Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Legacy Education Group
School Name: East Valley High School
Site Visit Date: March 2, 2015

Required for: Annual Report
Evaluation Criteria Area: Data

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[D.1] **aggregate_algebra1** **aggregate_Geometry** **StudentGrowthAndAchievement_Geo** **StudentGrowthAndAchievementSummary_Alg1**	**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 Charter Holder provided ATI Student Growth and Achievement Reports for Geometry and Algebra 1. The reports are based on data from pretest and CBAS#2. This data represents current year data but no year to year comparison has been conducted. The Charter Holder stated that last year only a pretest was administered of ATI and the other assessment used last year was AIMSweb. • The growth charts indicated that Algebra 1 and Geometry is ELA showing "Expected Growth Maintained" for the current year. • The Charter Holder provided aggregate reports for math using the ATI data administered this year. These graphs show the passing rate of the classes based on a cut score and identify students that are on course, low risk, moderate risk, and high risk. These graphs do not demonstrate evidence of the rate of growth. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • No comparison has been conducted for the AIMSweb prior year data and the current year data of ATI-Galileo.
[D.2] **aggregateELA_9** **aggregateELA_10** **aggregateELA_11** **aggregateELA_12** **StudentGrowthAndAchievementELA_9** **StudentGrowthAndAchievementELA_10** **StudentGrowthAndAchievementELA_11** **StudentGrowthAndAchievementSummaryELA_12**	**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 Charter Holder provided ATI Student Growth and Achievement Reports for ELA grades 9-12. The reports are based on data from pretest and CBAS#2. This data represents current year data but no year to year comparison has been conducted. The Charter Holder stated that last year only a pretest was administered of ATI and the other assessment used last year was AIMSweb.

	No comparison has been completed between the AIMSweb prior year data and the current year data. • The growth charts for ELA indicate grades 9-12 are showing "Expected Growth Maintained" for the current year. • The Charter Holder provided aggregate reports ELA using the ATI data administered this year. These graphs show the passing rate of the classes based on a cut score and identify students that are on course, low risk, moderate risk, and high risk. These graphs do not demonstrate evidence of the rate of growth. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • No comparison has been conducted for the AIMSweb prior year data and the current year data of ATI-Galileo.
[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:** No data was provided by the Charter Holder.
[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:** No data was provided by the Charter Holder.

[D.5] **aggregate_algebra1** **aggregate_Geometry** **aims_5_year_view**	**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.** A table representing the % of cohort groups that are meeting and exceeding from years 2010 to 2014 utilizing AIMS assessment data. The percentages are the following consecutively: 18%, 26%, 33%, 28%, and 22%. No comparison data was provided to demonstrate improved academic performance in Percent Passing for Math. Aggregate Multi-test Reports were provided by the Charter Holder for Algebra 1 and Geometry which represent benchmark assessments provided in the current school year. Each report provides the number of students meeting/exceeding benchmark and those approaching and falling far below. The Algebra class has reached the cut score level for CBAS#2, however, in Geometry the class is below the Approaches benchmark level. Three scores are displayed to represent pretest, CBAS #1, and CBAS#2 grade level data. No comparison data was provided. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The multi-test reports do not provide overall school data to provide evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing for Reading.

[D.6] **aggregateELA_9** **aggregateELA_10** **aggregateELA_11** **aggregateELA_12** **aims_5_year_view**	**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.** A table representing the % of cohort groups that are meeting and exceeding from years 2010 to 2014 utilizing AIMS assessment data. The percentages are the following consecutively: 51%, 45%, 58%, 60%, and 74%. No comparison data was provided to demonstrate improved academic performance in Percent Passing for Reading. Aggregate Multi-test Reports were provided by the Charter Holder for ELA grades 9-12 which represent benchmark assessments given in the current year. Each report provides the number of students meeting/exceeding benchmark and those approaching and falling far below. As a class most grade levels indicate that they have reached the cut score level for CBAS#2. Three scores are displayed to represent pretest, CBAS #1, and CBAS#2 grade level data. No comparison data was provided. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The chart include % of cohort groups meeting and exceeding based on the AIMS data do not demonstrate alignment with the data provided in the FY14 academic dashboard. The Charter Holder indicated that those numbers were determined on all students, FAY and non-FAY. The multi-test reports do not provide overall school data to provide evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing for Reading
[D.7] **N/A**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Math
[D.8] **N/A**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Reading
[D.9]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Math **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Math.** **The documents provided demonstrate/do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** No data was provided by the Charter Holder.

[D.10]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Reading **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Reading.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** No data was provided by the Charter Holder.
[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:** No data was provided by the Charter Holder.
[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:** No data was provided by the Charter Holder.

[D.13] **Copy of Grad Rate Percent** **grad_rateDSP 2015** **Graduation Rate Summary Report**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved performance in High School Graduation Rate **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved performance in High School Graduation Rate.** The Charter Holder provided a chart that includes the graduation rate from 2012 to 2014. The chart indicates a decrease from 51% to 30%. A summary report was provided to provide the graduation rate for 2012 and 2013. No comparison data was provided. The second chart provided is labeled "Credit Completion Rate Average" and "Average Credits needed to Graduate". These charts calculate the # of years a student has attended the school versus the average credit deficiencies. The Charter Holder indicated that the longer a student is with the school the less credits they are deficient and on track for graduation. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved performance because:** The summary reports include the same information that was provided in the first file to indicate that in 2012 the rate was 51% and in 2013 the rate was 42%, which demonstrates a decline and no comparison data for 2015. The Charter Holder was unable to describe how the charts on credit completion indicate an improved performance in High School Graduation Rate.

I, Katherine Poulos, completed this Site Visit Inventory during the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on March 2, 2015. _____

I, Kathy Tolman, received a copy of this document at the end of the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on March 2, 2015. Kathryn Tolman