APPENDIX C

Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation

Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: The Paideia Academies, Inc.
School Name: The Paideia Academy of South Phoenix
Date Submitted: 3/21/13

Required for: Expansion - Grade Level

Evaluation Completed: 4/3/13; Revised 4/24/13

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*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, sufficient curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Math was evident.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Math. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Math was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Math. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring and documenting student growth in Math was evident.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student growth in Math. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient professional development plan that contributes to increased student growth in Math was evident.** No data specific to student median growth percentiles was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student achievement in Math. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase student growth in Math.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, sufficient curriculum that contributes to increased student growth in Reading was evident.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Reading. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Reading was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting increases in student growth in Reading. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring and documenting student growth in Reading was evident.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student growth in Reading. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient professional development plan that contributes to increased student growth in Reading was evident.** No data specific to student median growth percentiles was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student achievement in Reading. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase student growth in Reading.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a Math curriculum that contributes to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **Based upon 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.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Math. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Math was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Math. **Based upon further review of additional documentation at the site visit, a sufficient plan for monitoring and documenting student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% was evident.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%. **Based upon further review of additional documentation at the site visit, a sufficient professional development plan that contributes to student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% was evident.** No data specific to students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student growth in Math. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a Reading curriculum that contributes to increased student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **Based upon 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 does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Reading. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Reading was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring and documenting student growth for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% in Reading. **Based upon further review of additional documentation at the site visit, a sufficient plan for monitoring and documenting student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% was evident.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%. **Based upon further review of additional documentation at the site visit, a sufficient professional development plan that contributes to student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% was evident.** No data specific to students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student growth in Reading. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math was evident** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Math. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Math was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math. **Based upon further review of additional documentation at the site visit, a sufficient plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math was evident.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math was evident.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading was evident** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Reading. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Reading was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading. **Based upon further review of additional documentation at the site visit, a sufficient plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading was evident.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading was evident.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a plan for implementing 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. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities was evident.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Math. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Math was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, data was provided that demonstrated implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities was evident.** 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. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2b. Composite School Comparison *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a plan for implementing 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. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students wit disabilities was evident.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Reading. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Reading was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visits, data was provided that demonstrated implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in comparison to expected performance levels in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities was evident.** 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. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison 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. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for ELL students was evident.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Math. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Reading was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, data was provided that demonstrated implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for ELL students.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students was evident.** No data specific to ELL students was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in Math. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase student proficiency in Math for ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison 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. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Reading. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Reading was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visits, data was provided that demonstrated implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students was evident.** No data specific to ELL students was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in Reading. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase student proficiency in Reading for ELL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison 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. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for FRL students.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Math. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Math was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, data was provided that demonstrated implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for FRL students.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students was evident.** No data specific to FRL students was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in Math. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase student proficiency in Math for FRL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison 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. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Reading. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Reading was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, data was provided that demonstrated implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for FRL students.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students was evident.** No data specific to FRL students was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in Reading. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase student proficiency in Math for FRL students.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison Students with disabilities *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a plan for implementing a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was evident.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Math. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Reading was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, data was provided that demonstrated implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was evident.** No data specific to students with disabilities was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in Math. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison Students with disabilities *Reading*	S	I	**Curriculum:** The narrative does not describe a plan for implementing a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a curriculum that contributes to increasing student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities was evident.** **Instruction:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring the integration of the AZ Academic Standards into instruction in Reading. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit a sufficient plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction in Reading was evident.** **Assessment:** The narrative does not describe a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, data was provided that demonstrated implementation of a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.** **Professional Development:** The narrative does not describe implementation of a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, a professional development plan that contributes to increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities was evident.** No data specific to students with disabilities was provided to demonstrate efforts to increase student proficiency in Reading. **Data was presented at the site visit that demonstrated efforts to increase student proficiency in Reading 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 or meeting targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model. **Based upon further review of documentation at the site visit, data was provided that demonstrated efforts to meet targets as described in the A-F Letter Grade Model.**