Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Ira H. Hayes Memorial Applied Learning Center
School Name: Ira H. Hayes High School
Date Submitted: March 31, 2014
Academic Dashboard: FY13/FY12

Required for: Renewal
Initial Evaluation Completed: April 7, 2014
Final Evaluation Completed: May 22, 2014

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

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Math		I/S	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise curriculum evidenced by committee work. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. **Professional Development**: This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Math. **Data**: The data provided did not demonstrate increased student growth in Math on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. No analysis of data was provided.	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. **Instruction:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. **Assessment**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional decisions. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
				holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Reading		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise curriculum evidenced by committee work. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for Reading. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Reading. **Data:** The data provided did not demonstrate increased student growth in Reading on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. No analysis of data was provided.	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. **Instruction**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
				decisions. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% Math		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to create and implement curriculum. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for students in the bottom 25% for Math. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Math for students in the bottom 25%.	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for students in the bottom 25% for Math. **Instruction**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers for students in the bottom 25% for Math. **Assessment:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			Data: No Math data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth for students in the bottom 25% in Math.	implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional decisions for students in the bottom 25% for Math. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan for students in the bottom 25% for Math. **Data**: The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources for students in the bottom 25%.
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% Reading		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to create and implement curriculum. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for students in the bottom 25%. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for students in the bottom 25% for Reading. **Instruction:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Reading for students in the bottom 25%. **Data**: No Reading data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth for students in the bottom 25% in Reading.	charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers for students in the bottom 25% for Reading. **Assessment:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional decisions for students in the bottom 25% for Reading. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan for students in the bottom 25% for Reading. **Data:** The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources for students in the bottom 25%.
2a. Percent Passing Math		**I/S**	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise curriculum evidenced by committee work. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. **Professional Development**: This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math. **Data**: The Math data provided demonstrated overall increased student proficiency. No analysis of data was provided.	Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. **Instruction:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional decisions. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data**: The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
2a. Percent Passing Reading		I/S	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise curriculum evidenced by committee work. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading. **Data:** The Reading data provided did not demonstrate increased student proficiency. No analysis of data was provided.	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. **Instruction:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. **Assessment:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional decisions. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
				demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
2b. Composite School Comparison (Traditional and Small Schools only) Math		I/S	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise curriculum evidenced by committee work. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency to expected performance levels for ELL, FRL, and students with disabilities in Math as compared to similar schools. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math for ELL, FRL, and students with disabilities as compared to similar schools. **Data**: No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math to expected performance levels for ELL, FRL, and students with disabilities as compared to similar schools.	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for students with disabilities in Math as compared to similar schools. I**nstruction**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers for students with disabilities in Math as compared to similar schools. **Assessment**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional decisions for students with disabilities in Math as compared to similar schools. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
				contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan for students with disabilities in Math as compared to similar schools. **Data:** The data provided demonstrates that the school has not seen an increase in the percentage of students passing AIMS or expected to pass AIMS. No data was provided to address improved student growth. The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources for students with disabilities.
2b. Composite School Comparison (Traditional and Small Schools only) Reading		**I/S**	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise curriculum evidenced by committee work. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency to expected performance levels for ELL, FRL, and students with disabilities in Reading as compared to similar schools. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Reading for ELL, FRL, and students with	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for students with disabilities in Reading as compared to similar schools. I**nstruction**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers for students with disabilities in Reading as compared to similar schools. **Assessment**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			disabilities as compared to similar schools. **Data**: No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading to expected performance levels for ELL, FRL, and students with disabilities as compared to similar schools.	assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional decisions for students with disabilities in Reading as compared to similar schools. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan for students with disabilities in Reading as compared to similar schools. **Data:** The data provided demonstrates that the school has not seen an increase in the percentage of students passing AIMS or expected to pass AIMS. No data was provided to address improved student growth. The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources for students with disabilities.
2c. Subgroup Comparison (2b. for Alternative) ELL Math	N/A	N/A	The narrative indicates the charter school does not have any ELL students enrolled.	The narrative indicates the charter school does not have any ELL students enrolled.
2c. Subgroup Comparison (2b. for Alternative) ELL Reading	N/A	N/A	The narrative indicates the charter school does not have any ELL students enrolled.	The narrative indicates the charter school does not have any ELL students enrolled.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison (2b. for Alternative) FRL Math		I/S	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise curriculum evidenced by committee work. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for FRL students. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students.	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. **Instruction**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. **Assessment**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional decisions. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
				demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
2c. Subgroup Comparison (2b. for Alternative) FRL Reading		I/S	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise curriculum evidenced by committee work. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for FRL students. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **Data**: No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. I**nstruction**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. **Assessment**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional decisions. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
				on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources.
2c. Subgroup Comparison (2b. for Alternative) Students with disabilities Math		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise curriculum evidenced by committee work. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for students with disabilities. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in math for students with disabilities.	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for students with disabilities in Math. I**nstruction**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers for students with disabilities in Math. **Assessment**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional decisions for students with disabilities in Math. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
				includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan for students with disabilities in Math. **Data:** The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources for students with disabilities.
2c. Subgroup Comparison (2b. for Alternative) Students with disabilities Reading		**I/S**	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise curriculum evidenced by committee work. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for students with disabilities. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **Data**: No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for students with disabilities in Reading. I**nstruction**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers for students with disabilities in Reading. **Assessment**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
				little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional decisions for students with disabilities in Reading. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan for students with disabilities in Reading. **Data:** The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources for students with disabilities in Reading.
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System		**I/S**	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise curriculum evidenced by committee work. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps, pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, committee work, data review teams, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation. The narrative provided did not	**Curriculum**: This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. **Instruction**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. **Assessment**: This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading. **Data**: No data was provided to demonstrate increased growth and proficiency in Math and Reading.	implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The evidence demonstrated that little data is collected and data is not used to make instructional decisions. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth and proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. **Data:** The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources. The charter holder did not provide data and analysis that demonstrates improved academic performance based on data generated from valid and reliable assessment sources for students in the bottom 25% and students with disabilities subgroups.
4a. Graduation		**I/S**	**Graduation Rate:** This area was scored approaches. The narrative describes a strategy the school uses to ensure students in grades 9-12 graduate on time. However, the narrative does not describe strategies that include individual student plans for academic and career success, which are monitored, reviewed and updated annually and/or highly effective practices the school uses for addressing early academic difficulty. **Data:** No data was provided to demonstrate success in ensuring students graduate on time.	**Graduation Rate:** This area was scored as falls far below. Through the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress process the charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes increasing the percent of entering ninth graders who graduate from high school in four years. While the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder has implemented strategies to ensure students in grades 9-12 graduate on time, the school did not present data that demonstrates success in ensuring students graduate on time.