# Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Aprender Tucson
School Name: Southside Community School
Site Visit Date: January 20, 2015

Required for: Annual Report
Evaluation Criteria Area: Data

| Document Name/Identification | Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome |
|---|---|
| [D.1] | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) - Math<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Math.**<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the charter holder provided Galileo FY15 data comparing the pretest to the first benchmark test. The data shows that 8/10 classes showed growth between the two tests. The classes showing declines in average developmental score between the two test periods are first grade and seventh grade. Third grade did not show an increase in developmental score, but this was reflective of a drop in the cut scores. At the beginning of the year 4/10 grades were not meeting benchmark, but at the benchmark test 7/10 grades were not meeting benchmark.<br><br>The charter holder also provided the pretest results across years for all grade levels, identifying the percent of students who come in scoring "proficient". In 2015 the pretest results were better by approximately 11 percentage points than the 2014 pretest results.<br><br>For the data described above, the charter holder did not provide any data to compare this to prior years.<br><br>The Charter Holder provided a comparison of SGP from AIMS data from 2013 and 2014. The data shows improvement, as is reflected in the Dashboard. |
| [D.2] | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) - Reading<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Reading.**<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the charter holder provided Galileo FY15 data comparing the pretest to the first benchmark test. The data shows that only 7/10 classes showed growth between the two tests. The three classes showing declines in average developmental score between the two test periods are first grade, sixth grade, seventh grade, and ninth grade. Seventh grade drop was reflective of a drop in the cut scores. At the beginning of the year 3/10 grades were not meeting benchmark, but at the benchmark test 5/10 grades were not meeting benchmark.<br><br>The charter holder also provided the pretest results across years for all grade levels, identifying the percent of students who come in scoring "proficient". In 2015 the pretest results were better by approximately 5 percentage points than the 2014 pretest results. However, the results show lower percentage of students coming in proficient than in 2013. The charter holder indicated that this may be reflective of a change in the methodology Galileo uses, now testing with |

| | |
|---|---|
| | grade level standards only on the pre-test as compared to prior years in which Galileo tested prior year standards as well as current grade standards.<br><br>The charter Holder provided testing data from the "Degrees of Reading Powers" test that is new to the school this year. The test is a criterion based measure of reading comprehension. At all grade levels the test showed some growth from the pretest to the benchmark test. Grade 2-3 typically demonstrate 10 points improvement within the year, Grade 4-8 typically show 4 points improvement within the year, High School Grades typically demonstrate 1-2 points of growth per year. The school's data shows approximately 8 points of growth for 2nd grade, and approximately 5 points of growth for 3rd grade; approximately 8 points of growth for 4th grade, approximately 8 points of growth for 5th grade, approximately 3 points of growth for 6th, 7th , and 8th grade; and approximately 5 points of growth for 9th grade. This data also shows that 8th and 9th grade students are close to the grade levels; the other grades are not as close to the grade level targets.<br><br>For the data described above, the charter holder did not provide any data to compare this to prior years.<br><br>The Charter Holder provided a comparison of SGP from AIMS data from 2013 and 2014. The data shows improvement, as is reflected in the Dashboard. |
| **[D.3]** | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Math<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Math.**<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the charter holder provided Galileo FY15 data comparing the pretest to the first benchmark test. The data shows that 4/6 classes showed growth between the two tests. The classes showing declines in average developmental score between the two test periods are 6th, 7th, and 9th. At the beginning of the year 5/6 grades were not meeting benchmark, at the benchmark test 5/6 grades were not meeting benchmark; the grade levels that were not meeting changed. The charter holder did note that for several grade levels the cut scores dropped between the two test administrations, thus these classes can be seen as showing greater growth than expected.<br><br>For the data described above, the charter holder did not provide any data to compare this to prior years.<br><br>The Charter Holder provided a comparison of SGP from AIMS data from 2013 and 2014. The data shows improvement, as is reflected in the Dashboard. |
| **[D.4]** | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Reading<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Reading.**<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the charter holder provided Galileo FY15 data comparing the pretest to the first benchmark test. The data shows that 4/6 classes showed growth between the two tests. The classes showing declines in average developmental score between the two test periods are 6th and 9th. At the beginning of the year 2/6 grades were not meeting benchmark, but at the benchmark test 5/6 grades |

