Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Tucson Preparatory School
School Name: Tucson Preparatory School
Date Submitted: 1/4/14
Academic Dashboard: FY13

Required for: Annual Report
Initial Evaluation Completed: 2/7/14
Final Evaluation Completed: 12/8/2014

I = Result after initial evaluation
S = Result after evaluation of information collected from the site visit

			Initial Evaluation	Final Evaluation
Measure	**Acceptable**	**Not Acceptable**	**Comments**	**Comments**
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative listed the courses available to students and stated that assessment results were used to identify students for remediation, but did not describe a system for implementing a 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 in math. **Instruction:** The area was scored as Approaches because the narrative stated that teachers were evaluated and observed, and that teachers conducted peer observations, but did not describe a system for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative named the assessment used and stated that results were used to identify students in need of remediation, but did not describe assessments aligned with the curriculum or a system for reviewing and analyzing data. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in math. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative stated that teachers were obtaining certifications in addition to their highly qualified status, but did not describe a professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs that	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student growth in Math on ACCR Standards because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have demonstrated how and when the school evaluates curriculum options, what findings the school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned

			includes follow-up and monitoring strategies. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in math. No data or analysis was provided for this measure.	curriculum with fidelity . **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student growth on ACCR Standards for Math because the evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams which would have demonstrated the school regularly and timely assesses students in a manner that is aligned with the curriculum in order to monitor student progress; and demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that does not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student growth in Math because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional development plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Math.
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative listed the courses available to students and stated that assessment results were used to identify students for remediation, but did not describe a system for implementing a curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student growth in Reading on ACCR Standards because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have demonstrated how and when the school

			to increased student growth in reading. **Instruction:** The area was scored as Approaches because the narrative stated that teachers were evaluated and observed, and that teachers conducted peer observations, but did not describe a system for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative named the assessment used and stated that results were used to identify students in need of remediation, but did not describe assessments aligned with the curriculum or a system for reviewing and analyzing data. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in reading. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative stated that teachers were obtaining certifications in addition to their highly qualified status, but did not describe a professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in reading. No data or analysis was provided for this measure.	evaluates curriculum options, what findings the school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Reading because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student growth on ACCR Standards for Reading because the evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that does not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student growth in Reading because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes

				follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional development plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth in Reading.
1b. Improvement (*Alternative High Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	The narrative provided did not address this measure. No data or analysis was provided for this measure.	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student performance in Math on ACCR Standards for non-proficient students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of non-proficient students which would have demonstrated how and when the school evaluates curriculum options, what findings the school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps; and demonstrated there is curriculum intended to provide differentiated materials, activities, and/or strategies for struggling, non-proficient students. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math for non-proficient students because

				the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of non-proficient students which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity; and demonstrated that the school evaluates the quality of instruction and identifies the strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs of teachers in relation to meeting the needs of non-proficient students. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student performance on ACCR Standards for Math for non-proficient students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of non-proficient students which would have demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction; and demonstrated how the assessment system assesses non-proficient students according to their needs. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that does not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student performance in Math for non-proficient students because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of non-proficient students which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional

				development plan; and demonstrate how the professional development plan addresses teacher weaknesses and learning needs and areas of high importance in relation to non-proficient students according to their needs. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student performance in Math for non-proficient students.
1b. Improvement (*Alternative High Schools only*) *Reading*		**I/S**	The narrative provided did not address this measure. No data or analysis was provided for this measure.	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence that curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of non-proficient students. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student performance in Reading on ACCR Standards for non-proficient students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of non-proficient students which would have demonstrated how and when the school evaluates curriculum options, what findings the school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps; and demonstrated there is curriculum intended to provide differentiated materials, activities, and/or strategies for struggling non-proficient students. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Reading for non-proficient students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of non-proficient students which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that

				teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity; and demonstrated that the school evaluates the quality of instruction and identifies the strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs of teachers in relation to meeting the needs of non-proficient students. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student performance on ACCR Standards for Reading for non-proficient students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of non-proficient students which would have demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction; and demonstrated how the assessment system assesses non-proficient students according to their needs. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that does not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student performance in Reading for non-proficient students because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of non-proficient students which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional development plan; and demonstrate how the professional development plan addresses teacher weaknesses and learning needs and areas of high importance in relation to non-proficient students according to their needs.

