Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: The Paideia Academies, Inc.
School Name: The Paideia Academy South Phoenix
Site Visit Date: September 21, 2015

Required for: Expansion - Grade Level
Expansion - Enrollment Cap
Evaluation Criteria Area: Data - Revised

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome	
[D.1] **Paideia AIMS Web Data Analysis**	**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.** According to the MCAP assessment, there was an increase in overall school-wide growth when calculated as a weighted average. FY14 was 71% and FY15 was 77%. The report shows an increase in 2 out of 4 grade levels: 3rd grade increased from 27% to 29%, 4th grade increased from 24 to 26%, 5th grade decreased from 26% to 23% and 6th grade decreased from 23% to 21%. According to the MCOMP report, the weighted school wide average also increased, going from 65% in FY14 to 70% in FY15 overall. The report shows an increase in 2 out of 4 grade levels. 3rd grade increased from 27% to 29%, 3rd grade increased from 24% to 26%, 5th grade decreased from 26% to 23% and 6th grade decreased from 23% to 21%. **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] **Paideia AIMS Web Data Analysis**	**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 MAZE assessment report shows a decrease in 2 out of 4 grade levels and an overall decrease in the school wide average. In FY14, the school average was 64% and in FY15, it decreased to 51%. By grade level, in 3rd grade the average scores increased from 27% to 29%, 4th grade increased from 24% to 26%, 5th grade decreased from 26% to 23% and 6th grade decreased from 23% to 21%. The RCBM assessment report shows a decrease in 2 out of 4 grade levels and an overall decrease in the school wide average. In FY14, the school average was 63% and in FY15, it decreased to 56%. By grade level, in 3rd grade the average scores increased from 27% to 29%, 4th grade increased from 24% to 26%, 5th grade decreased from 26% to 23% and 6th grade decreased from 23% to 21% **The documents provided DO NOT demonstrate improved academic performance because:** The weighted averages show a decline in academic performance at the school wide level, as well as half of the grade levels showing a decline. **Final Evaluation: Revision:** Based on further analysis of the data files provided to Board staff at the site visit, the evaluation for this measure has been revised. The data provided demonstrates that the average student in the group is improving at a greater rate than the national average rate of improvement. The data provided demonstrates improved academic performance.	
	☒ 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] **Bottom 25% 25 using all each year**	**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** Bottom 25% students based on fall performance are identified through an MCAP report, and tracked in a normed list. The number of FAY tested students were counted from the bottom up to determine an accurate count of those who took the test both years. The ROI for all students above increased from 63.4 to 70.6 in math. Three out of four grades improved. 3rd grade increased from 50.3 to 68.9, 5th grade increased from 47.1 to 83.0, 6th grade increased from 69.6 to 78.3 and the decrease in 4th grade was from 87.9 to 55.0. **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] **Bottom 25% 25 using all each year**	**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 evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Reading OR Improvement – Reading.** Bottom 25% students based on fall performance are identified through an MCAP report, and created a normed list. The number of FAY tested students were counted from the bottom up to determine an accurate count of those who took the test both years. The ROI for all students above increased from 56.6 to 60.5 and an increase was found in two grades. 3rd grade decreased from 64.3 to 56.1, 4th increased from 56.4 to 62.5, 5th grade decreased from 62.1 to 58.3 and 6th grade increased from 41.9 to 67.7. **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] **Paideia AIMS Web Data Analysis** **Tier Transition 3** **Tier Transition 6**	**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** Based on MCAP data, in Spring of FY14, 61% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 75% in FY15. Additionally, a reduction of Tier 3 students was shown from FY14 to FY15 by 11%. Based on MCOMP data, in Spring of FY14, 66% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 74% in FY15. Additionally, a reduction of Tier 3 students was shown from FY14 to FY15 by 4%. **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] **Paideia AIMS Web Data Analysis** **Tier Transition 3** **Tier Transition 6**	**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.** Based on RCBM data, in Spring of FY14, 54% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 61% in FY15. Additionally, a reduction of Tier 3 students was shown from FY14 to FY15 by 5%. Based on MAZE data, in Spring of FY14, 56% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 62% in FY15. Additionally, a reduction of Tier 3 students was shown from FY14 to FY15 by 7%. **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] **Paideia AIMS Web Data Analysis** **Tier Transition 3** **Tier Transition 6**	**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** Based on MCAP data, in Spring of FY14, 57% of students were in Tier 1, and that decreased to 56% in FY15. However, the amount of students in this subgroup nearly doubled year over year, and Tier 3 students reduced from 36% to 7%, Based on MCOMP data, in Spring of FY14, 43% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 56% 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.8] **Paideia AIMS Web Data Analysis** **Tier Transition 3** **Tier Transition 6**	**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.** Based on RCBM data, in Spring of FY14, 17% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 54% in FY15. Based on MAZE data, in Spring of FY14, 14% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 60% 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.9] **Paideia AIMS Web Data Analysis** **Tier Transition 3** **Tier Transition 6**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Math **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Math.** Based on MCAP data, in Spring of FY14, 61% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 77% in FY15. Additionally, a reduction of Tier 3 students was shown from FY14 to FY15 by 11%. Based on MCOMP data, in Spring of FY14, 66% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 77% 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.10] **Paideia AIMS Web Data Analysis** **Tier Transition 3** **Tier Transition 6**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Reading **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Reading.** Based on RCBM data, in Spring of FY14, 51% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 59% in FY15. Based on MAZE data, in Spring of FY14, 53% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 63% 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.11] **Paideia AIMS Web Data Analysis** **Tier Transition 3** **Tier Transition 6**	**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.** Based on MCAP data, in Spring of FY14, 32% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 38% in FY15. Based on MCOMP data, in Spring of FY14, 32% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 50% 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.12] **Paideia AIMS Web Data Analysis** **Tier Transition 3** **Tier Transition 6**	**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.** Based on RCBM data, in Spring of FY14, 16% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 31% in FY15. Based on MAZE data, in Spring of FY14, 9% of students were in Tier 1, and that increased to 33% 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.