Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: E-Institute Charter School, Inc.
School Name: Taylion Virtual High School
Date Submitted: 6/19/13, due 5/12/13

Required for: Review - Annual Report

Evaluation Completed: 8/27/13; 1/7/14

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**	No data was provided. **No additional data was provided that indicated improved student growth.**
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*		**I/S**	No data was provided. **No additional data was provided that indicated improved student growth.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative 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. **In conjunction with the site visit, the school submitted course guide/syllabus aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for Algebra I, Algebra II, Advanced Algebra with Financial Applications, and Calculus. Each course outline maps the standards and has a pacing guide embedded in the syllabus.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed or is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. The narrative 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. **The online curriculum includes an assessment program for each course. Assessments are built into each online course and may be in the form of self-checks, practice lessons, multiple choice tests, projects, oral assessments and discussions. However, the evidence provided did not include evidence of a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth for students in the lowest 25%for math nor data from multiple assessments to drive instructional decisions.** No data was provided. **Data results provided in conjunction with the site visit included a placeholder for AIMS results for lowest 25% in Math but the lowest 25% were not identified. Additionally, no analysis or comparative data was provided to determine if these students are growing as a result of the school's instructional program.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative 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. **In conjunction with the site visit, the school submitted course guide/syllabus aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for English I, English II, and English IV. Each course outline maps the standards and has a pacing guide embedded in the syllabus.** . **Assessment:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed or is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. The narrative 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. **The online curriculum includes an assessment program for each course. Assessments are built into each online course and may be in the form of self-checks, practice lessons, multiple choice tests, projects, oral assessments and discussions. However, the evidence provided did not include evidence of a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth for students in the lowest 25% in reading nor data from multiple assessments to drive instructional decisions.** No data was provided. **Data results provided in conjunction with the site visit included a placeholder for AIMS results for lowest 25% in Reading but the lowest 25% were not identified. Additionally, no analysis or comparative data was provided to determine if these students are growing as a result of the school's instructional program.**
2a. Percent Passing *Math*		**I/S**	No data was provided. **In conjunction with the site visit, the school provided test results for Math in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 AIMS. The school also provided a course completion list for 2012-2013 which included math courses. However, no analysis or comparative data was provided to determine if an increasing number of students are passing as a result of the school's instructional program.**
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*		**I/S**	No data was provided. **In conjunction with the site visit, the school provided test results for Reading in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 AIMS. The school also provided a course completion list for 2012-2013 which included English courses. However, no analysis or comparative data was provided to determine if an increasing number of students are passing as a result of the school's instructional program.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative 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. **In conjunction with the site visit, the school submitted course guide/syllabus aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for Algebra I, Algebra II, Advanced Algebra with Financial Applications, and Calculus. Each course outline maps the standards and has a pacing guide embedded in the syllabus.** **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 Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **The online curriculum includes an assessment program for each course. Assessments are built into each online course and may be in the form of self-checks, practice lessons, multiple choice tests, projects, oral assessments and discussions. However, the evidence provided did not include evidence of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency for FRL, ELL or SPED students nor data from multiple assessments to drive instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing 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 Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **The school provided a professional development calendar for the prior two years. The professional development was focused on implementing Common Core State Standards, Special Education, online instruction and evaluation, administrator training, and administrator evaluator training.** No data was provided. **Data results provided in conjunction with the site visit included a placeholder for AIMS results in Math for students identified as ELL and SPED but no students were identified. Additionally, no analysis or comparative data was provided to determine if students are growing as a result of the school's instructional program.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative 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. **In conjunction with the site visit, the school submitted course guide/syllabus aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for English I, English II, and English IV. Each course outline maps the standards and has a pacing guide embedded in the syllabus.** **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 for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **The online curriculum includes an assessment program for each course. Assessments are built into each online course and may be in the form of self-checks, practice lessons, multiple choice tests, projects, oral assessments and discussions. However, the evidence provided did not include evidence of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency for FRL, ELL or SPED students nor data from multiple assessments to drive instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing 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 for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **The school provided a professional development calendar for the prior two years. The professional development was focused on implementing Common Core State Standards, Special Education, online instruction and evaluation, administrator training, and administrator evaluator training.** No data was provided. **Data results provided in conjunction with the site visit included a placeholder for AIMS results in Reading for students identified as ELL and SPED but no students were identified. Additionally, no analysis or comparative data was provided to determine if students are passing as a result of the school's instructional program.