				Data: No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student performance in Reading for non-proficient students.
2a. Percent Passing *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative listed the courses available to students and stated that assessment results were used to identify students for remediation, but did not describe a system for implementing a 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 proficiency in math. **Instruction:** The area was scored as Approaches because the narrative stated that teachers were evaluated and observed, and that teachers conducted peer observations, but did not describe a system for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative named the assessment used and stated that results were used to identify students in need of remediation, but did not describe assessments aligned with the curriculum or a system for reviewing and analyzing data. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in math. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative stated that teachers were obtaining certifications in addition to their highly qualified status, but did not describe a professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for professional development that contributed to increased student proficiency in math. No data or analysis was provided for this measure.	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Math on ACCR Standards because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have demonstrated how and when the school evaluates curriculum options, what findings the school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Math because the evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes

				data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams which would have demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that does not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Math because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional development plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math.
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative listed the courses available to students and stated that assessment results were used to identify students for remediation, but did not describe a system for implementing a 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 proficiency in reading. **Instruction:** The area was scored as Approaches because the narrative stated that teachers were evaluated and observed, and that teachers conducted peer observations, but did not describe a system for analysis and feedback. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards into instruction. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Reading on ACCR Standards because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have demonstrated how and when the school evaluates curriculum options, what findings the school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides

			named the assessment used and stated that results were used to identify students in need of remediation, but did not describe assessments aligned with the curriculum or a system for reviewing and analyzing data. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in reading. **Professional Development:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative stated that teachers were obtaining certifications in addition to their highly qualified status, but did not describe a professional development plan aligned with teacher learning needs that includes follow-up and monitoring strategies. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in reading. No data or analysis was provided for this measure.	evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Reading because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that does not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Reading because the evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams which would have demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that does not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Reading because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional

				development plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading.
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Fall Far Below because the narrative states that adapted curriculum is created for ELL students on a case-by-case basis for students, but does not describe a system to implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for ELL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in math for ELL students. **Instruction:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Assessment:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Professional Development:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. No data or analysis was provided for this measure.	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Math on ACCR Standards for ELL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students which would have demonstrated how and when the school evaluates curriculum options, what findings the school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps; and demonstrated there is curriculum intended to provide differentiated materials, activities, and/or strategies for struggling ELL students. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math for ELL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of ELL students which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity; and demonstrated that the school evaluates the quality of instruction and identifies the strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs of teachers in relation to meeting the needs of ELL students.

				Assessment: This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Math for ELL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students which would have demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction; and demonstrated how the assessment system assesses ELL students according to their needs. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that does not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Math for ELL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional development plan; and demonstrate how the professional development plan addresses teacher weaknesses and learning needs and areas of high importance in relation to ELL students according to their needs. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students.

2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Fall Far Below because the narrative states that adapted curriculum is created for ELL students on a case-by-case basis for students, but does not describe a system to implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for ELL students. The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in reading for ELL students. **Instruction:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Assessment:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Professional Development:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. No data or analysis was provided for this measure.	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Reading on ACCR Standards for ELL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students which would have demonstrated how and when the school evaluates curriculum options, what findings the school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps; and demonstrated there is curriculum intended to provide differentiated materials, activities, and/or strategies for struggling ELL students. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Reading for ELL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of ELL students which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity; and demonstrated that the school evaluates the quality of instruction and identifies the strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs of teachers in relation to meeting the needs of ELL students. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Reading for ELL students because the

				evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students which would have demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction; and demonstrated how the assessment system assesses ELL students according to their needs. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that do not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Reading for ELL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of ELL students which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional development plan; and demonstrate how the professional development plan addresses teacher weaknesses and learning needs and areas of high importance in relation to ELL students according to their needs. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below because the narrative states that tutoring is provided and remediation courses are assigned based on assessment results, but does not describe a system to implement, evaluate, and revise 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 increasing student proficiency in math for FRL students.	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Math on ACCR Standards for FRL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of FRL students which would have demonstrated how and when the school evaluates curriculum options, what findings the

			Instruction: The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Assessment:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Professional Development:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. No data or analysis was provided for this measure.	school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps; and demonstrated there is curriculum intended to provide differentiated materials, activities, and/or strategies for struggling FRL students. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math for FRL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of FRL students which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity; and demonstrated that the school evaluates the quality of instruction and identifies the strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs of teachers in relation to meeting the needs of FRL students. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Math for FRL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of FRL students which would have demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction; and

				demonstrated how the assessment system assesses FRL students according to their needs. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that does not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Math for FRL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of FRL students which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional development plan; and demonstrate how the professional development plan addresses teacher weaknesses and learning needs and areas of high importance in relation to FRL students according to their needs. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students.
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below because the narrative states that tutoring is provided and remediation courses are assigned based on assessment results, but does not describe a system to implement, evaluate, and revise 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 increasing student proficiency in reading for FRL students. **Instruction:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Assessment:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Professional Development:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. No data or analysis was provided for this measure.	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Reading on ACCR Standards for FRL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of FRL students which would have demonstrated how and when the school evaluates curriculum options, what findings the school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps; and demonstrated there is curriculum intended to

				provide differentiated materials, activities, and/or strategies for struggling FRL students. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Reading for FRL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of FRL students which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity; and demonstrated that the school evaluates the quality of instruction and identifies the strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs of teachers in relation to meeting the needs of FRL students. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Reading for FRL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of FRL students which would have which would have demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction; and demonstrated how the assessment system assesses FRL students according to their needs. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that does not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Reading for FRL students because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning

				needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of FRL students which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional development plan; and demonstrate how the professional development plan addresses teacher weaknesses and learning needs and areas of high importance in relation to FRL students according to their needs. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Fall Far Below because the narrative states that modified workloads and tutoring are provided but does not describe a system to implement, evaluate, and revise 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 increasing student proficiency in math for students with disabilities. **Instruction:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Assessment:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Professional Development:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. No data or analysis was provided for this measure.	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Math on ACCR Standards for Students with disabilities because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of Students with disabilities which would have demonstrated how and when the school evaluates curriculum options, what findings the school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps; and demonstrated there is curriculum intended to provide differentiated materials, activities, and/or strategies for struggling students with disabilities. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP

				provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math for Students with disabilities because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of students with disabilities which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity; and demonstrated that the school evaluates the quality of instruction and identifies the strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs of teachers in relation to meeting the needs of students with disabilities. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Math for Students with disabilities because the evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of Students with disabilities which would have demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction; and demonstrated how the assessment system assesses students with disabilities according to their needs. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that does not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Math for Students with disabilities because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of Students with disabilities which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and

				demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional development plan; and demonstrate how the professional development plan addresses teacher weaknesses and learning needs and areas of high importance in relation to students with disabilities according to their needs. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Fall Far Below because the narrative states that modified workloads and tutoring are provided but does not describe a system to implement, evaluate, and revise 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 increasing student proficiency in reading for students with disabilities. **Instruction:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Assessment:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Professional Development:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. No data or analysis was provided for this measure.	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student proficiency in Reading on ACCR Standards for Students with disabilities because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum, and that the curriculum is adapted to meet the needs of Students with disabilities which would have demonstrated how and when the school evaluates curriculum options, what findings the school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps; and demonstrated there is curriculum intended to provide differentiated materials, activities, and/or strategies for struggling students with disabilities. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Reading for Students with disabilities because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, and that the processes are adapted to meet the needs of Students with disabilities which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all

				grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity; and demonstrated that the school evaluates the quality of instruction and identifies the strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs of teachers in relation to meeting the needs of students with disabilities. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student proficiency on ACCR Standards for Reading for Students with disabilities because the evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams, and that is adapted to meet the needs of Students with disabilities which would have demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction; and demonstrated how the assessment system assesses students with disabilities according to their needs. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that does not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student proficiency in Reading for Students with disabilities because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation, and that that is adapted to meet the needs of Students with disabilities which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional development plan; and demonstrate how the professional development plan addresses teacher weaknesses and learning needs and areas of high importance in relation to students with disabilities according to their

				needs. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** This area was scored as Falls Far Below because the narrative states that tutoring is provided and curriculum has been redeveloped, but does not describe a system to implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum aligned with Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards. **Instruction:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. **Assessment:** This area was scored as Approaches because the narrative provides a breakdown of math computation and reading comprehension scores, but did not describe assessments aligned with the curriculum or formative and summative assessments. **Professional Development:** The narrative did not address this area for this measure. 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.	**Curriculum:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of processes that do not demonstrate the school has implemented a curriculum to increase student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading on ACCR Standards because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to create, implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum which would have demonstrated how and when the school evaluates curriculum options, what findings the school makes about curriculum options, and who is involved in the curriculum adoption process; demonstrated the school utilizes tools that identify what must be taught, the expected pacing, strategies, methods, and activities, and communicated expectations for the consistent use of these tools; and demonstrated how the school evaluates how effectively the curriculum enables students to master the standards, identifies gaps in the curriculum, and demonstrates how the school is addressing curricular gaps. **Instruction:** This area is scored as Approaches. The DSP provides evidence of processes to evaluate the instructional practices of the teachers evidenced by formal teacher evaluations, informal classroom observations. The DSP provides evidence of a system that provides for some analysis and feedback to further develop the system. The DSP provides evidence of approaches that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the ACCR Standards into instruction in Math and Reading because the evidence does not demonstrate a system that includes processes to monitor the integration of ACCR Standards into instruction, which would have demonstrated that the school ensures all grade level standards are taught within the school year in all classrooms and that teachers implement an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity. **Assessment:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of an approach that do not demonstrate the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting changes in student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading on ACCR Standards because the evidence does not demonstrate a system based on clearly defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional

				methodology and includes data collection from multiple assessments, and data review teams which would have demonstrated how and when the school analyzes assessment data, what findings the school makes from assessment data, who is involved in the analysis of assessment data, and how that analysis is used to inform and adapt instruction. **Professional Development:** This area is scored as Falls Far Below. The DSP provides evidence of a plan that does not demonstrate the school implemented a professional development plan to increase student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading on ACCR Standards because the evidence does not demonstrate a comprehensive plan that is aligned with teacher learning needs, includes follow-up and monitoring strategies, focuses on areas of high importance, and supports high quality implementation which would have demonstrated that the plan was developed to address teacher learning needs and areas of high importance; demonstrate how the charter holder provides access to resources necessary to implement the information and strategies, and/or otherwise supports teachers in planning to implement the information and strategies; and demonstrated how implementation is observed and evaluated and how the school ensures teacher development is ongoing in relation to the information and strategies learned through the professional development plan. **Data:** No data and analysis of data was provided to demonstrate increased student growth and proficiency in Math and Reading.