The Shelby School

An Arizona Non-Profit Charter School

June 9, 2013

Via e-mail only

Martha Morgan
Director of Charter Accountability
Arizona State Board for Charter Schools
1616 W. Adams Street
Suite 170
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Martha:

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me and Dr. Stuyvesant on Friday, June 7th. As we expressed, we were so surprised to learn of your February 7, 2013 letter requesting the submission of a Demonstration of Sufficient Progress report on or before May 7, 2013. We only learned of this letter by chance when our external accountant found that the Shelby School was on the agenda for the June 10, 2013 meeting of the ASBCS. The accountant contacted us the afternoon of Thursday, June 6th. We were shocked, to say the least. We then contacted Bianca with your office, who kindly forwarded the letter to us again.

We are still trying to determine why we did not receive the e-mail on February 7th. It is clear that we had some sort of technology failure, and we are working to make sure that this does not occur again. As you know, we are located in a rural area and frequently experience power and utility outages due to rain and snow, especially in the winter months. Had we received the e-mail, I can assure you that we would have timely submitted all of the materials requested. In the thirteen years since we received our charter from your Board, we have never failed to comply with any request for information. We apologize for these unintended circumstances.

Since Thursday the 6th we have been working diligently to generate a quality DSP Report as requested in your February 7 letter. That DSP document is attached to this letter. We feel that this document clearly and accurately addresses the concerns that our School is confronting with respect to its math and reading scores, the steps we have taken to address those issues, the progress we have made, and our continued work ahead.

Thank you again for your assistance. If we can be of any help to you or the Board during your consideration of the attached DSP, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Trina L. Kamp, Contract Signer, <drtrina.shelby@gmail.com>

Mailing Address:
The Shelby School
PO Box 1804
Payson, AZ 85547
(Tel) 928-478-4706
(Fax) 928-478-0681

Shipping Address:
The Shelby School
249 W. Standage Drive
Payson, AZ 85541

Demonstration of Sufficient Progress (DSP) Report-The Shelby School

Introduction

This Demonstration of Sufficient Progress (DSP) report will examine the Shelby School's academic performance rating of 2011-2012. We received an overall rating of 54.41 which fell 8.59 points from the Meets Standard. In this report we will examine the SGP in Math of 34 and the SGP in Reading of 41. In addition, we will examine the percent passing of 39% in Math and 71% in Reading as well as the subgroup results. To avoid redundancy, we have integrated the topics of Curriculum, Instruction, etc. into our primary focus on reading and math.

Reading Intervention for all Students and Subgroups of Students

The Shelby School implemented a comprehensive reading assessment and intervention program for the 2012-2013 year. Below is a table which reflects the diagnostic criteria we used for each grade level in response to the 2011-2012 SGP and percent passing on AIMS.

Table 1
Reading Diagnostic Criteria by Grade Level

Kindergarten to Grade 2	Grades 3 to 6	Grades 7 to 10
1. Dibels Testing	AIMS Testing	AIMS Testing
2. Classroom Performance and Initial Skills Assessment	Dibels, Reading Program Assessment and Classroom Performance	Reading Program Assessment and Classroom Performance
3. Teacher Recommendation	Teacher Recommendation	Teacher Recommendation

In response to the 2011-2012 SGPs and percent passing in AIMS, the Shelby School began a universal screening program for all students in the fall of 2012. We identified students who were at Benchmark, At Some Risk, and At Risk. Diagnostic testing followed for those at some risk and at risk (Tier II and Tier III). Those at some risk (Tier II) received an additional 30 minutes, four days of week of individualized or small group instructional support. Those at risk (Tier III) received additional instructional support of 60 minutes, five days a week. Progress monitoring occurred every three weeks and Benchmark (summative evaluation) occurred at mid-year and end of year. Our ALEAT CIP report presents additional significant detail on these topics.

We also created a four-member literacy and math committee responsible for the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of our reading program. This committee implemented professional development activities for all teachers and aides and oversaw the math program as well. Professional development activities included numerous Webinars and teacher workshops in best practices for reading instruction and intervention. These workshops focused on: phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, spelling, vocabulary, and comprehension. Our intervention program for both reading and math was coordinated and instructed by highly qualified teachers and highly qualified instructional aides.

In regard to our subgroups, The Shelby School does not have any ELL students. However, if we were to have students enrolled, this intervention plan would have been successful with them as well. Our FRL subgroup (which makes up 80% of our population), the bottom 25% of students, and our special education students all benefited from this program. The main adjustment that we made, based on input from our literacy committee, was to provide individualized, one-on-one instructional intervention to our bottom 25% and our special education students subgroups (many of these students were in both groups).

