Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Educational Impact, Inc.
School Name: Academy Adventures Primary School
Site Visit Date: December 3, 2014

Required for: Failing School
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 **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Math.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the Charter Holder provided an analysis of FY13 and FY14 AIMS math data for students who had been at the school for two years. This analysis looks at the changes in scale scores, not the changes in SGP, for students who attended the school for FY13 and FY14. In its analysis, the Charter Holder indicated that 79% of the students who attended for those two years increased their AIMS scale scores from the first to the second year. However, this Charter Holder did not account for the fact that the ADE-established AIMS scale score cut offs for each performance level increase for each grade level. Thus, this data does not demonstrate improved academic performance. Additionally, the data indicated that 2 students (14%) who attended for both years actually saw a decline in their scale scores and 1 student (7%) saw no change. The Charter holder also provided internal beginning of year, middle of year, and end of year data for FY13 and FY14 from their "Investigations" assessment and baseline data for FY15 from the Galileo assessment(kindergarten and first grade are continuing to use the same assessment as in prior years). The change in the benchmarking assessment makes any comparison of FY15 to prior year of data difficult. The internal data from beginning of year and end of year data for FY13 and FY14 indicates that the charter holder saw an increase in student growth in FY14, however this conflicts with the dashboard data which indicates a decline in SGP in FY14. The charter holder indicated that in FY15, the baseline data showed students were starting at a higher level. The baseline percent correct for FY15 is 46%, which is higher than both of the prior years (FY14 – 31% and FY13-42%). However, there are two problems with this data. First, the change in assessment makes any comparison difficult as the increase in scores may simply be a reflection of the use of a different assessment. Second, this data does not serve as a measure of improvement because the FY15 assessment established a baseline, but does not demonstrate the success of the school's academic program in the current year.

[D.2]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) - Reading **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Reading.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The charter holder provided internal beginning of year, middle of year, and end of year data for FY13 and FY14 and baseline data for FY15 from Dibels. The data, consistent with the data from the FY14 dashboard, does show a slight increase in the student growth in reading from FY13 to FY14. The FY15 baseline data is consistent with the prior years' baseline data. This data does not serve as a measure of improvement because the FY15 assessment established a baseline, but does not demonstrate the success of the school's academic program in the current year.
[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 **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Math** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The Charter holder provided internal beginning of year and end of year data for FY13 and FY14 from their "Investigations" assessment and baseline data for FY15 from the Galileo assessment (kindergarten and first grade are continuing to use the same assessment as in prior years). The change in the benchmarking assessment makes any comparison of FY15 to prior year of data difficult. The internal data from beginning of year and end of year data for FY13 and FY14 indicates that in FY14 the charter holder saw a decrease in beginning to end of year math growth for students in the bottom 25% in kindergarten, first grade, and fifth grade and an increase in beginning to end of year math growth for students in second, third, and 4th grade. Because this data was disaggregated by grade level and shows inconsistent results, the data does not provide any information about the school's performance with students in the bottom 25% in FY14. The charter holder indicated that in FY15, the baseline data showed students in the bottom 25% were starting at a higher level. The baseline percent correct for students in the bottom 25% is disaggregated by grade level. In kindergarten and first grade, where the charter holder is administering the same assessment as in prior years, the data shows the students are starting at a lower baseline. In all other grades, the data shows the students are starting at a higher baseline. However, there are two problems with this data. First, the change in assessment for grades 2-5 makes any comparison difficult as the increase in scores may simply be a reflection of the use of a different assessment. Second, this data does not serve as a measure of improvement because the FY15 assessment established a baseline, but does not demonstrate the success of the school's academic program in the current year.

[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 **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Reading** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The charter holder provided internal end of year data for FY13 and FY14 from Dibels disaggregated by grade level for bottom 25% students. The data shows very slight increases in oral reading fluency for bottom 25% students in 2nd and 3rd grade from FY13 to FY14, and larger increases in oral reading fluency for bottom 25% students in 4th and 5th grade from FY13 to FY14. However, because the data is disaggregated by grade and shows inconsistent results, the data does not provide any information about the school's performance with students in the bottom 25% in FY14. The charter holder provided no data for FY15.
[D.5]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Math **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Math.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the charter holder provided Galileo pre-test (baseline) data for FY15. In the data, which is disaggregated by grade level, the Charter holder indicates that 63% of students in 2nd grade scored a passing score on the baseline, 53% of students in 3rd grade scored a passing score on the baseline, 53% of students in 4th grade scored a passing score on the baseline, and 45% of students in 5th grade scored a passing score on the baseline. This data does not provide any data about improved academic performance in Percent Passing in math because the data establishes a baseline does, but does not demonstrate the success of the school's academic program in the current year. Additionally, the Charter Holder does not have any similar data from prior years to provide as a comparison.
[D.6]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Reading **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Reading.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the charter holder provided Galileo pre-test (baseline) data for FY15. In the data, which is disaggregated by grade level, the Charter holder indicates that 50% of students in 2nd grade scored a passing score on the baseline, 40% of students in 3rd grade scored a passing score on the baseline, 64% of students in 4th grade scored a passing score on the baseline, and 75% of students in 5th grade scored a passing score on the baseline. This data does not provide any data about improved academic performance in Percent Passing in reading because the data establishes a baseline does, but does not demonstrate the success of the school's academic program in the current year. Additionally, the Charter Holder does not have any similar data from prior years to provide as a comparison.

