Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Phoenix Advantage Charter School, Inc.
School Name: Phoenix Advantage Charter School
Site Visit Date: February 19, 2015

Required for: Annual Report
Evaluation Criteria Area: Data

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[D.1] **Scale Score Growth** **Grade Level Student Gains**	**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 documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • the data from FY12, FY13, and FY14 for students who had been enrolled for the three years indicate an increase in "scaled score growth" for all grade levels except 8th grade in FY14. This is problematic because as compared to the dashboard, FY14 reflected the lowest SGP of the three years. • the data from FY13 and FY14 for students who had been enrolled in both years indicate an increase for 3/6 grade levels in the percent of students who met or exceeded their growth targets and an increase in the 2014 scaled score gains for all grades over 2013 scaled score gains. This is problematic because as compared to the dashboard, FY14 reflected the lowest SGP of the three years. • The charter holder provided the appeal filed with the ADE concerning the letter grade. The appeal was based on a large percentage of ill students during testing and challenges hiring qualified instructors. The appeal was rejected by the ADE. • The charter holder provided data for the FY13 years to demonstrate the previous validity of the internal scantron testing as a predictor for AIMS results. This, in conjunction with the appeal information, was intended to demonstrate that FY2014 was an outlier year. In FY13, the reading scantron test substantially under predicted AIMS performance for all grade levels, the math scantron was within 9 percentage points for all grade levels except math which was over predicted by 24 percentage points. This data does not indicate that the scantron is a valid assessment predictor of state assessment data.

[D.2] **Scale Score Growth**	**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 documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • the data from FY12, FY13, and FY14 for students who had been enrolled for the three years indicate an increase in "scaled score growth" for all grade levels. This is problematic because as compared to the dashboard, FY14 reflected the lowest SGP of the three years. • The charter holder provided the appeal filed with the ADE concerning the letter grade. The appeal was based on a large percentage of ill students during testing and challenges hiring qualified instructors. The appeal was rejected by the ADE. • The charter holder provided data for the FY13 years to demonstrate the previous validity of the internal scantron testing as a predictor for AIMS results. This, in conjunction with the appeal information, was intended to demonstrate that FY2014 was an outlier year. In FY13, the reading scantron test substantially under predicted AIMS performance for all grade levels, the math scantron was within 9 percentage points for all grade levels except math which was over predicted by 24 percentage points. This data does not indicate that the scantron is a valid assessment predictor of state assessment data.

[D.3] **Grade Level Student Gains**	**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:** • the data from FY13 and FY14 for students who had been enrolled in both years indicate an increase in the percentage of students scoring at the above or far above levels and an increase in the scaled score growth between fall and spring as compared to the prior year. This is problematic because as compared to the dashboard, FY14 reflected the lowest SGP of the three years. • The charter holder provided the appeal filed with the ADE concerning the letter grade. The appeal was based on a large percentage of ill students during testing and challenges hiring qualified instructors. The appeal was rejected by the ADE. • The charter holder provided data for the FY13 years to demonstrate the previous validity of the internal scantron testing as a predictor for AIMS results. This, in conjunction with the appeal information, was intended to demonstrate that FY2014 was an outlier year. In FY13, the reading scantron test substantially under predicted AIMS performance for all grade levels, the math scantron was within 9 percentage points for all grade levels except math which was over predicted by 24 percentage points. This data does not indicate that the scantron is a valid assessment predictor of state assessment data.

[D.4] **Grade Level Student Gains**	**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:** • the data from FY13 and FY14 for students who had been enrolled in both years indicate an increase in the percentage of students scoring at the above or far above levels and an increase in the scaled score growth between fall and spring as compared to the prior year. This is problematic because as compared to the dashboard, FY14 reflected the lowest SGP of the three years. • The charter holder provided the appeal filed with the ADE concerning the letter grade. The appeal was based on a large percentage of ill students during testing and challenges hiring qualified instructors. The appeal was rejected by the ADE. • The charter holder provided data for the FY13 years to demonstrate the previous validity of the internal scantron testing as a predictor for AIMS results. This, in conjunction with the appeal information, was intended to demonstrate that FY2014 was an outlier year. In FY13, the reading scantron test substantially under predicted AIMS performance for all grade levels, the math scantron was within 9 percentage points for all grade levels except math which was over predicted by 24 percentage points. This data does not indicate that the scantron is a valid assessment predictor of state assessment data.

