Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Evaluation Instrument

Charter Holder Name: Phoenix Collegiate Academy, Inc.
School Name: Phoenix Collegiate Academy
Date Submitted: October 17, 2013

Required for: Expansion - Grade Level, Enrollment Cap
Initial Evaluation Completed: November 13, 2013
Final Evaluation Completed: December 18, 2013

I = Result after initial evaluation
S = Result after evaluation of information collected from the site visit

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
1a. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased student growth in Reading was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased student growth in Reading was provided. **After further review of documentation at the site visit, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student growth in Reading.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% was provided. **After further review of documentation at the site visit, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student growth in Math for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%.**
1b. Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) Bottom 25% *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25% was provided. **After further review of documentation at the site visit, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student growth in Reading for students with growth percentiles in the lowest 25%.**
2a. Percent Passing *Math*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Math was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Math was provided. **After further review of documentation at the site visit, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student proficiency in Math.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2a. Percent Passing *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Reading was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Reading was provided. **After further review of documentation at the site visit, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading.**
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Math for students in the ELL, FRL, or SPED categories was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Math was provided. **After further review, while the charter holder demonstrated the implementation of acceptable systems in Curriculum and Assessment for monitoring student proficiency in Math for students identified as ELL or SPED, data provided did not demonstrate increased proficiency in Math for students in these subgroups.**
2b. Composite School Comparison (*Traditional and Small Schools only*) *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Reading for students in the ELL, FRL, or SPED categories was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Reading for students in the ELL, FRL, or SPED categories was provided. **After further review, while the charter holder demonstrated the implementation of acceptable systems in Curriculum and Assessment for monitoring student proficiency in Reading for students identified as ELL or SPED, data provided did not demonstrate increased proficiency in Reading for students in these subgroups.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Math for students in the ELL category was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Math for students in the ELL category was provided. **After further review, while the charter holder demonstrated the implementation of acceptable systems in Curriculum and Assessment for monitoring student proficiency in Math for students identified as ELL, data provided did not demonstrate increased proficiency in Math for students in the ELL subgroup.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* ELL *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Reading for students in the ELL category was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Reading for students in the ELL category was provided. **After further review, while the charter holder demonstrated the implementation of acceptable systems in Curriculum and Assessment for monitoring student proficiency in Reading for students identified as ELL, data provided did not demonstrate increased proficiency in Reading for students in the ELL subgroup.**

Measure	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Comments
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* FRL *Reading*	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Reading for students in the FRL category was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Reading for students in the FRL category was provided. **After further review of documentation at the site visit, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student proficiency in Reading for students in the FRL subgroup.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Math*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities was provided. **After further review, while the charter holder demonstrated the implementation of acceptable systems in Curriculum and Assessment for monitoring student proficiency in Math for students with disabilities, data provided did not demonstrate increased proficiency in Math for students in the SPED subgroup.**
2c. Subgroup Comparison *(2b. for Alternative)* Students with disabilities *Reading*		**I/S**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities was provided. **After further review, while the charter holder demonstrated the implementation of acceptable systems in Curriculum and Assessment for monitoring student proficiency in Reading for students with disabilities, data provided did not demonstrate increased proficiency in Reading for students in the SPED subgroup.**
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	**S**	**I**	**Curriculum:** No student data that supports increased student growth and proficiency was provided. **Assessment:** No student data that supports increased student growth and proficiency was provided **After further review of documentation at the site visit, data provided by the charter holder demonstrated increased student growth and proficiency in Math and in Reading.**