Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: La Tierra Community School, Inc.
School Name: La Tierra Community School

Date Submitted: 05/13/13
Required for: Adding Grade Levels and Enrollment Cap

Initial Evaluation Completed: 05/21/13
Final Evaluation Completed: 06/27/13

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

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Math*	**I/S**		
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*	**I/S**		
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Instruction:** The narrative does not describe the monitoring and evaluation of instructional practices regarding students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **Based on the review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Instruction:** The narrative does not describe the monitoring and evaluation of instructional practices regarding students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **Based on the review of documentation at the site visit, a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction was evident.**
2a. Percent Passing *Math*	**I/S**		
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*	**I/S**		

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*	**S**	**I**	No data specific to ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math. **After further review of documentation, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for all students including FRL students and students with disabilities. The school did not report having any ELL students.**
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	No data specific to ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Reading. **After further review of documentation, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading for all students including FRL students and students with disabilities. The school did not report any ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a plan for implementing a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for ELL students in Math. **After further review at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency for ELL students in Math was demonstrated.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Math with regards to ELL students. **Based on the 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 does not describe a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **At the site visit, an assessment system for monitoring and documenting increases in student proficiency in Math for ELL students was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes 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.** The narrative does not address the ELL population of the school. No data specific to ELL students was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in Math. **The school did not report any ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a plan for implementing a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for ELL students in Reading. **After further review at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency for ELL students in Reading was demonstrated.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Reading with regards to ELL students. **Based on the 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 does not describe 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 for ELL students was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes 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.** The narrative does not address the ELL population of the school. No data specific to ELL students was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in Reading. **The school did not report any ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a plan for implementing a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for FRL students in Math. **After further review at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency for FRL students in Math was demonstrated.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Math with regards to FRL students. **Based on the 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 does not describe 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 Reading for FRL students was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes 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.** The narrative does not address the FRL population of the school. No data specific to FRL students was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in Math. **After further review of documentation, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a plan for implementing a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for FRL students in Reading. **After further review at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency for FRL students in Reading was demonstrated.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Reading with regards to FRL students. **Based on the 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 does not describe 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 for FRL students was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes 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.** The narrative does not address the FRL population of the school. No data specific to FRL students was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in Reading. **After further review of documentation, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student 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 does not describe implementation of a Math curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency for students with disabilities. **After further review at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency for students with disabilities in Math was demonstrated.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Math with regards to students with disabilities Math. **Based on the 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 does not describe 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 for students with disabilities was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative did not explicitly link the professional development plan to increased student proficiency for students with disabilities in Math. **At the site visit, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.** The narrative does not address the ESS population of the school. No data specific to students with disabilities was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in Math. **After further review of documentation, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student 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 does not describe implementation of a Reading curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency for students with disabilities. **After further review at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency for students with disabilities in Reading was demonstrated.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Reading with regards to students with disabilities. **Based on the 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 does not describe 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 for students with disabilities was demonstrated.** **Professional Development:** The narrative did not explicitly link the professional development plan to increased student proficiency for students with disabilities in Reading. **At the site visit, the school provided documentation of professional development that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.** The narrative does not address the ESS population of the school. No data specific to students with disabilities was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in Reading. **After further review of documentation, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	**I/S**		