Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: George Gervin Youth Center, Inc.
School Name: George Gervin Prep Academy
Site Visit Date: April 16, 2015

Required for: Expansion - Grade Level
Evaluation Criteria Area: Data

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[D.1] **Galileo Screenshots**	**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.** Galileo scatter plots of FY14 and FY15 data show the percentage of students in the Higher Growth category for each grade level. For FY14 41 of 66 students (62%) were in the High Growth category. For FY15 49 of 84 students (58.3%) were in the High Growth category. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The data provided for FY15 demonstrates a slight decline in growth as compared to the previous year.
	Final Evaluation: ☐ Data presented serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as sufficient. ☒ Data presented does not serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as insufficient.
[D.2] **Data 1a**	**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 demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Reading.** The Charter Holder provided data for Baseline, Benchmark 1, and Benchmark 2 for FY13, FY14, and FY15. A comparison of data shows that for Benchmark1 and Benchmark2 the FY15 data has increased over both the prior years' data. From Baseline to Benchmark 2 the improvement for FY13 and FY14 shows a decline from Baseline to Benchmark2. FY15 data shows an increase of approximately 5 percentage points. Based on the data provided the school is increasing the percentage of proficient students at a greater rate than in the prior year.
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Data presented serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Data presented does not serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as insufficient.
[D.3] **Data 1b**	**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 Charter Holder provided data for Baseline, Benchmark 1, and Benchmark 2 for FY14, and FY15. A comparison of data shows that for Baseline, Benchmark1 and Benchmark2 the FY15 data shows a lower growth percentile for each assessment period. From Baseline to Benchmark 2 the improvement for FY14 shows an increase of 12.5 percentage points from Baseline to Benchark2. FY15 data shows an increase of approximately 11.9 percentage points. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** the comparative data shows that the growth for students in the bottom 25% is lower in FY15 than in FY14. That data shows that during the school year FY15 results shows slightly less improvement from Baseline to Benchmark 2 than occurred in FY14.
	Final Evaluation: ☐ Data presented serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as sufficient. ☒ Data presented does not serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as insufficient.
[D.4] **Data 1b**	**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 demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Reading.** The Charter Holder provided data for Baseline, Benchmark 1, and Benchmark 2 for FY14, and FY15. A comparison of data shows that for Baseline, Benchmark1 the FY15 data shows a lower growth percentile for each assessment period. Benchmark 2 data shows an improvement for FY15 as compared to the prior year. From Baseline to Benchmark 2 the improvement for FY14 shows a decrease of 11.8 percentage points from Baseline to Benchark2. FY15 data shows an increase of approximately 10.6 percentage points.
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Data presented serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Data presented does not serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as insufficient.
[D.5] **Galileo Screenshots**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Math **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Math** • Galileo scatter plot reports were provided for 6th, 7th, and 8th grade for FY14 and FY15. For FY14 27 of 66 students (40%) were in the High Achievement category. For FY15 41 of 84 students (49%) were in the High Achievement category. This demonstrates an increase in the percentage of students proficient in Math for FY15.
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Data presented serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Data presented does not serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as insufficient.

[D.6] **Data2a_2**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Reading The Charter Holder provided data for Baseline, Benchmark 1, and Benchmark 2 for FY13, FY14, and FY15. A comparison of data shows that for Benchmark1 and Benchmark2 the FY15 data has increased over both the prior years' data. From Baseline to Benchmark 2 the improvement for FY13 and FY14 shows a decline from Baseline to Benchmark2. FY15 data shows an increase of approximately 5 percentage points.
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Data presented serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Data presented does not serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as insufficient.
[D.7] **Data2c1**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Math **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Math.** • An unlabeled graph was provided that indicated a comparison of FY14 and FY15 data for Benchmark 1 and Benchmark 2 and Baseline data only for FY14. The Benchmark 1 data shows a result of 28.57% for FY14 and 11.11% for FY15. Benchmark 2 shows a result of 20% for FY14 and FY15. This data shows that as of Benchmark 2 the school has maintained Math performance of ELL students as compared to the prior year.
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Data presented serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Data presented does not serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as insufficient.
[D.8] **Data2c1**	**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.** • An unlabeled graph was provided that indicated a comparison of FY14 and FY15 data for Benchmark 1 and Benchmark 2 and Baseline data only for FY14. The Benchmark 1 data shows a result of 28.57% for FY14 and 10% for FY15. Benchmark 2 shows a result of 42.86% for FY14 and 20% for FY15. This data shows that as of Benchmark 2 the school has not demonstrated improved academic performance. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The FY14 shows higher performance in FY14 at each assessment point. The FY14 data also shows a greater increase from Benchmark 1 to Benchmark 2 than the current year. FY15 results are lower and do not improve as well as the prior year assessment results. FY15 data does not demonstrate evidence on improved proficiency in Reading for ELLs.

	Final Evaluation: ☐ Data presented serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as sufficient. ☒ Data presented does not serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as insufficient.
[D.9] **Data 2c2**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Math **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Math.** The Charter Holder provided data for Baseline, Benchmark 1, and Benchmark 2 for FY13, FY14, and FY15. A comparison of data shows that for each interval the FY15 data has increased over both the prior years' data. From Baseline to Benchmark 2 the improvement for FY13 and FY14 shows an increase of less than 5 percentage points. FY15 data shows an increase of approximately 7 percentage points. The data provide for FY15 shows improved proficiency in Math for FRL-eligible students.
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Data presented serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Data presented does not serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as insufficient.
[D.10] **Data2c2**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Reading **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Reading.** The Charter Holder provided data for Baseline, Benchmark 1, and Benchmark 2 for FY13, FY14, and FY15. A comparison of data shows that for Benchmark1 and Benchmark2 the FY15 data has increased over both the prior years' data. From Baseline to Benchmark 2 the improvement for FY13 and FY14 shows a decline from Baseline to Benchmark2. FY15 data shows an increase of approximately 5 percentage points. The data provide for FY15 shows improved proficiency in Reading for FRL-eligible students.
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Data presented serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Data presented does not serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as insufficient.

[D.11] **Data2c3**	**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 demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Math.** The Charter Holder provided data for Baseline, Benchmark 1, and Benchmark 2 for FY14, and FY15. A comparison of data shows that for Benchmark1 and Benchmark2 the FY15 data has increased over the prior years' data. From Baseline to Benchmark 2 the data for FY14 shows a decline from Baseline to Benchmark2. FY15 data shows an increase of approximately 11 percentage points. The data provide for FY15 shows improved proficiency in Math for students with disabilities.
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Data presented serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Data presented does not serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as insufficient.
[D.12] **Data2c3**	**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 demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Reading.** The Charter Holder provided data for Baseline, Benchmark 1, and Benchmark 2 for FY14, and FY15. A comparison of data shows that for Benchmark1 and Benchmark2 the FY15 data has increased over the prior years' data. From Baseline to Benchmark 2 the data for FY14 shows an increase of 8 percentage points from Baseline to Benchmark2. FY15 data shows an increase of approximately 26 percentage points. The data provide for FY15 shows improved proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities.
	Final Evaluation: ☒ Data presented serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as sufficient. ☐ Data presented does not serve as evidence of improved academic performance, and thus is evaluated as insufficient.