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative 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, the school stated that teachers are prepared to use the SIOP instructional model to support ELL students but no supplemental curriculum to support ELL students was identified.** **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 Math for ELL students. **The online curriculum includes an assessment program for each course but it was not apparent how these assessments are or could be modified for English Language Learners. The school did not include evidence of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency for ELL students nor data from multiple assessments to drive instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 Math for ELL students. **At the site visit, the school stated that teachers have an SEI endorsement and use the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model.** No data was provided. **Data results provided in conjunction with the site visit included a placeholder for AIMS results in Math for students identified as ELL but no students were identified. Additionally, no analysis or comparative data was provided to determine if students are passing as a result of the school's instructional program.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**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 for ELL students. **The online curriculum includes an assessment program for each course but it was not apparent how these assessments are or could be modified for English Language Learners. The school did not include evidence of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency for ELL students nor data from multiple assessments to drive instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 for ELL students. **At the site visit, the school stated that teachers have an SEI endorsement and use the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model.** No data was provided. **Data results provided in conjunction with the site visit included a placeholder for AIMS results in Reading for students identified as ELL but no students were identified. Additionally, no analysis or comparative data was provided to determine if an increasing number of students are passing as a result of the school's instructional program.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*			**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 Math for FRL students. **The online curriculum includes an assessment program for each course. The school has a Title I Math instructor available to work with students; the instructor reports progress to the principal each day. However, the evidence provided did not include evidence of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency for FRL eligible students nor data from multiple assessments to drive instructional decisions.**
		I/S	**Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 Math for FRL students. **The school's the professional development was focused on implementing Common Core State Standards, Special Education, online instruction and evaluation, administrator training, and administrator evaluator training.** No data was provided. **Data results provided in conjunction with the site visit included AIMS results in Math for students identified as FRL. However, no analysis or comparative data was provided to determine if an increasing number of students are passing as a result of the school's instructional program.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** 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 curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **In conjunction with the site visit, the school submitted course guide/syllabus aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for English I, English II, and English IV. Each course outline maps the standards and has a pacing guide embedded in the syllabus.** **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 for FRL students. **The online curriculum includes an assessment program for each course. However, the evidence provided did not include evidence of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency for FRL eligible students nor data from multiple assessments to drive instructional decisions.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 for FRL students. **The school's the professional development was focused on implementing Common Core State Standards, Special Education, online instruction and evaluation, administrator training, and administrator evaluator training.** No data was provided. **Data results provided in conjunction with the site visit included AIMS results in Reading for students identified as FRL. However, no analysis or comparative data was provided to determine if an increasing number of students are passing as a result of the school's instructional program.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** 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 curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit, the school submitted course guide/syllabus aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for Algebra I, Algebra II, Advanced Algebra with Financial Applications, and Calculus. Each course outline maps the standards and has a pacing guide embedded in the syllabus. The school states that the online curriculum incorporates software that is effective with SPED students but no data was provided as evidence.** **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 Math for students with disabilities. **The online curriculum includes an assessment program for each course. However, the evidence provided did not include evidence of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency for SPED students nor data from multiple assessments to drive instructional decisions.** No data was provided. **Data results provided in conjunction with the site visit included AIMS results in Math for students identified with disabilities. However, no analysis or comparative data was provided to determine if students are passing as a result of the school's instructional program.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** 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 curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit, the school submitted course guide/syllabus aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for English I, English II, and English IV. Each course outline maps the standards and has a pacing guide embedded in the syllabus. The school states that the online curriculum incorporates software that is effective with SPED students but no data was provided as evidence.** **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 for students with disabilities. **The online curriculum includes an assessment program for each course. However, the evidence provided did not include evidence of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency for SPED students nor data from multiple assessments to drive instructional decisions.** No data was provided. **Data results provided in conjunction with the site visit included AIMS results in Reading for students with disabilities. However, no analysis or comparative data was provided to determine if an increasing number of students are passing as a result of the school's instructional program.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	**I**		
4a. High School Graduation Rate ***(Traditional and Small Schools)***	**I**		

Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: E-Institute Charter School, Inc.
School Name: E-Institute at Metro
Date Submitted: 6/9/13, due 5/12/13

Required for: Review - Annual Report

Evaluation Completed: 8/27/13

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**	Limited data was provided. **No additional growth data was provided.**
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	Limited data was provided. **Additional Nova Net data was provided that demonstrated student growth in Language Arts.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Improvement (*Alternative High Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth for non-proficient students from one performance band to the next in Math. **In conjunction with the site visit; curriculum maps, pacing guides for math, and lesson plans were provided that demonstrated a fragmented approach that lacked cohesiveness and alignment with other school improvement efforts. No data was included to support student growth for non-proficient students from one performance band to the next in Math.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed or is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting growth of non-proficient students from one performance band to the next in Math. **In conjunction with the site visit; a comprehensive system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology was demonstrated. However, no additional data was provided to support the growth of non-proficient students from one performance band to the next in math.** No data was provided. **No additional data was provided to support the growth of non-proficient students from one performance band to the next in math.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Improvement (*Alternative High Schools only*) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth for non-proficient students from one performance band to the next in Reading. **In conjunction with the site visit; curriculum maps, pacing guides for math, and lesson plans were provided that demonstrated a fragmented approach that lacked cohesiveness and alignment with other school improvement efforts.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed or is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting growth of non-proficient students from one performance band to the next in Reading. **In conjunction with the site visit; a comprehensive system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology was demonstrated. Additional Nova Net data was provided that demonstrated growth of non-proficient students from one performance band to the next in Reading.** No data was provided. **Nova Net data was provided that demonstrated growth of non-proficient students from one performance band to the next in Reading.**
2a. Percent Passing *Math*	**S**	**I**	Limited data was provided. **In conjunction with the site visit; Galileo data was provided that demonstrated the majority of the students were on target to meet proficiency goals.**
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*	**S**	**I**	Limited data was provided. **In conjunction with the site visit; Galileo data was provided that demonstrated the majority of the students were exceeding the target to meet proficiency goals.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **No additional documentation 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 Math for ELL students. **Azella assessment results were provided the students were at the Intermediate level.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 Math for ELL students. **No additional documentation was provided.** No data was provided. **Azella assessment results were provided documenting the charter educates three Intermediate ELL students.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Assessment:** The narrative describes does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **No additional documentation was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 for ELL students. **No additional documentation was provided.** No data was provided. **Azella assessment results were provided documenting the charter educates three Intermediate ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*		**I/S**	**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 Math for FRL students. **No additional documentation was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 Math for FRL students. **No additional documentation was provided.** No data was provided. **No additional documentation was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **No additional documentation 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 for FRL students. **No additional documentation was provided.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 for FRL students. **No additional documentation was provided.** No data was provided. **No additional documentation was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit; the charter demonstrated a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards in Math for students with disabilities.** **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 Math for students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit; the charter demonstrated a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology in Math for students with disabilities. No assessment data was provided for tracking these students in isolation.** No data was provided. **No additional data was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit; the charter demonstrated a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards in Reading for students with disabilities.** **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 for students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit; the charter demonstrated a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology in Reading for students with disabilities. No assessment data was provided for tracking these students in isolation.** No data was provided. **No additional data was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	**I/S**		
4a. High School Graduation Rate ***(Alternative Schools)***	**I/S**		
4b. Academic Persistence *(Alternative only)*		**I/S**	Limited data included. **No additional data related to academic persistence was provided.**

Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: E-Institute Charter School, Inc.
School Name: E-Charter High School at Buckeye
Date Submitted: 6/9/13, due 5/12/13

Required for: Review - Annual Report

Evaluation Completed: 8/27/13; 10/7/13

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*	**S**	**I**	Limited data was provided. **The data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.**
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	Limited data was provided. **The data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*	**I/S**		

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading**. In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards that contributed to increased student growth in Reading for the students scoring in the bottom 25% in Reading. This was evidenced by curriculum maps, pacing guides, and data review teams.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed or is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. The narrative 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. **The assessment system and the data provided in the original DSP, used for all E-Institute Schools, were actually specific to Buckeye.** No data was provided. **The data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.**
2a. Percent Passing *Math*	**S**	**I**	Limited data was provided. **The data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.**
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*	**S**	**I**	Limited data was provided. **The data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative 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. **In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards. This was evidenced by curriculum maps, pacing guides, and data review teams.** **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 Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **The assessment system and the data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing 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 Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs for students with disabilities; no additional information was provided for ELL students or FRL students.** No data was provided. **The data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative 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 **In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards. This was evidenced by curriculum maps, pacing guides, and data review teams.** **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 for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **The assessment system and the data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing 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 for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs for students with disabilities; no additional information was provided for ELL students or FRL students.** No data was provided. **The data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students **In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards in Math for ELL students.** **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 Math for ELL students. **The assessment system and the data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 Math for ELL students. **No additional information was provided.** No data was provided. **No additional information was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**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 for ELL students. **The assessment system and the data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 for ELL students. **No additional information was provided.** No data was provided. **No additional information was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*		**I/S**	**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 Math for FRL students. **The assessment system and the data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 Math for FRL students. **No additional information was provided.** No data was provided. **No additional information was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards in Reading for FRL students.** **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 for FRL students. **The assessment system and the data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 for FRL students. **No additional information was provided.** No data was provided. **No additional information was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards in Math for students with disabilities.** **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 Math for students with disabilities. **The assessment system and the data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.** No data was provided. **No additional information was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards in Reading for students with disabilities.** **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 for students with disabilities. **The assessment system and the data provided in the original DSP used for all E-Institute Schools, was actually specific to Buckeye.** No data was provided. **No additional information was provided.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	**I/S**		

