Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Desk Audit

Charter Holder Name: Trivium Preparatory Academy
School Name: Great Hearts Academies – Trivium Prep
Desk Audit Date: April 22, 2015

Required for: Expansion - Enrollment Cap
Evaluation Criteria Area: Data

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome	
[D.1] **Math Growth as measured by risk reduction (all students)**	**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) – Reading** • **The document indicates that the percentage of students identified by the ATI Galileo benchmark assessments as "On Course" increase by 11 percentage points (64% to 75%) from 2013-14 to 2014-15, with corresponding decreases in the categories "Low Risk," "Moderate Risk," and "High Risk."** • **An analysis by the Charter Holder of the validity and reliability of the 2013-14 ATI benchmark assessment results for math as a predictor of 2014 AIMS Math results indicates that AIMS Math was passed by 96% of students identified as "On Course," 76% of students identified as "Low Risk," 72% of students identified as "Moderate Risk," and 18% of students identified as "High Risk." The analysis also indicates that overall, 85% of students performed as expected on the 2014 AIMS Math assessment based on their risk level. This indicates that changes the risk levels identified by ATI Galileo benchmark assessments represent valid and reliable indicators of student proficiency in math.** **The documents provided DO NOT demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • **The graph and information does not indicate that these figures were taken from corresponding time periods during the two years, nor do they indicate a rate of change over time. These figures indicate that students are increasing in proficiency but do not show an increase in growth.** • **The analysis of validity and reliability provided by the Charter Holder does not indicate that the data used provides a valid and reliable predictor of student growth.** **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] **ELA Growth as measured by risk reduction (all students)**	**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 document indicates that the percentage of students identified by the ATI Galileo benchmark assessments as "On Course" increase by 2 percentage points (from 94% to 96%) from 2013-14 to 2014-15, with corresponding decreases in the categories "Low Risk" and "Moderate Risk," and a 1% increase in the "High Risk" category from 0% to 1%.** • **An analysis by the Charter Holder of the validity and reliability of the 2013-14 ATI benchmark assessment results for reading as a predictor of 2014 AIMS Reading results indicates that AIMS Reading was passed by 96% of students identified as "On Course," 100% of students identified as "Low Risk," 100% of students identified as "Moderate Risk," and 0% of students identified as "High Risk." The analysis also indicates that overall, 90% of students performed as expected on the 2014 AIMS Reading assessment based on their risk level. This indicates that changes the risk levels identified by ATI Galileo benchmark assessments represent valid and reliable indicators of student proficiency in reading.** **The documents provided DO NOT demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • **The graph and information does not indicate that these figures were taken from corresponding time periods during the two years, nor do they indicate a rate of change over time. These figures indicate that students are increasing in proficiency but do not show an increase in growth.** • **The analysis of validity and reliability provided by the Charter Holder does not indicate that the data used provides a valid and reliable predictor of student growth.** **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] **Math Growth as measured by risk reduction (bottom quartile)**	**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 document indicates that the percentage of students identified by the ATI Galileo benchmark assessments as "On Course" increase by 15 percentage points (from 27% to 42%) from 2013-14 to 2014-15, with corresponding decreases in the categories "Low Risk" and "High Risk," and no change in "Moderate Risk".** • **An analysis by the Charter Holder of the validity and reliability of the 2013-14 ATI benchmark assessment results for math as a predictor of 2014 AIMS Math results indicates that AIMS Math was passed by 96% of students identified as "On Course," 76% of students identified as "Low Risk," 72% of students identified as "Moderate Risk," and 18% of students identified as "High Risk." The analysis also indicates that overall, 85%**