| | |
|---|---|
| | were not meeting benchmark. The charter holder did note that for several grade levels the cut scores dropped between the two test administrations, thus these classes can be seen as showing greater growth than expected.<br><br>The charter Holder provided testing data from the "Degrees of Reading Powers" test that is new to the school this year. The test is a criterion based measure of reading comprehension. At all grade levels, except 7th grade, the test showed some growth from the pretest to the benchmark test. Grade 2-3 typically demonstrate 10 points improvement within the year, Grade 4-8 typically show 4 points improvement within the year, High School Grades typically demonstrate 1-2 points of growth per year. The school's data shows approximately 2 points of growth for 4th grade, approximately 1 points of growth for 5th grade, approximately 1 points of growth for 6th grade, approximately 1 points of loss for 7h grade, approximately 5 points of growth for 8th grade, and approximately 8 points of growth for 9th grade. This data also shows that 8th and 9th grade students are close to the grade levels; the other grades are not as close to the grade level targets.<br><br>For the data described above, the charter holder did not provide any data to compare this to prior years.<br><br>The Charter Holder provided a comparison of SGP from AIMS data from 2013 and 2014. The data shows improvement, as is reflected in the Dashboard. |
| [D.5] | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Math<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Math.**<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the charter holder provided Galileo FY15 data comparing the pretest to the first benchmark test. The data shows that 8/10 classes showed growth between the two tests. The classes showing declines in average developmental score between the two test periods are first grade and seventh grade. Third grade did not show an increase in developmental score, but this was reflective of a drop in the cut scores. At the beginning of the year 4/10 grades were not meeting benchmark, but at the benchmark test 7/10 grades were not meeting benchmark.<br><br>The charter holder also provided the pretest results across years for all grade levels, identifying the percent of students who come in scoring "proficient". In 2015 the pretest results were better by approximately 11 percentage points than the 2014 pretest results.<br><br>For the data described above, the charter holder did not provide any data to compare this to prior years.<br><br>The Charter Holder provided a comparison of AIMS percent passing data across school years from 2002 through 2014. The data does not demonstrate a clear trend of improvement, rather the math percent passing has remained between 30-45 percent since 2007. In 2014, the percent passing was approximately 43%, the highest level of performance since 2005.<br><br>The Charter Holder provided a comparison of Percent Passing from AIMS data from 2013 and 2014. The data shows improvement, as is reflected in the Dashboard. |

