# Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Aprender Tucson
School Name: Southside Community School
Date Submitted: 5/7/13

Required for: Review - Annual Report

Evaluation Completed: 6/19/13

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

| Measure | Acceptable | Not Acceptable | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25%** *Math* | **S** | **I** | Data specific to bottom 25% in Math was not provided. **Data was provided that demonstrated most grade levels were making progress with their bottom 25% in Math.** |
| **2a. Percent Passing** *Math* | **I/S** | | |
| **2a. Percent Passing** *Reading* | **I/S** | | |
| **2b. Composite School Comparison** (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math* | **S** | **I** | No data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities was provided. **AIMS data provided for ELL students' data did not demonstrate progress towards the Board's expectations, however the internal data for both Galileo and DIBELS did demonstrate progress towards the Board's expectations.** **FRL students make up 100% of the population so their data is not disaggregated. Students with disabilities data demonstrated progress in AIMS and internal data presented on the site visit.** |
| **2b. Composite School Comparison** (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading* | **S** | **I** | No data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading for ELL students, FRL students, and students with disabilities was provided. **AIMS data provided for ELL students' data did not demonstrate progress towards the Board's expectations, however the internal data for both Galileo and DIBELS did demonstrate progress towards the Board's expectations.** **FRL students make up 100% of the population so their data is not disaggregated. Students with disabilities data demonstrated progress in AIMS and internal data presented on the site visit.** |

| Measure | Acceptable | Not Acceptable | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2c. Subgroup Comparison**<br>*(2b. for Alternative)*<br>ELL<br>*Math* | **S** | **I** | No data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for ELL students was provided. **ELL students' data did not demonstrate progress towards the Board's expectations; however the internal data for both Galileo and DIBELS did demonstrate progress towards the Board's expectations.** |
| **2c. Subgroup Comparison**<br>*(2b. for Alternative)*<br>FRL<br>*Math* | **S** | **I** | No data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for FRL students. **FRL students make up 100% of the population so their data is not disaggregated.** |
| **2c. Subgroup Comparison**<br>*(2b. for Alternative)*<br>FRL<br>*Reading* | **S** | **I** | No data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading for FRL students. **FRL students make up 100% of the population so their data is not disaggregated.** |
| **2c. Subgroup Comparison**<br>*(2b. for Alternative)*<br>Students with disabilities<br>*Math* | **S** | **I** | No data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was provided. **Students with disabilities data demonstrated progress in AIMS and internal data presented on the site visit.** |
| **2c. Subgroup Comparison**<br>*(2b. for Alternative)*<br>Students with disabilities<br>*Reading* | **S** | **I** | No data that demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities was provided. **Students with disabilities data demonstrated progress in AIMS and internal data presented on the site visit.** |
| **3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System** | **I/S** | | |