Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Omega Alpha Academy
School Name: Omega Alpha Academy
Site Visit Date: April 8, 2015

Required for: Renewal
Evaluation Criteria Area: Data

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[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.** No comparative Math growth data was provided for students in the bottom 25%. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** No comparative Math growth data was provided for students in the bottom 25%.
	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 **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Math.** A comparison of the percentage of correct answers on the Pre-AIMS benchmark assessment for FY13 and FY14 as compared to Galileo Benchmark #3 for FY15 shows increase in the average percent correct in Math for some but not all grade levels. A comparison of the percentage of students at benchmark in Math on FY14 AIMSweb and FY15 Galileo shows that for some but not all grade levels a greater percentage of students were at benchmark in FY15 as compared to FY14. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** data provided demonstrates a comparison of the average percent correct but does not include a comparison of the proficiency rate in Math for students in FY15 and the prior year. The comparison of the percentage of students at benchmark in Math for AIMSweb in FY14 and Galileo in FY15 show improved proficiency for some but not all grade levels.
	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]	**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 comparison of the percentage of correct answers on the Pre-AIMS benchmark assessment for FY13 and FY14 as compared to Galileo Benchmark #3 for FY15 shows increase in the average percent correct in Reading for some but not all grade levels. A comparison of the percentage of students at benchmark in Reading on FY14 AIMSweb and FY15 Galileo shows that for some but not all grade levels a greater percentage of students were at benchmark in FY15 as compared to FY14. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** data provided for pre-AIMS and Galileo demonstrates a comparison of the average percent correct but does not include a comparison of the proficiency rate in Reading for students in FY15 and the prior year. The comparison of the percentage of students at benchmark in Math for AIMSweb in FY14 and Galileo in FY15 show improved proficiency for some but not all grade levels.
	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.** A comparison of the percentage of correct answers on the Pre-AIMS benchmark assessment for FY13 and FY14 as compared to Galileo Benchmark #3 for FY15 shows increase in the average percent correct in Math for ELLs for some but not all grade levels. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** data provided demonstrates a comparison of the average percent correct but does not include a comparison of the proficiency rate in Math for ELLs in FY15 and 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]	**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.** A comparison of the percentage of correct answers on the Pre-AIMS benchmark assessment for FY13 and FY14 as compared to Galileo Benchmark #3 for FY15 shows increase in the average percent correct in Reading for ELLs for some but not all grade levels. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** data provided demonstrates a comparison of the average percent correct but does not include a comparison of the proficiency rate in Reading for students in FY15 and 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 **N/A**
	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 **N/A**
	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]	**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.** A comparison of the percentage of correct answers on the Pre-AIMS benchmark assessment for FY13 and FY14 as compared to Galileo Benchmark #3 for FY15 shows increase in the average percent correct in Math for students with disabilities for some but not all grade levels. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** data provided demonstrates a comparison of the average percent correct but does not include a comparison of the proficiency rate in Math for students with disabilities in FY15 and 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.12]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Reading demonstrates a comparison of the average percent correct but does not include a comparison of the proficiency rate in Reading for students with disabilities in FY15 and 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.13]	**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 provided based on in-house data from PowerSchool shows an increased in the graduation rate from 33% to 60%.
	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.