Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Kin Dah Lichii Olta
School Name: Kin Dah Lichii Olta
Date Submitted: March 27, 2013

Required for: Renewal

Evaluation Completed: 5/16/13; 6/4/2013

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) *Reading*	S	I	Curriculum: The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading. **After further review at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading was demonstrated.** Instruction: The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** Assessment: The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Reading. **At the site visit, an assessment system for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Reading was demonstrated.** Professional Development: The narrative 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 provided that demonstrated a professional development plan that contributes to increased student growth in Reading.** No data referencing Student Growth Percentiles was included. **At the site visit, data presented specific to student median growth percentiles in Reading demonstrated an increase in student growth.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative and data 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. **After further review at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math was demonstrated.** **Instruction:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Math for students in the bottom 25%. **At the site visit, the school shared assessment data that demonstrated how the school monitors and documents increased student growth in Math for students in the bottom 25%.** **Professional Development:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Math for students in the bottom 25%. **At the site visit, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student growth in Math for students in the bottom 25%.** Limited data was provided for this measure. **At the site visit, additional data was provided to demonstrate growth in Math for the bottom 25%.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** 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. **Based on further review of additional documentation at the site visit, sufficient curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% was evident.** **Instruction:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Reading for students in the bottom 25%. **At the site visit, the school shared assessment data that demonstrated how the school monitors and documents increased student growth in Reading for students in the bottom 25%.** **Professional Development:** The narrative and provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student growth in Reading for students in the bottom 25%. **At the site visit, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student growth in Reading for students in the bottom 25%.** Limited data was provided for this measure. **At the site visit, additional data was provided to demonstrate growth in Reading for the bottom 25%.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Math*	S	I	**Curriculum:** The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math. **Applicant provided additional documentation that demonstrated a sufficient curriculum that contributes to an increased number of students passing the state assessment in Math.** **Instruction:** 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. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math. **At the site visit, an assessment system for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency in Math was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** 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, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math.** Very limited data was presented. **At the site visit, additional data was provided to demonstrate proficiency in Math.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading. **Applicant provided additional documentation that demonstrated a sufficient curriculum that contributes to an increased number of students passing the state assessment in Reading.** **Instruction:** 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. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading. **At the site visit, an assessment system for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency in Reading was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading. **At the site visit, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading.** Very limited data was provided. **At the site visit, additional data was provided to demonstrate proficiency in Reading.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** 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. **Applicant provided additional documentation that demonstrated a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency of ELL students, FRL students and students with disabilities to expected performance levels in Math as compared to similar schools.** **Instruction:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, the school presented data that demonstrated how it monitored subgroups in math proficiency.** **Professional Development:** 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, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.** No data was provided specific to this measure. **At the site visit, additional data was provided to demonstrate proficiency in Math for subgroups.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **After further review of documentation from the site visit, the school does offer a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities to expected performance levels in Reading as compared to similar schools.** **Instruction:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, the school presented data that demonstrated how it monitored subgroups in reading proficiency.** **Professional Development:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **At the site visit, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.** No data was provided specific to this measure. **At the site visit, additional data was provided to demonstrate proficiency in Reading for subgroups.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **After further review of documentation from the site visit, the school does offer a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for ELL students in Math.** **Instruction:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **At the site visit, the school provided multiple measures aligned with the curriculum that demonstrated how it monitors and documents student proficiency in math for ELL students.** **Professional Development:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **At the site visit, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students.** Very limited data was provided specific to this measure. Data was provided at the site visit. **At the site visit, additional data was provided to demonstrate proficiency in Math for ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **After further review of documentation from the site visit, the school does offer a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for ELL students in Reading.** **Instruction:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **At the site visit, an assessment system for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency in Reading was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **At the site visit, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.** Very limited data was provided specific to this measure. **At the site visit, additional data was provided to demonstrate proficiency in Reading for ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **After further review of documentation from the site visit, the school does offer a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for FRL students in Math.** **Instruction:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **At the site visit, an assessment system for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency in Math was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **At the site visit, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students.** Very limited data was provided specific to this measure. **At the site visit, additional data was provided to demonstrate proficiency in Math for FRL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **After further review of documentation from the site visit, the school does offer a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for FRL students in Reading.** **Instruction:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **At the site visit, an assessment system for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency in Reading was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **At the site visit, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.** Very limited data was provided specific to this measure. **At the site visit, additional data was provided to demonstrate proficiency in Reading for FRL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **After further review at the site visit, additional data supported that the school provided a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in math for students with disabilities.** **Instruction:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **At the site visit, an assessment system for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency in Math was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** 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, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.** Very limited data was provided specific to this measure. **At the site visit, additional data was provided to demonstrate proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **After further review at the site visit, additional data supported that the school provided a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in reading for students with disabilities.** **Instruction:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction. **Based on review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **At the site visit, an assessment system for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency in Reading was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** 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, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.** Very limited data was provided specific to this measure. **At the site visit, additional data was provided to demonstrate proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	**I**		