Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit

Charter/School Name: Painted Desert Demonstration Project – STAR Charter Representative:
Date: 5/20/13 Other leadership members present: Mr. Steve Babcock, Dr. Mark Sorenson, and Mrs. Kate Sorenson
Staff: Lisa Weisberg, Steve Sarmento, and Martha Morgan

The table below reflects the materials/items referenced in the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress and whether the evidence was confirmed:

Evidence Requested	Confirmed at Site Visit
Intervention documentation	X
AIMSweb data for 12-13 school year	X
Teacher evaluations	X
Example of a teacher completed lesson plan using common core standards	X
Curriculum map	X
Documentation from professional development	X

Staff requested further information regarding areas not sufficiently addressed in the Demonstration of Sufficient Progress:

Evidence Requested	Evidence Provided	Sufficient
Evidence of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading.	• Curriculum maps for reading and math • Common core standards	X
Evidence of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth for student with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math and Reading.	• Curriculum maps • Subject specific vocabulary • Writing/Speaking Projects • Intensive pull-outs	X
Evidence of a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math and Reading.	• Curriculum maps • Subject specific vocabulary • Writing/Speaking Projects	X
Evidence of a curriculum that increases student proficiency in Math and Reading for ELL, FRL, and SPED students	• Curriculum maps • Subject specific vocabulary • Writing/Speaking Projects	X
Evidence of an assessment system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Reading.	• AIMS web given three times/ year • Data broken down during pre-service	X
Evidence of an assessment system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading and Math.	• AIMS web progress monitoring for intervention students • AIMS web given three times/ year • Data broken down during pre-service	X

Evidence of an assessment system for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading and Math.	• AIMS web given three times/ year • Data broken down during pre-service	X
Evidence of an assessment system for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading and Math for ELL, FRL, and SPED.	• 81.4% FRL, no ELL or SPED • AIMS web given three times/ year • Data broken down during pre-service	X
Evidence of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student growth in Reading.	• Staff meetings once a month • PLC documentation • PD based on areas of ineffectiveness determined through observations – observations are given by Mr. Babcock, Dr. Sorenson, and a Board member. • Individualized plans for each teacher • Agendas	X
Evidence of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math and Reading.	• Staff meetings once a month • PLC documentation • PD based on areas of ineffectiveness determined through observations – observations are given by Mr. Babcock, Dr. Sorenson, and a Board member. • Individualized plans for each teacher • Agendas	X
Evidence of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading and Math.	• Staff meetings once a month • PLC documentation • PD based on areas of ineffectiveness determined through observations – observations are given by Mr. Babcock, Dr. Sorenson, and a Board member. • Individualized plans for each teacher • Agendas	X
Evidence of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math and Reading for ELL, FRL, and SPED students.	• Staff meetings once a month • PLC documentation • PD based on areas of ineffectiveness determined through observations – observations are given by Mr. Babcock, Dr. Sorenson, and a Board member. • Individualized plans for each teacher • Agendas	X
Evidence of an approach to monitor the integration of AZ Standards into instruction and evaluate the instructional practices of teachers as it relates to ELL, FRL, and students with disabilities.	• Lesson plans did not identify the standards • Standards checklist was a part of the report card • Teacher evaluation • Rating Scale based on success of report cards	