[D.5] **Scale Score Growth** **Grade Level Student Gains**	**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.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • the data from FY12, FY13, and FY14 for students who had been enrolled for the three years indicate an increase in "scaled score growth" for all grade levels except 8th grade in FY14. This is problematic because as compared to the dashboard, FY14 reflected the lowest proficiency rate for the 3 years. • the data from FY13 and FY14 for students who had been enrolled in both years indicate an increase in the proficiency rate for 3/6 grade levels. This is prob • The charter holder provided the appeal filed with the ADE concerning the letter grade. The appeal was based on a large percentage of ill students during testing and challenges hiring qualified instructors. The appeal was rejected by the ADE.lematic because as compared to the dashboard, FY14 reflected the lowest proficiency rate for the 3 years. • The charter holder provided data for the FY13 years to demonstrate the previous validity of the internal scantron testing as a predictor for AIMS results. This, in conjunction with the appeal information, was intended to demonstrate that FY2014 was an outlier year. In FY13, the reading scantron test substantially under predicted AIMS performance for all grade levels, the math scantron was within 9 percentage points for all grade levels except math which was over predicted by 24 percentage points. This data does not indicate that the scantron is a valid assessment predictor of state assessment data.

[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.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • the data from FY12, FY13, and FY14 for students who had been enrolled for the three years indicate an increase in "scaled score growth" for all grade levels. This is problematic because as compared to the dashboard, FY14 reflected a lower proficiency rate than in the prior year. • The charter holder provided the appeal filed with the ADE concerning the letter grade. The appeal was based on a large percentage of ill students during testing and challenges hiring qualified instructors. The appeal was rejected by the ADE. • The charter holder provided data for the FY13 years to demonstrate the previous validity of the internal scantron testing as a predictor for AIMS results. This, in conjunction with the appeal information, was intended to demonstrate that FY2014 was an outlier year. In FY13, the reading scantron test substantially under predicted AIMS performance for all grade levels, the math scantron was within 9 percentage points for all grade levels except math which was over predicted by 24 percentage points. This data does not indicate that the scantron is a valid assessment predictor of state assessment data.

[D.7] **Grade Level Student Gains**	**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:** • the data from FY13 and FY14 for students who had been enrolled in both years indicate an increase for 3/6 grade levels in the scaled score gains over 2013 scaled score gains; the data also shows an increase in the percent of students who met or exceeded their growth targets for only one grade level and decreases for 4 of the grade levels. • The charter holder provided the appeal filed with the ADE concerning the letter grade. The appeal was based on a large percentage of ill students during testing and challenges hiring qualified instructors. The appeal was rejected by the ADE. • The charter holder provided data for the FY13 years to demonstrate the previous validity of the internal scantron testing as a predictor for AIMS results. This, in conjunction with the appeal information, was intended to demonstrate that FY2014 was an outlier year. In FY13, the reading scantron test substantially under predicted AIMS performance for all grade levels, the math scantron was within 9 percentage points for all grade levels except math which was over predicted by 24 percentage points. This data does not indicate that the scantron is a valid assessment predictor of state assessment data. • The charter holder provided tables titled "ELL student growth Math – Percentage of students making1 year growth" for FY15. No comparison to prior years was provided. The data compares Quarter 2 to Quarter 3 and is broken out by grade level. One grade level show no growth, other grade levels show substantial changes, 4/6 grade levels show that fewer than 50% of students have made more than 1 year of growth.
[D.8] **Grade Level Student Gains**	**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.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • the data from FY13 and FY14 for students who had been enrolled in both years indicate an increase for 3/7 grade levels in the scaled score gains over 2013 scaled score gains; the data also shows an increase in the percent of students who met or exceeded their growth targets for only two grade level and decreases for3 of the grade levels.