| | |
|---|---|
| [D.6] | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Reading<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Reading.**<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the charter holder provided Galileo FY15 data comparing the pretest to the first benchmark test. The data shows that only 7/10 classes showed growth between the two tests. The three classes showing declines in average developmental score between the two test periods are first grade, sixth grade, seventh grade, and ninth grade. Seventh grade drop was reflective of a drop in the cut scores. At the beginning of the year 3/10 grades were not meeting benchmark, but at the benchmark test 5/10 grades were not meeting benchmark.<br><br>The charter holder also provided the pretest results across years for all grade levels, identifying the percent of students who come in scoring "proficient". In 2015 the pretest results were better by approximately 5 percentage points than the 2014 pretest results. However, the results show lower percentage of students coming in proficient than in 2013. The charter holder indicated that this may be reflective of a change in the methodology Galileo uses, now testing with grade level standards only on the pre-test as compared to prior years in which Galileo tested prior year standards as well as current grade standards.<br><br>The charter Holder provided testing data from the "Degrees of Reading Powers" test that is new to the school this year. The test is a criterion based measure of reading comprehension. At all grade levels the test showed some growth from the pretest to the benchmark test. Grade 2-3 typically demonstrate 10 points improvement within the year, Grade 4-8 typically show 4 points improvement within the year, High School Grades typically demonstrate 1-2 points of growth per year. The school's data shows approximately 8 points of growth for 2nd grade, and approximately 5 points of growth for 3rd grade; approximately 8 points of growth for 4th grade, approximately 8 points of growth for 5th grade, approximately 3 points of growth for 6th, 7th , and 8th grade; and approximately 5 points of growth for 9th grade. This data also shows that 8th and 9th grade students are close to the grade levels; the other grades are not as close to the grade level targets.<br><br>For the data described above, the charter holder did not provide any data to compare this to prior years.<br><br>The Charter Holder provided a comparison of AIMS percent passing data across school years from 2002 through 2014. The data demonstrates a trend of improvement, the reading percent passing has increased from less than 10% in 2002 to nearly 70% in 2014. From 2010 to 2014, the increase has been approximately 10% every 2 years.<br><br>The Charter Holder provided a comparison of Percent Passing from AIMS data from 2013 and 2014. The data shows improvement, as is reflected in the Dashboard. |
| [D.7] | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Math<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Math.**<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the charter holder provided |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Galileo FY15 data comparing the pretest to the first benchmark test. The data shows that 6/9 classes showed growth between the two tests. The three class showing declines in average developmental score between the two test periods are 1st, 7th, and 8th grades. At the beginning of the year 7/9 grades were not meeting benchmark, but at the benchmark test 8/9 grades were not meeting benchmark.<br><br>For the data described above, the charter holder did not provide any data to compare this to prior years.<br><br>The Charter Holder provided a comparison of Percent Passing from AIMS data from 2013 and 2014. The data shows improvement, as is reflected in the Dashboard. |
| [D.8] | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Reading<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Reading.**<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the charter holder provided Galileo FY15 data comparing the pretest to the first benchmark test. The data shows that 8/9 classes showed growth between the two tests. The class showing declines in average developmental score between the two test periods is 5th grade. At the beginning of the year 6/9 grades were not meeting benchmark, but at the benchmark test 9/9 grades were not meeting benchmark.<br><br>The charter Holder provided testing data from the "Degrees of Reading Powers" test that is new to the school this year. The test is a criterion based measure of reading comprehension. At all grade levels the test showed some growth from the pretest to the benchmark test.<br><br>The charter Holder provided testing data from the "Degrees of Reading Powers" test that is new to the school this year. The test is a criterion based measure of reading comprehension. At all grade levels the test showed some growth from the pretest to the benchmark test. Grade 2-3 typically demonstrate 10 points improvement within the year, Grade 4-8 typically show 4 points improvement within the year, High School Grades typically demonstrate 1-2 points of growth per year. The school's data shows approximately 8 point of growth for 2nd grade, and approximately 10 points of growth for 3rd grade; approximately 8 points of growth for 4th grade, approximately 8 points of growth for 5th grade, approximately 2 points of growth for 6thgrade, approximately 5 points of growth for 7th grade, and approximately 10 points of growth for 8th grade.<br><br>For the data described above, the charter holder did not provide any data to compare this to prior years.<br><br>The Charter Holder provided a comparison of Percent Passing from AIMS data from 2013 and 2014. The data shows improvement, as is reflected in the Dashboard. |
| [D.9] | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Math<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Math.**<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the charter holder provided |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Galileo FY15 data comparing the pretest to the first benchmark test. The data shows that 9/10 classes showed growth between the two tests. The class showing declines in average developmental score between the two test periods is 6th. At the beginning of the year 9/10 grades were not meeting benchmark, but at the benchmark test 8/10 grades were not meeting benchmark. The charter holder did note that for several grade levels the cut scores dropped between the two test administrations, thus these classes can be seen as showing greater growth than expected.<br><br>The charter holder did not provide any data to compare this to prior years.<br><br>The Charter Holder provided a comparison of Percent Passing from AIMS data from 2013 and 2014. The data shows declines in academic performance, as is reflected in the Dashboard. |
| **[D.10]** | **Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Reading<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Reading.**<br><br>**The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the charter holder provided Galileo FY15 data comparing the pretest to the first benchmark test. The data shows that 7/10 classes showed growth between the two tests. The classed showing declines in average developmental score between the two test periods are 2nd, 8th and 9th. At the beginning of the year 6/10 grades were not meeting benchmark, but at the benchmark test 7/10 grades were not meeting benchmark. The charter holder did note that for several grade levels the cut scores dropped between the two test administrations.<br><br>The charter Holder provided testing data from the "Degrees of Reading Powers" test that is new to the school this year. The test is a criterion based measure of reading comprehension. At all grade levels, except 2nd, 3rd, 6th, and 7th, the test showed some growth from the pretest to the benchmark test. Grade 2-3 typically demonstrate 10 points improvement within the year, Grade 4-8 typically show 4 points improvement within the year, High School Grades typically demonstrate 1-2 points of growth per year. The school's data shows approximately 1 points of loss for 2nd grade, and approximately 1points of loss for 3rd grade; approximately 4 points of growth for 4th grade, approximately 3 points of growth for 5th grade, no change for 6th grade, approximately 3 points of loss for 7th grade, approximately 2 points of growth for 8th grade; and approximately 8 points of growth for 9th grade. This data also shows that 8th and 9th grade students are close to the grade levels; the other grades are not as close to the grade level targets.<br><br>For the data described above, the charter holder did not provide any data to compare this to prior years.<br><br>The Charter Holder provided a comparison of Percent Passing from AIMS data from 2013 and 2014. The data shows declines in academic performance, as is reflected in the Dashboard. |

I, Katherine Poulos, completed this Site Visit Inventory during the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on January 20, 2015. _____

I, Christine Curtis, received a copy of this document at the end of the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on January 20, 2015. _____