Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Mountain Oak School, Inc.
School Name: Mountain Oak School
Date Submitted: 11/12/13

Required for: Renewal

Evaluation Completed: 12/6/13; 12/23/13

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

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Math*		I/S	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math. **At the site visit, a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards was confirmed. Lesson plans aligned to the standards and documentation to demonstrate the beginning stages of curriculum alignment was provided. No evidence of curriculum maps, pacing guides, committee work, or data review teams was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, lesson plans, a piloted teacher evaluation from last school year, a single teacher evaluation from the current school year, assessment result reports, and an observation schedule for 2014 were provided. No evidence of standards checklists, data review teams, or lesson plan review was provided.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach this is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Math. **At the site visit, EasyCBM assessment results were provided. No data analysis or description of how the results were used to inform instruction or professional development was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Math. **At the site visit, certificates and receipts were provided for Singapore Math and Common Core professional**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			development training from the previous and current school year. Professional development follow up forms were provided for the current school year. No documentation of how professional development is determined or monitored was provided.
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **At the site visit, a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards was confirmed. While lesson plans aligned to the standards were provided there was no evidence of differentiation for the bottom 25%. Documentation to demonstrate the beginning stages of curriculum alignment was provided. No evidence of curriculum maps, pacing guides, committee work, or data review teams was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, lesson plans, a piloted teacher evaluation from last school year, a single teacher evaluation from the current school year, assessment result reports, and an observation schedule for 2014 were provided. No evidence of standards checklists, data review teams, or lesson plan review was provided.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach this is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **At the site visit, EasyCBM assessment results were provided. No data analysis or description of how the results were used to inform instruction or professional development was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **At the site visit, certificates and receipts were provided for Singapore Math and Common Core professional development training from the previous and current school year. Professional development follow up forms were provided for the current school year. No documentation of how professional development is determined or monitored was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			Limited data provided. **Data provided did not demonstrate growth-.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **At the site visit, a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards was confirmed. While lesson plans aligned to the standards were provided there was no evidence of differentiation for students in the bottom 25%. Documentation to demonstrate the beginning stages of curriculum alignment was provided. No evidence of curriculum maps, pacing guides, committee work, or data review teams was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, lesson plans, a piloted teacher evaluation from last school year, a single teacher evaluation from the current school year, assessment result reports, and an observation schedule for 2014 were provided. No evidence of standards checklists, data review teams, or lesson plan review was provided.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **At the site visit, EasyCBM assessment results and Dibels results for grades 2 and 3 were provided. No analysis of how the results were used to inform instruction or professional development was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **At the site visit, certificates and receipts were provided for professional development training from the previous and current school year. Professional development follow up forms were provided for the current school year. No documentation of how professional development is determined or monitored was provided.** Limited data provided. **Data provided did not demonstrate growth.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math. **At the site visit, a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards was confirmed. Lesson plans aligned to the standards and documentation to demonstrate the beginning stages of curriculum alignment was provided. No evidence of curriculum maps, pacing guides, committee work, or data review teams was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, lesson plans, a piloted teacher evaluation from last school year, a single teacher evaluation from the current school year, assessment result reports, and an observation schedule for 2014 were provided. No evidence of standards checklists, data review teams, or lesson plan review was provided.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach this is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math. **At the site visit, EasyCBM assessment results were provided. No analysis of how the results were used to inform instruction or professional development was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stage of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. Professional development is usually external and determined without regard to an overall school plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for professional development that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math. **At the site visit, certificates and receipts were provided for Singapore Math and Common Core professional development training from the previous and current school year. Professional development follow up forms were provided for the current school year. No documentation of how professional development is determined or monitored was provided.** Limited data provided. **Data provided did not demonstrate proficiency.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading. **At the site visit, a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards was confirmed. Lesson plans aligned to the standards and documentation to demonstrate the beginning stages of curriculum alignment was provided. No evidence of curriculum maps, pacing guides, committee work, or data review teams was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, lesson plans, a piloted teacher evaluation from last school year, a single teacher evaluation from the current school year, assessment result reports, and an observation schedule for 2014 were provided. No evidence of standards checklists, data review teams, or lesson plan review was provided.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading. **At the site visit, EasyCBM assessment results and Dibels results for grades 2 and 3 were provided. No analysis of how the results were used to inform instruction or professional development was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading. **At the site visit, certificates and receipts were provided for Common Core professional development training from the previous and current school year. Professional development follow up forms were provided for the current school year. No documentation of how professional development is determined or monitored was provided.** No data provided. **Data provided did not demonstrate proficiency.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards was confirmed. Lesson plans aligned to the standards and documentation to demonstrate the beginning stages of curriculum alignment was provided. No evidence of curriculum maps, pacing guides, committee work, or data review teams was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system for monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, lesson plans, a piloted teacher evaluation from last school year, a single teacher evaluation from the current school year, assessment result reports, and an observation schedule for 2014 were provided. No evidence of standards checklists, data review teams, or lesson plan review was provided.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, EasyCBM assessment results for grades 2 and 3 were provided. No analysis of how the results were used to inform instruction or professional development was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, certificates and receipts were provided for professional development training from the previous and current school year. Professional development follow up forms were provided for the current school year. No documentation of how professional development is determined or monitored was provided.