	of students performed as expected on the 2014 AIMS Math assessment based on their risk level. This indicates that changes the risk levels identified by ATI Galileo benchmark assessments represent valid and reliable indicators of student proficiency in math. **The documents provided DO NOT demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • **The graph and information does not indicate that these figures were taken from corresponding time periods during the two years, nor do they indicate a rate of change over time. These figures indicate that students are increasing in proficiency but do not show an increase in growth.** • **The analysis of validity and reliability provided by the Charter Holder does not indicate that the data used provides a valid and reliable predictor of student growth.** **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] **ELA Growth as measured by risk reduction (bottom quartile)**	**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 document indicates that the percentage of students identified by the ATI Galileo benchmark assessments as "On Course" increase by 7 percentage points (from 78% to 85%) from 2013-14 to 2014-15, with corresponding decreases in the categories "Low Risk" and "Moderate Risk," and a 2% "High Risk" from 0% to 2%.** • **An analysis by the Charter Holder of the validity and reliability of the 2013-14 ATI benchmark assessment results for reading as a predictor of 2014 AIMS Reading results indicates that AIMS Reading was passed by 96% of students identified as "On Course," 100% of students identified as "Low Risk," 100% of students identified as "Moderate Risk," and 0% of students identified as "High Risk." The analysis also indicates that overall, 90% of students performed as expected on the 2014 AIMS Reading assessment based on their risk level. This indicates that changes the risk levels identified by ATI Galileo benchmark assessments represent valid and reliable indicators of student proficiency in reading.** **The documents provided DO NOT demonstrate improved academic performance because** • **The graph and information does not indicate that these figures were taken from corresponding time periods during the two years, nor do they indicate a rate of change over time. These figures indicate that students are increasing in proficiency but do not show an increase in growth.** • **The analysis of validity and reliability provided by the Charter Holder does not indicate that the data used provides a valid and reliable predictor of student growth.** **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]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Math • **No data required – the school scored a Meets or Exceeds for this measure on the current and prior academic dashboards.**	

[D.6]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Reading • **No data required – the school scored a Meets or Exceeds for this measure on the current and prior academic dashboards.**
[D.7]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Math • **No data required – the school does not currently serve any ELL students.**
[D.8]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Reading • **No data required – the school does not currently serve any ELL students.**
[D.9]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Math • **No data required – the school does not collect data on eligibility for FRL.**
[D.10]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Reading • **No data required – the school does not collect data on eligibility for FRL.**

[D.11] **Math Proficiency as measured by risk reduction (SPED)**	**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 document indicates that the percentage of students with disabilities identified by the ATI Galileo benchmark assessments as "On Course" increase by 11 percentage points (20% to 31%) from 2013-14 to 2014-15, and the percentage of students identified as "High Risk" decreased by 29 percentage points (from 60% to 31%). The percentage of students identified as "Low Risk" increased 15 percentage points (from 0% to 15%), and "Moderate Risk" increased three percentage points (from 20% to 23%). This indicates from 2014 to 2015, the school improved the risk status, or likelihood of passing the State standardized assessment, for 29% of students.** • **An analysis by the Charter Holder of the validity and reliability of the 2013-14 ATI benchmark assessment results for math as a predictor of 2014 AIMS Math results indicates that AIMS Math was passed by 96% of students identified as "On Course," 76% of students identified as "Low Risk," 72% of students identified as "Moderate Risk," and 18% of students identified as "High Risk." The analysis also indicates that overall, 85% of students performed as expected on the 2014 AIMS Math assessment based on their risk level. This indicates that changes the risk levels identified by ATI Galileo benchmark assessments represent valid and reliable indicators of student proficiency in math.** **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] **ELA Proficiency as measured by risk reduction (SPED)**	**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 document indicates that the percentage of students with disabilities identified by the ATI Galileo benchmark assessments as "On Course" increase by 45 percentage points (40% to 85%) from 2013-14 to 2014-15, and the percentage of students identified as "High Risk" decreased by 20 percentage points (from 20% to 0%). The percentage of students with disabilities identified as "Low Risk" decreased 12 percentage points (from 20% to 8%), and "Moderate Risk" decreased 12 percentage points (from 20% to 8%). This indicates from 2014 to 2015, the school improved the risk status, or likelihood of passing the State standardized assessment, for 45% of students.** • **An analysis by the Charter Holder of the validity and reliability of the 2013-14 ATI benchmark assessment results for reading as a predictor of 2014 AIMS Reading results indicates that AIMS Reading was passed by 96% of students identified as "On Course," 100% of students identified as "Low Risk," 100% of students identified as "Moderate Risk," and 0% of students identified as "High Risk." The analysis also indicates that overall, 90% of students performed as expected on the 2014 AIMS Reading assessment based on their risk level. This indicates that changes the risk levels identified by ATI Galileo benchmark assessments represent valid and reliable indicators of student proficiency in reading.** **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.13]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved performance in High School Graduation Rate • **No data required – the school did not serve grade 12 in FY2014.**	