Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Liberty Traditional Charter School
School Name: Liberty Traditional Charter School - Phoenix
Date Submitted: 2/28/13

Required for: Renewal

Evaluation Completed: 04/05/13; revised 05/01/13

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach, lacking cohesiveness and alignment with other school improvement efforts, to implement a curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards that contributes to increased student growth in Math. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math. **Applicant provided additional documentation at the site visit that demonstrated sufficient curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math.** No Math data from the current school year was provided. **Based upon further review of documentation provided at the site visit, additional data specific to student median growth percentiles in Math demonstrated a slight increase in growth.**
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach, lacking cohesiveness and alignment with other school improvement efforts, to implement a curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards that contributes to increased student growth in Reading. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading. **Applicant provided additional documentation at the site visit that demonstrated sufficient curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading.** No Reading data from the current school year was provided. **Based upon further review of documentation provided at the site visit, additional data specific to student median growth percentiles in Reading demonstrated an increase in student growth.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach, lacking cohesiveness and alignment with other school improvement efforts, to implement a curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards that contributes to increased student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%. 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. **Based on further review of additional documentation at the site visit, sufficient curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% was evident.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach, lacking cohesiveness and alignment with other school improvement efforts, to implement a curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards that contributes to increased student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%. 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 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.**
2a. Percent Passing *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach, lacking cohesiveness and alignment with other school improvement efforts, to implement a curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math. 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.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes that contribute to increased student proficiency in Math. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math. **Applicant provided additional documentation that demonstrated a sufficient professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Math.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes a fragmented approach to implement a curriculum aligned with Arizona Academic Standards that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading. 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.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes an approach that lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading. **Applicant provided additional documentation that demonstrated a sufficient professional development plan that contributed to increased student proficiency in Reading.**
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to implement a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency to expected performance levels in Math, as compared to similar schools, for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math to expected performance levels, as compared to similar schools, 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.** No Math data from the current school year specific to ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities was provided. **After further review at the site visit, data was provided that demonstrated student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math for students in subgroups.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to implement a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency to expected performance levels in Reading, as compared to similar schools, for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading to expected performance levels, as compared to similar schools, 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.** No Reading data from the current school year specific to ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities was provided. **After further review at the site visit, data was provided that demonstrated implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Reading for students in subgroups.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to implement a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students. The narrative and data 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.** No Math data from the current school year specific to ELL students was provided. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrates some increase in ELL student proficiency in Math.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to implement a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. The narrative and data 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.** No Reading data from the current school year specific to ELL students was provided. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase ELL student proficiency in Reading.**
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 in Math for FRL students. 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. **Administration stated that 100% of their population is FRL; therefore all efforts are to implement a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for FRL students.** **Assessment:** The assessments for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students are not aligned to the curriculum. The narrative describes the beginning stages of an assessment system. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **Administration stated that 100% of their population is FRL; therefore the data did demonstrate that the school was monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **Administration stated that 100% of their population is FRL; therefore all professional development efforts are directed at the FRL population.** No Math data from the current school year specific to FRL students was provided. **Administration stated that 100% of their population is FRL; therefore the data did demonstrate that the school was monitoring and documenting 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 in Reading for FRL students. 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. **Administration stated that 100% of their population is FRL; therefore all efforts are to implement a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for FRL students.** **Assessment:** The assessments for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for FRL students are not aligned to the curriculum. The narrative describes the beginning stages of an assessment system. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **Administration stated that 100% of their population is FRL; therefore the data did demonstrate that the school was monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.** **Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a professional development plan. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **Administration stated that 100% of their population is FRL; therefore all professional development efforts are directed at the FRL population.** No Reading data from the current school year specific to FRL students was provided. **Administration stated that 100% of their population is FRL; therefore the data did demonstrate that the school was monitoring and documenting 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 describes disjointed efforts to implement a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for students with disabilities. 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. **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.** No Math data from the current school year specific to students with disabilities was provided. **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.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative describes disjointed efforts to implement a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency to expected performance levels in Reading for students with disabilities. 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. **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.** No Reading data from the current school year specific to students with disabilities was provided. **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.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	**S**	**I**	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. **After further review at the site visit, the school provided additional data that demonstrated that the school is increasing student growth and proficiency.**

Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Liberty Traditional Charter School
School Name: Liberty Traditional Charter School-Saddleback
Date Submitted: 2/28/13

Required for: Renewal

Evaluation Completed: 04/05/13

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**	**Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of an assessment system. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **After further review at the site visit, a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math was demonstrated.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Assessment:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of an assessment system. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **After further review at the site visit, a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading was demonstrated.**
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*	**I/S**		

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Assessment:** The narrative describes an assessment approach not aligned with the curriculum and instructional practices in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading to expected performance levels, as compared to similar schools, for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **After further review at the site visit, a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading to expected performance levels, as compared to similar schools for subgroups was demonstrated.** No Reading data from the current school year specific to ELL students and students with disabilities was provided. **At the site visit, data regarding subgroup proficiency was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a professional development plan. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **At the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students was demonstrated.** No Math data from the current school year specific to ELL students and students with disabilities was provided. **At the site visit, data regarding ELL student proficiency in Math was provided.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a professional development plan. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **At the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students was demonstrated.** No Reading data from the current school year specific to ELL students was provided. **At the site visit, data regarding ELL student proficiency in Reading was provided.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a professional development plan. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **At the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students was demonstrated.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Professional Development:** The narrative describes the beginning stages of a professional development plan. The professional development described lacks a process for implementing new procedures and processes. The narrative and data provided did not demonstrate that the school implemented a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **At the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students was demonstrated.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a system to implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for students with disabilities. 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. **After further review at the site visit, a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in math for students with disabilities was demonstrated.** No Math data from the current school year specific to students with disabilities was provided. **At the site visit, additional data for students with disabilities was provided**.

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a system to implement, evaluate, and revise curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency for students with disabilities. 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. **After further review at the site visit, a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in math for students with disabilities was demonstrated.** No Reading data from the current school year specific to students with disabilities was provided. **At the site visit, additional data for students with disabilities was provided**.
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	**S**	**I**	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. **After further review at the site visit, the school demonstrated efforts to increase student growth and proficiency as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model.**