The results of the year-long intervention in reading are very encouraging, based on the 2012-2013 AIMS Reading results. For grade 5 (N = 5), grade 7 (N = 4), and grade 8 (N = 1), 100% of the students MET in the AIMS Reading. In grade 6 (N = 6), 67% MET and in grade 4 (N = 6), 50% of the students MET in AIMS Reading.

In Grade 3 (N = 5), we only had 1 MEET (17%), 4 APPROACH (66%), and 1 FFB (17%). To some this might be perceived as a “failure” for our grade 3 students. However, we are encouraged by this growth. From their second grade SAT-10 scores in 2011-2012 for Reading, this group (N = 7) performed the lowest of any second grade class we have ever encountered (with the one student included who scored at the NPR = 56th, group results were at the NPR = 12th. However, taking that one student out, the group results (N = 6) fell to the NPR = 4th). Without this reading intervention for 2012-2013, we would have predicted that all 6 students would FFB.

In addition, based on the SAT-10 for 2012-2013 in Reading, the second graders (N = 3) scored at the NPR = 35th (a significant improvement over last year’s second graders at a NPR = 12th). Our two ninth graders scored as a group in Reading at NPR = 90th. These results support the effectiveness of the reading intervention program we initiated last year due to the low SGP and the percent passing the AIMS in Reading from the 2011-2012 AIMS.

Table 2
AIMS Reading 2012-2013 by Grade Level

Grade	MEETS	APPROACHES	FFB
3 (N= 6)	1 (17%)	4 (66%)	1 (17%)
4 (N = 6)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
5 (N = 5)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
6 (N = 6)	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	0 (0%)
7 (N = 4)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
8 (N = 1)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

At the time of this report we still do not have the SGPs for reading and math for the 2012-2013 testing. This summer, after an evaluation by our literacy committee of our reading intervention program, we've implemented the Read Naturally software to provide additional computer support for students for the 2013-2014 year. In addition, we are engaging the services of an educational specialist to assist us in both our reading and math instructional and intervention programs.

Math Intervention for all Students and Subgroups of Students

For our math assessment and intervention program we implemented a grade intervention for grades 6 and 9 for 2011-2012. As a response to the 2011-2012 SGPs and percent passing in the math AIMS, The Shelby School began a screening program for students in grades 6 and 9 in the fall of 2012. We identified students who were at Benchmark, At Some Risk, and At Risk. Diagnostic testing followed for those at some risk and at risk (Tier II and Tier III). Those at some risk (Tier II) received an additional 30 minutes, four days of week of individualized or small group instructional support. Those at risk (Tier III) received additional instructional support of 60 minutes, five days a week. Progress monitoring occurred every three weeks and Benchmark (summative evaluation) occurred at mid-year and end of year. Our ALEAT CIP report presents additional significant detail on these topics.

We also created a four-member literacy and math committee responsible for the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of our math program. They also implemented professional development activities for all teachers and aides.

In regard to our subgroups, The Shelby School does not have any ELL students. However, if we were to have students enrolled, this intervention plan would have been successful with them as well. Our FRL subgroup (which makes up 80% of our population), the bottom 25% of students, and our special education students all benefited from this program. Our results for these two grade levels were encouraging, targeting grade 6 for the 2012-2013 AIMS, 4 of 6 (67%) met in AIMS math while in ninth grade with an N = 2 they performed as a group at the 90th Percentile Rank on the SAT-10.

Table 3
Math Diagnostic Criteria by Grade Level and 2012-2013 Results

Grade 6 (N=6)	**Grade 9 (N=2)**
1. AIMS Testing	AIMS Testing
2. Math Program Assessment and Classroom Performance	Math Program Assessment and Classroom Performance
3. Teacher Recommendation	Teacher Recommendation
4 of 6 MET AIMS Math – 67%	2 of 2 on SAT 10 Math PR = 90th

The math results for the other grades were not as encouraging. Based on this feedback we are immediately implementing our math intervention program for all grades using IXL Math for grades K-2 and ALEKS for grades 3-10.

Two positive results were the second graders (N = 3) who performed at the NPR = 43rd on the SAT-10, and the fourth graders (N = 6) where 50% met the AIMS standard.

