Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Legacy Schools
School Name: Encore Arts Academy
Site Visit Date: May 12, 2015

Required for: Renewal
Evaluation Criteria Area: Data

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome	
[D.1] **D.1.3 Year over Year Comparison to Demonstrate Growth 2013 to 2014** **D.1.4 Year over Year Comparison to Demonstrate Growth 2014 to 2015**	**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.** Galileo scores were provided for CBAS #1 and CBAS #2 for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015. The change in scores from CBAS #1 to CBAS #2 were calculated for each grade level. A comparison of the changes for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 showed that all grade levels demonstrated an increase in growth from CBAS #1 to CBAS #2. **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] **D.1.3 Year over Year Comparison to Demonstrate Growth 2013 to 2014** **D.1.4 Year over Year Comparison to Demonstrate Growth 2014 to 2015** **CBAS#3 Benchmark Summary for FY14** **CBAS#3 Benchmark Summary for FY15**	**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.** Galileo scores were provided for CBAS #1 and CBAS #2 for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015. The change in scores from CBAS #1 to CBAS #2 were calculated for each grade level. A comparison of the changes for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 showed that all grade but 3rd grade demonstrated an increase in growth from CBAS #1 to CBAS #2. Benchmark summary reports for CBAS#2 and CBAS #3 were also provided for FY14 and FY15. The change in the percentage of students passing for each benchmark were compared. Analysis shows a change in the percentage of student passing from CBAS#2 to CBAS#3: From 72% to 64% in FY14 (a decline of 8 percentage points) From 85% to 68.68% in FY15 (a decline of 16.32 percentage points) **The documents provided DO NOT demonstrate improved academic performance because:** Analysis of the data was demonstrates that for 3rd grade reading students showed less improvement from CBAS #1 to CBAS#2 than in the prior year, and a decline from CBAS#2 to CBAS#3 in the current year.	

	In FY14 the average student scale for 3rd grade Reading improved by 7 points from CBAS#1 to CBAS #2 In FY15 the average student scale score for 3rd grade Reading decreased by 25 points from CBAS#1 to CBAS #2 **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]	**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:** Data was provided for FY15, but no comparative data was provided to show improvement 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.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** Data was provided for FY15, but no comparative data was provided to show improvement 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.5] **D.1.1 Year over Year Comparison to Demonstrate Growth 2013 to 2014** **D.1.2 Year over Year Comparison to Demonstrate Growth 2014 to 2015**	**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.** Galileo scores were provided for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 identifying the percentage of students identified as On Course. A comparison of the percentage of students identified as On Course for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 showed that not all grade levels demonstrated an increase in the percentage of students identified as On Course. **The documents provided DO NOT demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The percentage of students On Course in Math in declined at each of the following grade levels: 4th grade from 64% in FY14 to 44.44% in FY15; 6th grade from 71.43% in FY14 to 63.64% in FY15; 8th grade from 41.67% in FY14 to 20.83% in 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] **D.1.1 Year over Year Comparison to Demonstrate Growth 2013 to 2014** **D.1.2 Year over Year Comparison to Demonstrate Growth 2014 to 2015**	**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.** Galileo scores were provided for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 identifying the percentage of students identified as On Course. A comparison of the percentage of students identified as On Course for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 showed that not all grade levels demonstrated an increase in the percentage of students identified as On Course. **The documents provided DO NOT demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The percentage of students On Course in Reading declined at each of the following grade levels: 5th grade from 50% in FY14 to 39.13% in FY15; 6th grade from 71.43% in FY14 to 53.33% in FY15 7th grade from 75% in FY14 to 61.11% in FY15 8th grade from 54.17% in FY14 to 45.83% in 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.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:** Data was provided for FY15, but no comparative data was provided to show improvement 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.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 DO NOT demonstrate improved academic performance because:** Data was provided for FY15, but no comparative data was provided to show improvement 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.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:** Data was provided for FY15, but no comparative data was provided to show improvement 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.