	• The charter holder provided the appeal filed with the ADE concerning the letter grade. The appeal was based on a large percentage of ill students during testing and challenges hiring qualified instructors. The appeal was rejected by the ADE. • The charter holder provided data for the FY13 years to demonstrate the previous validity of the internal scantron testing as a predictor for AIMS results. This, in conjunction with the appeal information, was intended to demonstrate that FY2014 was an outlier year. In FY13, the reading scantron test substantially under predicted AIMS performance for all grade levels, the math scantron was within 9 percentage points for all grade levels except math which was over predicted by 24 percentage points. This data does not indicate that the scantron is a valid assessment predictor of state assessment data. • The charter holder provided tables titled "ELL student growth Reading – Percentage of students making1 year growth" for FY15. No comparison to prior years was provided. The data compares Quarter 2 to Quarter 3 and is broken out by grade level. One grade level show no growth, other grade levels show substantial changes, 5/7 grade levels show that fewer than 50% of students have made more than 1 year of growth
[D.9] **Grade Level Student Gains**	**N/A**
[D.10] **Grade Level Student Gains**	**N/A**
[D.11] **Grade Level Student Gains** **Quarterly Growth**	**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:** • Students with disabilities in 3rd-8th grade showed growth in math in 2013. 6/6 grade levels showed growth in scaled scores from Spring to Fall in FY13. The average growth was 141.67 points. • Students with disabilities in 3rd-8th grade showed less growth in math in 2014. 5/6 grade levels showed growth and 1/6 showed a decrease in scaled scores from Spring to Fall in FY14. The average growth was 67.5 points. • On average in FY14, the growth in scaled scores for two 4th grade students with disabilities in math was 48 points, which is an average of 26% of the expected yearly growth for those students. • The charter holder provided data for the FY13 years to demonstrate the previous validity of the internal scantron testing as a predictor for AIMS results. This, in conjunction with the appeal information, was intended to demonstrate that FY2014 was an outlier year. In FY13, the reading scantron test substantially under predicted AIMS performance for all grade levels, the math scantron was within 9 percentage points for all grade levels

	except math which was over predicted by 24 percentage points. This data does not indicate that the scantron is a valid assessment predictor of state assessment data.
[D.12] **Grade Level Student Gains Quarterly Growth**	**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:** • Students with disabilities in 3rd-8th grade showed inconsistent growth in reading in 2013. 4/6 grade levels showed growth and 2/6 showed a decrease in scaled scores from Spring to Fall in FY13. The average growth was 80 points. • Students with disabilities in 3rd-8th grade showed improved growth in reading in 2014. 5/6 grade levels showed growth and 1/6 showed a decrease in scaled scores from Spring to Fall in FY14. The average growth was 88 points. However, the dashboard for FY14 indicates that the school's scores were worse in FY 14 than they were in FY13. • On average in FY14, the growth in scaled scores for two 4th grade students with disabilities in reading was 48.5 points, which is an average of 21% of the expected yearly growth for those students. • The charter holder provided data for the FY13 years to demonstrate the previous validity of the internal scantron testing as a predictor for AIMS results. This, in conjunction with the appeal information, was intended to demonstrate that FY2014 was an outlier year. In FY13, the reading scantron test substantially under predicted AIMS performance for all grade levels, the math scantron was within 9 percentage points for all grade levels except math which was over predicted by 24 percentage points. This data does not indicate that the scantron is a valid assessment predictor of state assessment data.

I, Katherine Poulos, completed this Site Visit Inventory during the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on February 19, 2015.

I, Leanne Bowley, received a copy of this document at the end of the site visit conducted by the Arizona State Board of Charter Schools on February 19, 2015.

Leanne Bowley