Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Milestones Charter School
School Name: Milestones Charter School
Date Submitted: March 31, 2014
Academic Dashboard: FY13/FY12

Required for: Renewal
Initial Evaluation Completed: April 8, 2014
Final Evaluation Completed: May 30, 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 and data review teams. 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, 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 professional development sessions. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, 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:** No analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Math on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards.	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
				Professional Development: This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** 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 data and analysis did not demonstrate improved proficiency and growth for reading and math.
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 and data review teams. 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, 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 professional development sessions. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, 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.	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			Data: No analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Reading on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards.	proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** 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 data and analysis did not demonstrate improved proficiency and growth for reading and math.
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, evaluate, and revise 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, 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 professional development sessions. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, 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%. **Data:** No analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth for students in the bottom 25% in Math.	of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** 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, evaluate, and revise 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, 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	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			students in the bottom 25%. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes professional development sessions. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, 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 analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth for students in the bottom 25% in Reading.	**Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** 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 to evaluate and revise curriculum evidenced by committee work and data review teams. However, the narrative does not describe a system to create and implement curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards, evidenced by curriculum alignment, curriculum maps,	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			pacing guides, instructional material adoptions, 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 professional development sessions. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, 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:** No analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency.	beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** 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 data and analysis did not demonstrate improved proficiency and growth for reading and math.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
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. 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, 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. **Instruction:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. The narrative describes a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. However, the narrative does not describe how this system is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students and FRL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Math for ELL and FRL students. **Assessment:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. However, the narrative does not describe how this system is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students and FRL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math for	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			ELL students and FRL students as compared to similar schools. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes professional development sessions. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, 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.	**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 data and analysis did not demonstrate improved proficiency and growth for reading and math as compared to expected performance levels for students in the ELL, FRL, and students with disabilities subgroups.
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. 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, 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. **Instruction:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. The narrative describes a system that provides for some analysis and	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			feedback to further develop the system. However, the narrative does not describe how this system is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students and FRL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Reading for ELL and FRL students. **Assessment:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. However, the narrative does not describe how this system is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students and FRL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Reading for ELL students and FRL students as compared to similar schools. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes professional development sessions. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, 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 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.	implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** 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 data and analysis did not demonstrate improved proficiency and growth for reading and math as compared to expected performance levels in Reading for ELL, FRL, and students with disabilities as compared to similar schools.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise 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, 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 ELL students. **Instruction:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. The narrative describes a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. However, the narrative does not describe how this system is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Math for ELL students. **Assessment:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. However, the narrative does not describe how this system is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency in Math on Arizona's College and Career Ready	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			Standards for ELL students. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes professional development sessions. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan, specific to the needs of ELL students, that is aligned with teacher learning needs, 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 in Math for ELL students. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in math for ELL students.	**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 data and analysis did not demonstrate improved proficiency and growth for reading and math for ELL students.
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise 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, 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 ELL students. **Instruction:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. The narrative describes a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. However, the narrative does not describe how this system is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction in Reading for ELL students **Assessment:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. However, the narrative does not describe how this system is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for ELL students in Reading. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes professional development sessions. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan, specific to the needs of ELL students, that is aligned with teacher learning needs, 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 ELL students. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in reading for ELL students.	comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** 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 data and analysis did not demonstrate improved proficiency and growth for reading and math for ELL students.
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL Students *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise 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, and clearly defined and measureable implementation across the school. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for FRL students. **Assessment:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. However, the narrative does not describe how this system is adapted to meet the needs of FRL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for FRL students in Math. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes professional development sessions. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, 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.	The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** 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 data and analysis did not demonstrate improved proficiency and growth for reading and math for FRL students.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL Students *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a fragmented approach to evaluate and revise 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, 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. **Assessment:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. However, the narrative does not describe how this system is adapted to meet the needs of FRL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for FRL students in Reading. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes professional development sessions. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, 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 approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
				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 data and analysis did not demonstrate improved proficiency and growth for reading and math for FRL students.
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. 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, 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. **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 approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
				development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** 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 data and analysis did not demonstrate improved proficiency and growth for reading and math for students with disabilities.
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. 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, 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. **Instruction:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes a system to evaluate the instructional practices of teachers. However, the narrative does not describe a system to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction, as evidenced by lesson plan reviews, formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations, standards checklists, data review teams, and standards-based assessments. Nor does the narrative describe a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Assessment:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as approaches. The charter holder provided evidence of implementation of a curriculum adapted to meet the needs of subgroup populations, but 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 the beginning stages and a fragmented approach to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with ACCR Standards. The approach lacks cohesiveness or alignment with other school improvement efforts. **Instruction:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction. Rather, the charter holder provided evidence of the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** This area was scored as falls far below. The charter holder did not provide evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency. Rather, the charter holder's evidence demonstrated that the charter holder is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Initial Evaluation Comments	Final Evaluation Comments
			describes an assessment system. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system, specific to ELL and FRL students, based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments, common/benchmark assessments, and data review teams. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency in Math and Reading on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for ELL and FRL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth and proficiency on Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for Math and Reading. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. The narrative describes professional development sessions. However, the narrative does not describe a comprehensive professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, 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 and proficiency in Math and Reading. **Data:** No data was provided to demonstrate increased growth and proficiency in Math and Reading.	**Professional Development:** This area was scored as approaches. 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 provided evidence of an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes at the school. **Data:** 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 data and analysis did not demonstrate improved proficiency and growth for reading and math.