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
4a. High School Graduation Rate ***(Traditional and Small Schools)***	**I/S**		

Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: E-Institute Charter School, Inc.
School Name: E-Institute at Avondale
Date Submitted: 6/9/13, due 5/12/13

Required for: Review - Annual Report

Evaluation Completed: 8/27/13; 10/7/13

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*	**S**	**I**	Limited data was provided. **At the site visit and from the additional documentation, additional growth data was provided.**
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	Limited data was provided. **At the site visit and from the additional documentation, additional growth data was provided.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*	**I/S**		

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to develop or address school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading**. On the site visit and from additional documentation provided, the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona's College and Career Readiness Standards that contributed to increased student growth in Reading for the students scoring in the bottom 25% in Reading.** **Assessment:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed or is at the beginning stages of developing a comprehensive assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures and is not collecting data to monitor student growth. The narrative 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. **No additional documentation was provided for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading.** No data was provided. **No additional data was provided.**
2a. Percent Passing *Math*	**S**	**I**	Limited data was provided. **Additional proficiency data was provided.**
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*	**S**	**I**	Limited data was provided. **Additional proficiency data was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative 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. **In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards.** **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 Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit; an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology was demonstrated by data collection from multiple assessments and evidence of data collection being used for targeted instruction. However, no assessment data was provided for tracking each of these subgroups in isolation.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing 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 Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs for ELL, FRL and students with disabilities.** No data was provided. **No additional data was provided for ELL, FRL, and students with disabilities.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative 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. **In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards.** **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 for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit; an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology was demonstrated by data collection from multiple assessments and evidence of data collection being used for targeted instruction. However, no assessment data was provided for tracking each of these subgroups in isolation.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of developing 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 for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **In conjunction with the site visit; the school was able to demonstrate a professional development plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs for ELL, FRL, and students with disabilities.** No data was provided. **No additional data was provided for ELL, FRL, and students with disabilities.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **On the site visit and from additional documentation provided, the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards in Math for ELL students.** **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 Math for ELL students. **On the site visit, an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology was demonstrated by data collection from multiple assessments and evidence of data collection being used for targeted instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 Math for ELL students. **No additional information was provided.** No data was provided. **No additional data for ELL students was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**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 for ELL students. **On the site visit, an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology was demonstrated by data collection from multiple assessments and evidence of data collection being used for targeted instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 for ELL students. **No additional information was provided.** No data was provided. **No additional data was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*		**I/S**	**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 Math for FRL students. **On the site visit, an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology was demonstrated by data collection from multiple assessments and evidence of data collection being used for targeted instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 Math for FRL students. **No additional information was provided.** No data was provided. **No additional data was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **On the site visit and from additional documentation provided, the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards in Reading for FRL students.** **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 for FRL students. **On the site visit, an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology was demonstrated by data collection from multiple assessments and evidence of data collection being used for targeted instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes that the school has not developed 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 for FRL students. **No additional information was provided.** No data was provided. **No additional data was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **On the site visit and from additional documentation provided, the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards in Math for students with disabilities.** **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 Math for students with disabilities. **On the site visit, an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology was demonstrated by data collection from multiple assessments and evidence of data collection being used for targeted instruction.** No data was provided. **No assessment data was provided for tracking each of these subgroups in isolation.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes does not describe a school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **On the site visit, the school was able to demonstrate it had a system in place to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, including supplemental curriculum, aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards in Reading for students with disabilities.** **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 for students with disabilities. **On the site visit, an assessment system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology was demonstrated by data collection from multiple assessments and evidence of data collection being used for targeted instruction.** No data was provided**. No assessment data was provided for tracking each of these subgroups in isolation.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	**I/S**		
4a. High School Graduation Rate ***(Traditional and Small Schools)***	**I/S**		