Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: The Shelby School
School Name: The Shelby School
Date Submitted: 6/9/13

Required for: Review - Annual Report

Evaluation Completed 6/19/13; 11/4/13

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 to implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included lesson plans, pacing guides, and standards checklists demonstrating a developing curriculum for Math. A new Math curriculum was scheduled for adoption for the 2013-14 school year.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews or formal teacher evaluations. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included pre-observation conference forms, notes from classroom observations, post-observation conference forms, and teacher performance evaluation forms that demonstrated the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a plan that lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Math. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included the professional development calendar for 2012-13, agendas and attendance logs for professional development sessions, math committee meeting agendas, and teacher/aide meeting agendas that demonstrated the implementation of a professional development plan.** Data provided does not demonstrate improved academic growth in Math. **Disaggregation and analysis of AIMS 2013 math scores was provided. The analysis did not demonstrate improved student growth in Math.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			In totality, the school demonstrated implementation of systems in the areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development, but did not provide data that demonstrated increased student growth in Math.
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach to implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included lesson plans, pacing guides, and standards checklists that demonstrated implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews or formal teacher evaluations. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included pre-observation conference forms, notes from classroom observations, post-observation conference forms, and teacher performance evaluation forms that demonstrated implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a plan that lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Reading. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included the professional development calendar for 2012-13, agendas and attendance logs for professional development sessions, literacy committee meeting agendas, and teacher/aide meeting agendas that demonstrated implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Reading.** Data provided does not demonstrate increases in student growth in Reading. **DIBELS and Great Leaps progress monitoring data was provided that demonstrated increases in student growth in Reading.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach to implement, evaluate, and revise 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. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included lesson plans, pacing guides, and standards checklists demonstrating a developing core curriculum for Math. A new Math intervention program was piloted during the school year, but no documentation of the piloted Math intervention was provided.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews or formal teacher evaluations. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included pre-observation conference forms, notes from classroom observations, post-observation conference forms, and teacher performance evaluation forms that demonstrated implementation of a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a plan that lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included the professional development calendar for 2012-2013, agendas and attendance logs for professional development sessions, math committee meeting agendas, and teacher/aide meeting agendas that demonstrated the implementation of a professional development plan.** No data specific to students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math was provided. **2013 AIMS data and three-year average percent passing data was provided. Data presented did not demonstrate improved academic growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math.** **In totality, the school demonstrated implementation of systems in the areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development, but did not provide data that demonstrated improved academic growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*	S	I	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach to implement, evaluate, and revise 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. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included lesson plans, pacing guides, and standards checklists that demonstrated implementation of a curriculum and intervention program that contributes to increased student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews or formal teacher evaluations. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included pre-observation conference forms, notes from classroom observations, post-observation conference forms, teacher performance evaluation form that demonstrated the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a plan that lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included the professional development calendar for 2012-2013, agendas and attendance logs for professional development sessions, math committee meeting agendas, teacher/aide meeting agendas that demonstrated the implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth for students for growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading.** No data specific to students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading was provided. **DIBELS and Great Leaps progress monitoring data was provided that demonstrated increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach to implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included lesson plans, pacing guides, and standards checklists demonstrating a developing curriculum for Math. A new Math curriculum was scheduled for adoption for the 2013-2014 school year.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews or formal teacher evaluations. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included pre-observation conference forms, notes from classroom observations, post-observation conference forms, and teacher performance evaluation forms that demonstrated the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a plan that lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for professional development that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included the professional development calendar for 2012-2013, agendas and attendance logs for professional development sessions, math committee meeting agendas, and teacher/aide meeting agendas that demonstrated the implementation of a professional development plan.** Data provided does not demonstrate improved student proficiency in Math. **Disaggregation and analysis of AIMS 2013 math scores was provided. The analysis did not demonstrate improved student proficiency in Math.** **In totality, the school demonstrated implementation of systems in the areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development, but did not provide data that demonstrated improved student proficiency in Math.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach to implement, evaluate, and revise 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. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included lesson plans, pacing guides, and standards checklists demonstrating a developing curriculum for Math. A new Math curriculum was scheduled for adoption for the 2013-2014 school year.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews or formal teacher evaluations. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included pre-observation conference forms, notes from classroom observations, post-observation conference forms, and teacher performance evaluation forms that demonstrated the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a plan that lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. 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. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included the professional development calendar for 2012-2013, agendas and attendance logs for professional development sessions, math committee meeting agendas, and teacher/aide meeting agendas that demonstrated the implementation of a professional development plan.** No data specific to students with disabilities was provided. **Analysis of AIMS math scores was provided for FRL students and SPED students. The data provided did not demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students and students with disabilities. The school currently does not serve any identified ELL students.** **In totality, the school demonstrated implementation of systems in the areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development, but did not provide data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students and students with disabilities.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison ELL *Math*	**I/S**		
2c. Subgroup Comparison ELL *Reading*	**I/S**		
2c. Subgroup Comparison FRL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach to implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included lesson plans, pacing guides, and standards checklists demonstrating a developing curriculum for Math. A new Math curriculum was scheduled for adoption for the 2013-2014 school year.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews or formal teacher evaluations. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included pre-observation conference forms, notes from classroom observations, post-observation conference forms, teacher performance evaluation form that demonstrated the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a plan that lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included the professional development calendar for 2012-2013, agendas and attendance logs for professional development sessions, math committee meeting agendas, teacher/aide meeting agendas that demonstrated the implementation of a professional development plan.** Data provided does not demonstrate improved academic improvement in Math. **Analysis of AIMS math scores was provided for FRL students. The data provided did not**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **In totality, the school demonstrated implementation of systems in the areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development, but did not provide data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach to implement, evaluate, and revise 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. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included lesson plans, pacing guides, and standards checklists demonstrating a developing curriculum for Math. A new Math curriculum was scheduled for adoption for the 2013-2014 school year.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews or formal teacher evaluations. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included pre-observation conference forms, notes from classroom observations, post-observation conference forms, and teacher performance evaluation forms that demonstrated the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a plan that lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included the professional development calendar for 2012-2013, agendas and attendance logs for professional development sessions, math committee meeting agendas, and teacher/aide meeting agendas that demonstrated the implementation of a professional development plan.** No data specific to students with disabilities was provided. **Analysis of AIMS math scores was provided for SPED students. The data provided did not demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.** **In totality, the school demonstrated implementation of systems in the areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development, but did not provide**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
			data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.
2c. Subgroup Comparison Students with disabilities *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach to implement, evaluate, and revise 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 increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included lesson plans, pacing guides, and standards checklists that demonstrated implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.** **Instruction:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of monitoring and evaluating standards and instructional practices. There is no evidence of lesson plan reviews or formal teacher evaluations. The narrative did not describe a process for formal evaluations of teachers. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included pre-observation conference forms, notes from classroom observations, post-observation conference forms, and teacher performance evaluation forms that demonstrated the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes a plan that lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **At the site visit, documentation was reviewed that included professional development calendar for 2012-13, agendas and attendance logs for professional development sessions, math committee meeting agendas, and teacher/aide meeting agendas that demonstrated the implementation of a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.** No data specific to students with disabilities was provided. **DIBELS and Great Leaps progress monitoring data was provided that demonstrated improved student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System		**I/S**	The narrative provided did not address target for the A-F Letter Grade Model. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school is increasing student growth and proficiency or meeting targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model. **At the site visit addition documentation addressing the growth and proficiency targets A-F Letter Grade Model was provided.** **In totality, the school demonstrated implementation of systems in the areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development, but did not provide data that demonstrated improved student growth and proficiency in Math.**