Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Primavera Technical Learning Center
School Name: Primavera Online
Site Visit Date: April 28, 2015

Required for: Renewal
Evaluation Criteria Area: Data

Document Name/Identification	Intended Purpose and Discussion Outcome	
[D.1]	**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) – Reading.** The change in average percent passing scores for unit assessments from the beginning of the course to the end of the course for FY14 and FY15 were compared. The comparison shows that in FY15 average scores shows less of a decline than in the prior year. The decline in scores is the results of adaptive testing and the increase in the number of standards assessed in the final unit exam. For Fy14 the average score declined by 6.5 points, in FY15 this decreased to a decline of 5.8 points. **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]	**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 demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Student Median Growth Percentile (SGP) – Reading.** The change in average percent passing scores for unit assessments from the beginning of the course to the end of the course for FY14 and FY15 were compared. The comparison shows that for FY15 average scores are comparable to 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.3]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Improvement – Math	

	The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Improvement – Math. A comparison of FY14 and FY15 results shows an increase in the percentage of students improving at least one performance level. This increased form 34% in FY14 to 46.9% in FY15. These results are based on school wide results for Math and Reading. Due to the limitations of the data available at the time of the site visit, content area level results were not available. **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]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Improvement – Reading **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Improvement – Reading.** A comparison of FY14 and FY15 results shows an increase in the percentage of students improving at least one performance level. This increased form 34% in FY14 to 46.9% in FY15. These results are based on school wide results for Math and Reading. Due to the limitations of the data available at the time of the site visit, content area level results were not available. **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 demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Math** A comparison of FY14 and FY15 final exam averages showed an increase from 67.6 to 68.1 in Math. A comparison of Fall 2013 to Fall 2014 AIMS results showed an increased in students passing AIMS from 17.6 to 21.5 **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 demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing – Reading. A comparison of FY14 and FY15 final exam averages showed an increase from 70.9 to 71.6 in Reading A comparison of Fall 2013 to Fall 2014 AIMS results showed an increase in the percentage of students passing AIMS Reading from 60.0 to 65.2. **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.** Unit test scores for FY2014 and FY2015 were compared. For ELL students in Math the comparison shows a slight decline from FY14 to FY15 with the average Exam 5 score decreasing from 64.1 to 60.3 **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 demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, ELL – Reading. Unit test scores for FY2014 and FY2015 were compared. For ELL students in Reading the comparison shows an increase from 68.2 to 69.3 as the average Exam 5 score for the end of the course.	
	☒ 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 The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Math. No disaggregated comparative data was provided for this subgroup. **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 The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Reading. No disaggregated comparative data was provided for this subgroup. **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 demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Math. Unit test scores for FY2014 and FY2015 were compared. For students with disabilities in Math the comparison shows no change in the Exam 5 end of course assessment results. **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 The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, Students with disabilities – Reading. Unit test scores for FY2014 and FY2015 were compared. For students with disabilities in Reading the comparison shows the average of Exam 5 was 71.3 for the prior year it was 70.5 showing an increase in the average percentage. **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] **Course Completion Reports**	**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. A comparison of course completion data from FY14 to FY15 shows an increase from 74% to 80%, demonstrating an increase in the percentage of students that are passing courses during the school 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.14] **Document explanation sheet**	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved performance in Academic Persistence **The documents provided demonstrate evidence of improved performance in** Academic Persistence**.** A comparison of retention data for FY14 and FY15 shows an increase in the percentage of returning students. This increased from 50% for 2013-2014 to 62% for 2014-2015. **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.