Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Kin Dah Lichii Olta
School Name: Kin Dah Lichii Olta
Date Submitted: 11/9/2013

Required for: Failing School

Evaluation Completed: 11/14/2013; 11/29/13

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 an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Math were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student growth in Math was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student growth in Math was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided included comparison of results from the same benchmark test administered in August and October and a comparison of benchmark assessment results to an average score on a weekly test. The data provided did not demonstrate improved student growth in Math. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			results, benchmark assessment results, lesson quizzes, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student growth in Math.
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Reading were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student growth in Reading was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student growth in Reading was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided included comparison of results from the same benchmark test administered in August and October and a comparison of benchmark assessment results to an average score on a weekly test. The data provided did not demonstrate improved student growth in Reading. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, weekly selection test results, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student growth in Reading.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Math were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the bottom 25% in Math was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the bottom 25% in Math was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided included comparison of results from the same benchmark test administered in August and October and a comparison of benchmark assessment results to an average score on a weekly test. The data provided did not demonstrate improved student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, lesson quizzes, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the bottom 25% in Math.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Reading were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student growth for students with growth percentiles in the bottom 25% in Reading was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the bottom 25% in Reading was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided included comparison of results from the same benchmark test administered in August and October and a comparison of benchmark assessment results to an average score on a weekly test. The data provided did not demonstrate improved student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, weekly selection test results, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the bottom 25% in Reading.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Math were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student proficiency in Math was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student proficiency in Math was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided documented a decrease in proficiency on AIMS from 2012 to 2013 and provided no additional data to demonstrate improved student proficiency after 2013 AIMS. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, lesson quizzes, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated improved student proficiency in Math.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Reading were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student proficiency in Reading was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student proficiency in Reading was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided documented a decrease in proficiency on AIMS from 2012 to 2013 and provided no additional data to demonstrate improved student proficiency after 2013 AIMS. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, weekly selection test results, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated improved student proficiency in Reading.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Math were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided documented a decrease in proficiency on AIMS from 2012 to 2013 and provided no additional data to demonstrate improved student proficiency after 2013 AIMS. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, lesson quizzes, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated improved student proficiency in Math in comparison to expected performance levels.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum. The narrative states that there is a process for evaluating materials, but no description of the evaluation or review process was provided. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Reading were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Reading was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Reading was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided documented a decrease in proficiency on AIMS from 2012 to 2013 and provided no additional data to demonstrate improved student proficiency after 2013 AIMS. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, weekly selection test results, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated improved student proficiency in Reading in comparison to expected performance levels.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison ELL *Math*		I/S	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Math were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math for ELL students was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student proficiency in Math for ELL students was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided documents an increase in scale scores on AIMS from 2012 to 2013. No additional data was provided to demonstrate improved student proficiency after 2013 AIMS. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, lesson quizzes, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated improved student proficiency in Math for ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Reading were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student proficiency Reading for ELL students was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student proficiency in Reading for ELL students was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided documented an increase in scale scores on AIMS from 2012 to 2013 and provided no additional data to demonstrate improved student proficiency after 2013 AIMS. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, weekly selection test results, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated improved student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison FRL *Math*		I/S	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Math were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student proficiency in Math for FRL students was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student proficiency in Math for FRL students was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided included comparison of results from the same benchmark test administered in August and October and a comparison of benchmark assessment results to an average score on a weekly test. The data provided did not demonstrate improved student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, lesson quizzes, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated improved student proficiency in Math for FRL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Reading were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student proficiency in Reading for FRL students was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student proficiency in Reading for FRL students was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided included comparison of results from the same benchmark test administered in August and October and a comparison of benchmark assessment results to an average score on a weekly test. The data provided did not demonstrate improved student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, weekly selection test results, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated improved student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Math were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided included comparison of results from the same benchmark test administered in August and October and a comparison of benchmark assessment results to an average score on a weekly test. The data provided did not demonstrate improved student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, lesson quizzes, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated improved student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes an approach to create and implement curriculum, but this approach does not evaluate and revise school curriculum. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the academic class schedule, curriculum maps, pacing guides, correlations to Common Core State Standards, weekly lesson plans, student groupings for Reading were provided. No documentation or evidence of ongoing evaluation and revision of the implemented curriculum was provided. No evidence that the newly implemented curriculum has resulted in improved student proficiency in Reading for Students with disabilities was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a professional development approach that lacks follow-up and monitoring strategies. **At the site visit additional documentation, including the Kin Dah Lichii Olta 2013-2014 Professional Development Plan, Summer Curriculum Map sign-in sheets, Curriculum and Instruction Staff Development agenda for Summer 2013, and report on the professional learning workshop of curriculum alignment to Arizona Common Core State Standards was provided. No documentation or evidence of follow-up or monitoring strategies as part of the professional development plan was provided. No evidence that the professional development plan has resulted in improved student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities was provided.** **Assessment: The narrative described data review teams using data to make instructional decisions. At the site visit no evidence of analysis of data or realignment of instruction based on data was provided.** The data provided included comparison of results from the same benchmark test administered in August and October and a comparison of benchmark assessment results to an average score on a weekly test. The data provided did not demonstrate improved student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **At the site visit current and historical data was reviewed and the assessments used by the school were discussed. Graphs of AIMS results, benchmark assessment results, weekly selection test results, and NWEA assessment results were provided, but no analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated improved student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System		**I/S**	The narrative provided did not include additional information to address this measure. **At the site visit no additional documentation or data specific to meeting targets as described in the A-F letter grade model were provided.**