** Limited data is provided. **Data provided did not demonstrate proficiency.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*		I/S	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards was confirmed. Lesson plans aligned to the standards and documentation to demonstrate the beginning stages of curriculum alignment was provided. No evidence of curriculum maps, pacing guides, committee work, or data review teams was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system for monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, lesson plans, a piloted teacher evaluation from last school year, a single teacher evaluation from the current school year, assessment result reports, and an observation schedule for 2014 were provided. No evidence of standards checklists, data review teams, or lesson plan review was provided.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, EasyCBM assessment results and Dibels results for grades 2 and 3 were provided. No analysis of how the results were used to inform instruction or professional development was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, certificates and receipts were provided for professional development training from the previous and current school year. Professional development follow up forms were provided for the current school year. No documentation of how professional development is determined or monitored was provided.** Limited data is provided. **Data provided did not demonstrate proficiency.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **At the site visit, a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards was confirmed. Lesson plans aligned to the standards and documentation to demonstrate the beginning stages of curriculum alignment was provided. No evidence of curriculum maps, pacing guides, committee work, or data review teams was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system for monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, lesson plans, a piloted teacher evaluation from last school year, a single teacher evaluation from the current school year, assessment result reports, and an observation schedule for 2014 were provided. No evidence of standards checklists, data review teams, or lesson plan review was provided.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **At the site visit, EasyCBM assessment results were provided. No analysis of how the results were used to inform instruction or professional development was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **At the site visit, certificates and receipts were provided for professional development training from the previous and current school year. Professional development follow up forms were provided for the current school year. No documentation of how professional development is determined or monitored was provided.** No data is provided. **Data provided did not differentiate for ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **At the site visit, a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards was confirmed. Lesson plans aligned to the standards and documentation to demonstrate the beginning stages of curriculum alignment was provided. No evidence of curriculum maps, pacing guides, committee work, or data review teams was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system for monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, lesson plans, a piloted teacher evaluation from last school year, a single teacher evaluation from the current school year, assessment result reports, and an observation schedule for 2014 were provided. No evidence of standards checklists, data review teams, or lesson plan review was provided.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **At the site visit, EasyCBM assessment results and Dibels results for grades 2 and 3 were provided. No analysis of how the results were used to inform instruction or professional development was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **At the site visit, certificates and receipts were provided for professional development training from the previous and current school year. Professional development follow up forms were provided for the current school year. No documentation of how professional development is determined or monitored was provided.** No data is provided. **Data provided did not differentiate for ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **At the site visit, a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards was confirmed. Lesson plans aligned to the standards and documentation to demonstrate the beginning stages of curriculum alignment was provided. No evidence of curriculum maps, pacing guides, committee work, or data review teams was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system for monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, lesson plans, a piloted teacher evaluation from last school year, a single teacher evaluation from the current school year, assessment result reports, and an observation schedule for 2014 were provided. No evidence of standards checklists, data review teams, or lesson plan review was provided.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **At the site visit, EasyCBM assessment results were provided. No analysis of how the results were used to inform instruction or professional development was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **At the site visit, certificates and receipts were provided for professional development training from the previous and current school year. Professional development follow up forms were provided for the current school year. No documentation of how professional development is determined or monitored was provided.** Limited data is provided. **Data provided did not demonstrate growth or proficiency.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **At the site visit, a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards was confirmed. Lesson plans aligned to the standards and documentation to demonstrate the beginning stages of curriculum alignment was provided. No evidence of curriculum maps, pacing guides, committee work, or data review teams was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a system for monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, lesson plans, a piloted teacher evaluation from last school year, a single teacher evaluation from the current school year, assessment result reports, and an observation schedule for 2014 were provided. No evidence of standards checklists, data review teams, or lesson plan review was provided.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **At the site visit, EasyCBM assessment results were provided. No analysis of how the results were used to inform instruction or professional development was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **At the site visit, certificates and receipts were provided for professional development training from the previous and current school year. Professional development follow up forms were provided for the current school year. No documentation of how professional development is determined or monitored was provided.** Limited data is provided. **Data provided did not demonstrate growth or proficiency.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school is increasing student growth and proficiency or meeting targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model. **At the site visit, a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona College and Career Ready Standards was confirmed. Lesson plans aligned to the standards and documentation to demonstrate the beginning stages of curriculum alignment was provided. No evidence of curriculum maps, pacing guides, committee work, or data review teams was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes an approach to monitor the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school is increasing student growth and proficiency or meeting targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model. **At the site visit, lesson plans, a piloted teacher evaluation from last school year, a single teacher evaluation from the current school year, assessment result reports, and an observation schedule for 2014 were provided. No evidence of standards checklists, data review teams, or lesson plan review was provided.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. Little data is collected. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school is increasing student growth and proficiency or meeting targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model. **At the site visit, EasyCBM assessment results and Dibels results for grades 2 and 3 were provided. No analysis of how the results were used to inform instruction or professional development was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school is increasing student growth and proficiency or meeting targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model. **At the site visit, certificates and receipts were provided for professional development training from the previous and current school year. Professional development follow up forms were provided for the current school year. No documentation of how professional development is determined or monitored was provided.** No data is provided. **Data provided did not demonstrate growth or proficiency.**