Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: James Sandoval Preparatory High School
School Name: Crown Point High School
Site Visit Date: March 12, 2015

Required for: Renewal
Evaluation Criteria Area: Data

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[D.1] D1.pdf	**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 demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Math.** A comparison of Galileo results from FY14 and FY15 shows an increase in the percentage of students increasing a performance category for Math. Results were provided for October and January. For FY14 results showed no change in student performance. 0% of students improved a performance category. For FY15 the percentage of students in the At Risk category declined from 76% to 0%, for Approaches increased 24% to 64%, and for At Benchmark from 0% to 36%. **The documents provided demonstrate improved academic performance because: the data shows an increase in the percentage of students improving an academic performance category on Galileo.**
[D.2] D1.pdf	**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.** A comparison of Galileo results from FY14 and FY15 shows an increase in the percentage of students increasing a performance category for Reading. Results were provided for October and January. For FY14 results showed a decline in the percentage of students in the At Risk category from 100% to 96%, for Approaches increased 0% to 4%. For FY15 the percentage of students in the At Risk category declined from 71% to 0%, for Approaches increased 28% to 61%, and for At Benchmark from 0% to 39%. **The documents provided demonstrate/do not demonstrate improved academic performance because: the data shows an increase in the percentage of students improving an academic performance category on Galileo.**
[D.3] D1.pdf	**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 demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Math.**

	A comparison of Galileo results from FY14 and FY15 shows an increase in the percentage of students in the bottom 25% increasing a performance category for Math. Results were provided for October and January. For FY14 results showed no change in student performance. 0% of students improved a performance category. For FY15 the percentage of students in the At Risk category declined from 100% to 0%, for Approaches increased 0% to 100%. **The documents provided demonstrate improved academic performance because: the data shows an increase in the percentage of students in the bottom 25% improving an academic performance category on Galileo.**
[D.4] D1.pdf	**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/do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Reading.** A comparison of Galileo results from FY14 and FY15 shows an increase in the percentage of students in the bottom 25% increasing a performance category for Reading. Results were provided for October and January. For FY14 results showed no change in student performance. 0% of students improved a performance category. For FY15 the percentage of students in the At Risk category declined from 100% to 0%, for Approaches increased 0% to 100%. **The documents provided demonstrate improved academic performance because: the data shows an increase in the percentage of students in the bottom 25% improving an academic performance category on Galileo.**
[D.5] D1.pdf	**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.** A comparison of October and January Galileo results from FY14 and FY15 show an increase in the percentage of students in the "At Benchmark" category. In FY14 0% of students were "At Benchmark" in January, for FY15 30% of students tested are "At Benchmark" in January. **The documents provided demonstrate improved academic performance because: a comparison of Galileo results for FY14 and FY15 shows an increase in student proficiency in Math as shown by an increase in the percentage of students in the "At Benchmark" category.**

[D.6] D1.pdf	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Reading **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Reading.** A comparison of October and January Galileo results from FY14 and FY15 show an increase in the percentage of students in the "At Benchmark" category. In FY14 0% of students were "At Benchmark" in January, for FY15 39% of students tested are "At Benchmark" in January. **The documents provided demonstrate improved academic performance because: a comparison of Galileo results for FY14 and FY15 shows an increase in student proficiency in Math as shown by an increase in the percentage of students in the "At Benchmark" category.**
[D.7] D1.pdf	**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 as compared to the prior year.** For Post-test data for FY13 shows 0% of ELLs proficient. 93% of students were At Risk and 7% Approaching. The school did not serve ELLs in the 2014 school year, so no data for comparison was available for this year. From October 2014 to January 2015 the percentage of ELLs At Risk declined from 100% to 33%, the percentage of students Approaching increased from 0% to 67%. The comparison of data shows increased growth in student performance, with a greater percentage of students at Approaches as of the middle of the year FY15 as compared to end of year FY13. **The documents provided demonstrate improved academic performance because:** A comparison of Galileo data from the FY13 shows no change in the percentage of proficient students, but data does show improved growth for ELLs for Math.

[D.8] D1.pdf	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Reading **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Reading as compared to the prior year.** For Post-test data for FY13 shows 0% of ELLs proficient. 79% of students were At Risk and 21% Approaching. The school did not serve ELLs in the 2014 school year, so no data for comparison was available for this year. From October 2014 to January 2015 the percentage of ELLs At Risk declined from 50% to 0%, the percentage of students Approaching increased from 50% to 100%. The data shows growth in student performance but does not demonstrate proficiency for ELLs since no students were At Benchmark. The comparison of data shows increased growth in student performance, with a greater percentage of students at Approaches as of the middle of the year FY15 as compared to end of year FY13. **The documents provided demonstrate improved academic performance because:** A comparison of Galileo data from the FY13 shows no change in the percentage of proficient students, but data does show improved growth for ELLs for Reading.
[D.9] N/A	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Math **N/A**
[D.10] N/A	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Reading **N/A**
[D.11] D1.pdf	**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.** Galileo assessment results show that 100% of students with disabilities were at “Meets” or “Exceeds” on the Spring 2015 results. **The documents provided demonstrate improved academic performance because: January 2015 Galileo data shows that all students with disabilities are proficient in Math.**

[D.12] D1.pdf	**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.** Galileo assessment results show that 100% of students with disabilities were at “Meets” or “Exceeds” on the Spring 2015 results. **The documents provided demonstrate improved academic performance because: January 2015 Galileo data shows that all students are proficient in Reading.**
[D.13] D1.pdf	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved performance in High School Graduation Rate **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved performance in High School Graduation Rate.** Graduation rate data was provide for FY13 and FY14 for 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year graduation rates. The comparison shows an increase in all categories for FY14. 4- year graduation rate increased from 62% to 72% 5-year graduation rate increased from 76% to 77% 6-year graduation rate increased from 76% to 79% **The documents provided demonstrate improved performance because: the graduation rate has increased from FY13 to FY14.**