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth and proficiency. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Math for ELL students.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students.** No data was provided. **No data and analysis were provided to demonstrate student proficiency in Math for ELL students.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe that the school uses a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe that the school integrated a system of monitoring and evaluating the Arizona Standards into instruction or describe the

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			evaluation of the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe that the school developed a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth and proficiency. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Reading for ELL students.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			No data was provided. **No data and analysis were provided to demonstrate student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to address that the school uses a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe that the school integrated a system of monitoring and evaluating the Arizona Standards into instruction or describe the evaluation of the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe that the school developed a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth and proficiency. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Math for FRL students. **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students.** No data was provided. **No data and analysis were provided to demonstrate student proficiency in Math for FRL students.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to address that the school uses a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe that the school integrated a system of monitoring and evaluating the Arizona Standards into instruction or describe the evaluation of the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe that the school developed a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth and proficiency. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Reading for FRL students.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.** No data was provided. **No data and analysis were provided to demonstrate student**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			proficiency in Reading for FRL students.
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe that the school uses a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe that the school integrated a system of monitoring and evaluating the Arizona Standards into instruction or describe the evaluation of the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math students with disabilities .** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe that the school developed a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth and proficiency. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Math for students with disabilities. **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.** No data was provided. **No data and analysis were provided to demonstrate student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe that the school uses a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities that was clearly defined and measurable across the school.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe that the school integrated a system of monitoring and evaluating the Arizona Standards into instruction or describe the evaluation of the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Standards into instruction. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe that the school developed a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth and proficiency. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance in Reading for students with disabilities.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. 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. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			No data was provided. **No data and analysis were provided to demonstrate student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to address that the school uses a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. 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. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because at the site visit the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that is aligned to Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. They were unable to provide evidence of curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoption committees, data review teams, or any other system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency or meeting targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe that the school integrated a system of monitoring and evaluating the Arizona Standards into instruction or describe the evaluation of the instructional practices of the teachers. The system does not provide for analysis and feedback. 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. **This measure scored a Falls Far Below because at the site visit, the charter holder did not demonstrate a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. They were unable to provide evidence of lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations from the current school year (documentation provided is from 12-13 school year under a previous administration), informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review team documentation, standards based assessment data, or any other system that monitors the integration of standards and evaluates instructional practices, that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive not aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. Little or no data is collected from assessments; and data review teams and data are not used to make instructional decisions. 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. **This measure scored Approaches because at the site visit the charter holder was able to provide Galileo reports that were aligned to the**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Arizona College and Career Ready Standards but they were unable to provide alignment to the curriculum and instructional methodology, additional assessment data from other sources, or analysis demonstrating improved academic performance. **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs and does not include follow-up and monitoring strategies. The plan does not focus on areas of high importance and does not support high quality implementation. 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. **This measure scored Falls Far Below because the charter holder was unable to provide a current professional development plan (previous school years were provided) based on teacher learning needs. They could not provide evidence of follow-up and monitoring strategies. There was no evidence that there was a current plan in place that focused on areas of high importance and high quality implementation that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.** No data was provided. **No additional data or analysis provided.**
4a. High School Graduation Rate ***(Traditional and Small Schools)***		**I/S**	Did not address this measure. **No additional information was provided.**