Table 4
AIMS Math by Grade Level 2012-2013

Grade	**MEETS**	**APPROACHES**	**FFB**
3 (N = 6)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)
4 (N = 6)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)
5 (N = 5)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)
6 (N = 6)	4 (67%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)
7 (N = 4)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)
8 (N = 1)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)

Our committee analyzed the individual scores and evaluated strengths and areas for improvement. The committee found that several students who approached were within a few points of meeting the AIMS. For instance, a fifth grader fell one point short of meeting the AIMS math. All staff who participated in this program are highly qualified. Also, at the time of this report we still do not have the SGPs for reading and math for the 2012-2013 testing. For Fall, we are implementing a comprehensive program for all grades which will include, in addition to the basic math curriculum, IXL Math for grades K-2 and ALEKS for grades 3-10.

Additional Requested Information Related to our Program and School

The Shelby School is a K-10 school. Over the years, we have worked diligently to increase our attendance percentages and have had less than a 5% absence rate. Since we do not offer 11th or 12th grade, we do not have alternative programs, service learning, or career/technical education. However, as 8th through 10th grade students show a marked interest in an occupational area we work to provide mentorships and training in those additional areas. For instance, as part of a student's Career Plan (which is developed with the parents) we have provided mentorships in law, engineering, construction, food service, and veterinary medicine.

Teachers and aides at our School are consistently monitored in their classrooms and are provided instructional and teaching support on an on-going basis. They also receive a review and evaluation of their students' summative testing at the end of each year. In addition, teacher meetings and in-service occurs several times a month to assist with any concerns regarding the needs of specific students and to provide additional training for the staff. Since all of our teachers and aides are highly qualified, all of our students benefit from this experience.

Based on an ongoing needs assessment, our School provides staff, on at least a monthly basis, workshops to support their professional development. Past workshop topics include: AIMS Interpretation, Student Study Skills, Communicating with Parents, Bullying, and Cyber-Bullying. In addition, staff have attended numerous Webinars, for instance, in reading: Close Reading, Text Complexity, Grammar in CCSS, and Instructional Shifts in CCSS ELA. In math, the Webinars and on-line training have included: Mathematics Practices K-2 and 3-5, Introduction to Math Standards and Key Content Shifts, School-wide Collaboration to Implement the Math CCSS, and Training in the Use of ALEKS.

Our School has a plan in place that ensures implementation of the Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness for teachers and principal. This plan includes reports to our School Board and follow-up input to the staff to continue to improve their effectiveness.

Teachers and aides have been trained throughout the school year to scaffold all instruction such as modeling a task, giving advice and providing coaching. They are then trained to gradually remove these strategies as students develop their own autonomous learning strategies. In addition, we continuously use individualized instruction and maintain a 10:1 student-teacher ratio in all classrooms. The School has created a comprehensive progress monitoring procedure for all students which includes a beginning of the year assessment, individualized and small group additional instruction, progress monitoring every three weeks, and formative evaluation three times a year.

One of the School's primary goals is to prepare students to be successful in the 10th grade AIMS testing by providing the necessary instruction and remediation based on students' needs. Using their performance from the 8th grade AIMS and the 9th grade SAT-10 testing, we developed a support plan of instruction to "fill in the gaps" which have been identified so that they can succeed on the 10th grade AIMS.

Parents are involved in our Continuous Improvement Plan and in all school plans. We have teachers who are parents also involved in our Continuous Improvement Plan. The School has implemented expressed needs of parents in the overall planning process. For instance, the parents expressed a need over last summer to have a scouting program for boys and girls not just from our School but also available to children in the greater geographical area. We are one of the few schools in the nation that now sponsors a scouting program at the direct request of our parents.

Our School's parents have developed their own PTO and we have teachers as parents who also contribute to the organization. We also provide a parent workshop on how to interpret the AIMS or SAT-10 results which are sent to parents at the end of every year. We work individually with parents to help them provide the best instruction to their students while doing homework, and consult with them on any other concerns.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Report. As a small rural school, we care deeply about our students and school, and have diligently worked to meet all of the State requirements in all areas. Although not asked for, one of our strongest programs is Science. During 2011-2012 we had 100% meet or exceed the AIMS at the grades tested and this year we had close to 100% meet or exceed, including our two 9th graders taking the AIMS Biology test who exceeded. Finally, we are the only charter school in the greater Payson area to offer instruction in grades K-8 and we feel that, based on parent and student input, we provide a valuable, small group alternative to this geographical region. Thank you again.