Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Prescott Valley Charter School
School Name: Prescott Valley School
Site Visit Date: March 2, 2015

Required for: Renewal
Evaluation Criteria Area: Data

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome
[D.1] **2015 Data** **DIBELS Lexile and Grade equiv** **2014-2015** **DSP Data** **PVS Data overview**	**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 the following:** **improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Math.** Comparison of growth scores from pre-test to benchmark #2 shows that the average increase in growth points from scaled scores increased from 40.90 in 2014 to 46.42 in 2015. Grade level data was provided that shows declines in average growth point for grades 1, 5, 7, and 8. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** not all grade demonstrated an increase in student growth points.
[D.2] **2015 Data** **DIBELS Lexile and Grade equiv** **2014-2015** **DSP Data** **PVS Data overview**	**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 the following: improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Reading.** Galileo benchmark assessments results show an increase in the percentage of students in the High Growth categories from 2014 (52%) to 2015 (64%). Comparison of growth scores from pre-test to benchmark #2 shows an increase in the average growth points from 23.03 in 2014 to 65.92 in 2015. Grade level data provided shows declines in average growth points in grades 1, 3, and 7. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** not all grade demonstrated an increase in student growth points.
[D.3] **2015 Data** **DIBELS Lexile and Grade equiv**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Math

2014-2015 **DSP Data** **PVS Data overview** **Bottom 25 Tracker 2015**	**The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of the following:** **improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Math.** Comparison of growth scores from pre-test to benchmark #2 show that the average growth increased from -20.83 for 2014 to -3.00 for 2015. Grade level data provided shows declines in average growth points from the prior year for grades 4, 8, and 10. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** not all grade demonstrated an increase in student growth points.
[D.4] **2015 Data** **DIBELS Lexile and Grade equiv** **2014-2015** **DSP Data** **PVS Data overview** **Bottom 25 Tracker 2015**	**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 the following:** **improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) bottom 25% – Reading.** Comparison of growth scores from pre-test to benchmark #2 show that the average of 7.33 for 2014 increased to 46.8 for 2015. Grade level data provided shows declines in average growth points from the prior year for 7th grade. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** Grade level data provided shows declines in average growth points from the prior year for grades 4, 8, and 10.
[D.5] **2015 Data** **DIBELS Lexile and Grade equiv** **2014-2015** **DSP Data** **PVS Data overview**	**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 the following:** **improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Math.** Comparison of the percentage of students passing on Galileo (meets or exceed) shows that for 2015 the percentage of students passing is greater than in the 2014 for all tested grade levels (3rd – 12th) **The documents provided demonstrate improved academic performance because:** Galileo results demonstrate improved student proficiency for all tested grade levels.

[D.6] **2015 Data** **DIBELS Lexile and Grade equiv** **2014-2015** **DSP Data** **PVS Data overview**	**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 the following:** **improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Reading.** Comparison of benchmark results show that the percentage of students passing on Galileo (meets or exceed) shows that for 2015 the percentage of students passing is greater than in the 2014. **The documents provided demonstrate improved academic performance because:** Galileo results demonstrate improved student proficiency for all tested grade levels.
[D.7] **2015 Data** **DIBELS Lexile and Grade equiv** **2014-2015** **DSP Data** **PVS Data overview** **ELL Tracker 2015**	**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 the following:** **improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Math.** **Comparison of the percentage of students passing on Galileo (meets or exceed) shows that average percentage point increase for 2015 was greater than in 2014.** Grade level data provided shows declines in average growth points from the prior year for 1st grade. Comparison of Benchmark #2 results shows a decline in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding benchmark. In 2014 100% (3 of 3 students) to 54% (13 of 24 students) in 2015. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** Grade level data provided shows declines in the percentage of proficient ELL students in Math.

[D.8] **2015 Data** **DIBELS Lexile and Grade equiv** **2014-2015** **DSP Data** **PVS Data overview** **ELL Tracker 2015**	**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 the following:** **improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Reading.** Comparison of the percentage of students passing on Galileo (meets or exceed) shows that average percentage point increase for 2015 was greater than in 2014. Grade level data provided shows declines in average growth points from the prior year for 1st grade. Comparison of Benchmark #2 results shows no change in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding benchmark. In 2014 50% (2 of 4 students) to 50% (12 of 24 students) in 2015. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** Grade level data provided shows no improvement in the percentage of proficient ELL students in Reading.
[D.9] **N/A**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Math 80% of students are eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch. This category is not applicable to the school.
[D.10] **N/A**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Reading 80% of students are eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch. This category is not applicable to the school.
[D.11] **2015 Data** **DIBELS Lexile and Grade equiv** **2014-2015** **DSP Data** **PVS Data overview** **SPED Tracker 2015**	**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 the following:** **of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Math.** Comparison of the percentage of students passing on Galileo (meets or exceed) shows that average declined from 2014 to 2015. % Passing (Meets or Exceeds) CBAS #1 2014 25 % declined in 2015 to 21%; CBAS #2 2014 – 33% declined in 2015 to 22%. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** Comparison of the percentage of students passing on Galileo (meets or exceed) shows that average declined from 2014 to 2015.

[D.12] **2015 Data** **DIBELS Lexile and Grade equiv 2014-2015** **DSP Data** **PVS Data overview** **SPED Tracker 2015**	**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 the following:** **of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Reading.** Comparison of the percentage of students passing on Galileo (meets or exceed) shows that average declined from 2014 to 2015. % Passing (Meets or Exceeds) CBAS #1 2014 75 % declined in 2015 to 41%; CBAS #2 2014 – 67% declined in 2015 to 46%. **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** Comparison of the percentage of students passing on Galileo (meets or exceed) shows that average declined from 2014 to 2015.