Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Omega Schools, Inc.
School Name: C. Doby Preparatory
Date Submitted: 11/12/13

Required for: Failing School

Evaluation Completed: 11/14/13; 11/22/13

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's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school that contributes to increased student growth in Math.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Math. **Academy of Math Intervention Software Program test results were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased student growth in Math. No documentation was provided to demonstrate how assessments are used to inform instruction was provided. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Math. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned**

			with the curriculum and instructional practices. **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student growth in Math.**
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. Additionally, curriculum alignment was provided for 2nd and 3rd grade and documentation to support Dibels data meetings for K-3 was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Reading. **Academy of Reading Intervention Software Program, Spalding spelling scores for 3rd and 4th grades, and Riverdeep Reading Test Prep reports for Grades K-3 were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased student growth in Reading. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Reading. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student growth in Reading.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited 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. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a**

			system. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school that contributes to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **Academy of Math Intervention Solution test results were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased student growth for the lowest performing students in Math. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited 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. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited 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. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. Additionally, curriculum alignment was provided for 2nd and 3rd grade and documentation to support Dibels data meetings for K-3 was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the**

			beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **Academy of Reading Intervention Software Program, Spalding spelling scores for 3rd and 4th grades, and Riverdeep Reading Test Prep reports for Grades K-3 were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased student growth in Reading for the lowest performing students. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited 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. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading.**
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's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school that contributes to increased student growth in Math.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math. **Academy of Math Intervention Software Program test results were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math. No documentation was provided to demonstrate how assessments are used to**

			inform instruction was provided. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math.**
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. Additionally, curriculum alignment was provided for 2nd and 3rd grade and documentation to support Dibels data meetings for K-3 was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading. **Academy of Reading Intervention Software Program, Spalding spelling scores for 3rd and 4th grades, and Riverdeep Reading Test Prep reports for Grades K-3 were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive**

			nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading.**
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited 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. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans, a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught, and a sample ILLP were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **Academy of Math Intervention Software Program test results were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. No documentation was provided to demonstrate how assessments are used to inform instruction was provided. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited 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. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.**

2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited 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. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. Additionally, curriculum alignment was provided for 2nd and 3rd grade and documentation to support Dibels data meetings for K-3 was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **Academy of Reading Intervention Software Program, Spalding spelling scores for 3rd and 4th grades, and Riverdeep Reading Test Prep reports for Grades K-3 were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited 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. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. It was not**

			evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school that contributes to increased student proficiency for ELL students in Math. **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **Academy of Math Intervention Software Program test results were provided. No analysis was provided to demonstrate how these assessments demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. No documentation was provided as to how assessments are used to inform instruction was provided. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. Additionally, curriculum alignment was provided for 2nd and 3rd grade and documentation to support Dibels data meetings for K-3 was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of**

			the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices. **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **Academy of Reading Intervention Software Program, Spalding spelling scores for 3rd and 4th grades, and Riverdeep Reading Test Prep reports for Grades K-3 were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *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's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school that contributes to increased student proficiency for FRL students in Math.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **Academy of Math Intervention Software Program test results were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased**

			student proficiency in Math for FRL students. No documentation was provided to demonstrate how assessments are used to inform instruction was provided. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. Additionally, curriculum alignment was provided for 2nd and 3rd grade and documentation to support Dibels data meetings for K-3 was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **Academy of Reading Intervention Software Program, Spalding spelling scores for 3rd and 4th grades, and Riverdeep Reading Test Prep reports for Grades K-3 were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **Professional development**

			schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices. **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *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's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. It was not evident that a system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school that contributes to increased student proficiency for students with disabilities in Math.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **Academy of Math Intervention Software Program test results were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. No documentation was provided to demonstrate how assessments are used to inform instruction was provided. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited 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. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.**

2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach that the school uses to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum, aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. Additionally, curriculum alignment was provided for 2nd and 3rd grade and documentation to support Dibels data meetings for K-3 was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **Academy of Reading Intervention Software Program, Spalding spelling scores for 3rd and 4th grades, and Riverdeep Reading Test Prep reports for Grades K-3 were provided. No analysis was provided as to how these assessments demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. The narrative and limited data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.** **No analysis was provided to identify data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.**
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's College and Career Ready Standards. The data and analysis included provided limited support for the narrative. 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. **First through sixth grade curriculum maps that demonstrated lack of alignment to lesson plans and a report card that listed the order of concepts to be taught were provided. Template forms for curriculum evaluations and revisions were provided; however there was no documentation to demonstrate these elements were in place as a system. It was not evident that a**

			system to create implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum was clearly defined and implemented across the school that contributes to increased student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading. **Instruction:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. The narrative and limited 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. 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. **Lesson plans provided did not demonstrate alignment with curriculum maps, learning activities, or demonstrate differentiation between grade levels in combo classes with the exception of the 1st/2nd grade class. Documentation of two informal classroom observations, the beginning stages of standard checklists, and a formal evaluation template were provided. The school demonstrated the beginning stages of a system to monitor and evaluate standards and instructional practices.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures. 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. **Academy of Math Intervention Software Program test results were provided. No analysis was provided to demonstrate how these assessments demonstrate increased student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading. No documentation was provided as to how assessments are used to inform instruction was provided. No evidence that a benchmark assessment is administered was provided. These assessments did not demonstrate a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the school is in the beginning stages of developing a professional development plan based on identified teacher learning needs. 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. **Professional development schedules, agendas, sign-in sheets, plans, and evaluations of the presentation were provided. However, no documentation to support follow-up and monitoring strategies or that the plan is aligned with teacher learning needs was provided. The school demonstrated an approach to professional development that is not comprehensive nor aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices.**