[D.7]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Math **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Math.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The Charter holder provided internal beginning of year for FY13 and FY14 from their "Investigations" assessment and baseline data for FY15 from the Galileo assessment (kindergarten and first grade are continuing to use the same assessment as in prior years). The change in the benchmarking assessment makes any comparison of FY15 to prior year of data difficult. The charter holder indicated that in FY15, the baseline data showed ELLs were starting at a higher level. The baseline percent correct for ELLs for FY15 is disaggregated by grade level and shows that for all grade levels except kindergarten the baseline % correct is higher than in the prior year. However, there are two problems with this data. First, the change in assessment makes any comparison difficult as the increase in scores may simply be a reflection of the use of a different assessment. Second, this data does not serve as a measure of improvement because the FY15 assessment established a baseline, but does not demonstrate the success of the school's academic program in the current year. The Charter Holder's analysis of the growth shown by ELLs on the Investigations assessment in FY13 as compared the growth in FY14, shows that the ELLs demonstrated slightly more growth in FY14, but does not provide any information on their proficiency.
[D.8]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Reading **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Reading.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The charter holder provided internal beginning of year, middle of year, and end of year data for FY13 and FY14 and baseline data for FY15 from Dibels. The data, disaggregated by grade level, shows a decline in composite score from FY13 end of year to FY 14 end of year for kindergarten and 2nd grade and an increase in composite score from FY13 end of year to FY 14 end of year for 1st grade, 3rd grade, 4th grade, and 5th grade. Because the data is disaggregated by grade and shows inconsistent results, the data does not provide any information about the school's performance with ELLs in FY14. The FY15 baseline data also shows inconsistent performance as compared to the prior years' baseline data (increases in grades K, 4, and 5 and decreases in grades 1, 2, and 3). This data does not serve as a measure of improvement because the FY15 assessment established a baseline, but does not demonstrate the success of the school's academic program in the current year. Additionally, the disaggregated data is inconsistent and does not show any trends.
[D.9]	**Not applicable.**
[D.10]	**Not applicable.**

[D.11]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Math **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Math.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The Charter holder provided internal beginning of year for FY13 and FY14 from their "Investigations" assessment and baseline data for FY15 from the Galileo assessment (kindergarten and first grade are continuing to use the same assessment as in prior years). The change in the benchmarking assessment makes any comparison of FY15 to prior year of data difficult. The charter holder indicated that in FY15, the baseline data showed students with disabilities were starting at a higher level. The baseline percent correct for students with disabilities for FY15 is disaggregated by grade level and shows that for all grade levels except first grade the baseline % correct is higher than in the prior year. However, there are two problems with this data. First, the change in assessment makes any comparison difficult as the increase in scores may simply be a reflection of the use of a different assessment. Second, this data does not serve as a measure of improvement because the FY15 assessment established a baseline, but does not demonstrate the success of the school's academic program in the current year. The Charter Holder's analysis of the growth shown by students with disabilities on the Investigations assessment in FY13 as compared the growth in FY14, shows that the students with disabilities demonstrated slightly more growth in FY14, but does not provide any information on their proficiency.
[D.12]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Reading **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Reading.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The charter holder provided internal beginning of year, middle of year, and end of year data for FY13 and FY14 and baseline data for FY15 from Dibels. The data, disaggregated by student, shows no consistent pattern. Some students show improvement within school years, other students show declines. Some students show more improvement from FY13 to FY14, others show no change and others declines. Because the data is disaggregated by student and shows inconsistent results, the data does not provide any information about the school's performance with students with disabilities in FY14. The FY15 baseline data also shows inconsistent performance as compared to the prior years' baseline data. This data does not serve as a measure of improvement because the FY15 assessment established a baseline, but does not demonstrate the success of the school's academic program in the current year. Additionally, the disaggregated data is inconsistent and does not show any trends.

I, Katherine Poulos, completed this Site Visit Inventory after the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on December 3, 2014. _____

I, Mary Ann Ponczar, received a copy of this document after the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on December 3, 2014. _____