Demonstration of Sufficient Progress Site Visit Inventory

Charter Holder Name: Tucson Preparatory School
School Name: Tucson Preparatory School
Site Visit Date: March 23, 2015

Required for: Annual Report
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 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 provided was "SGP - Math" indicated the SGP for their students saw a decrease from 2013 to 2014. • This data was not provided for current year data. • This data was not provided for all students, but rather only a subgroup. • Student by student internal data is provided. No analysis was conducted. A quick view of this data indicates that many students demonstrate declines in performance from year to year. • The charter holder provided 3 anecdotal "case studies" to show improved performance. No data was provided to support this is an accurate reflection of performance. Further the case studies indicate that students are removed from remediation, but no data was provided to support these changes in student status. Rather the charter holder's representatives indicate that these are based on informal assessment and teacher observation.
[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 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 provided was "SGP, Bottom 25% - Reading" indicated the SGP for their Bottom 25% students in 2013 they were able to increase SGP 4 percentage points, but in they were able to increase SGP 4 percentage points. • This data was not provided for current year data. • This data was not provided for all students, but rather only a subgroup.

	• Student by student internal data is provided. No analysis was conducted. A quick view of this data indicates that many students demonstrate declines in performance from year to year. • The charter holder provided 3 anecdotal "case studies" to show improved performance. No data was provided to support this is an accurate reflection of performance. Further the case studies indicate that students are removed from remediation, but no data was provided to support these changes in student status. Rather the charter holder's representatives indicate that these are based on informal assessment and teacher observation.
[D.3]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Improvement – Math **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Improvement – Math.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • the data provided included spring and fall AIMS for 2013, the 2014 data includes fall and spring for 2014 and fall 2015. This data includes 10th grade students as well as retesting students. • This data shows that there is a decrease of in the percentage (-6%) of students who scored FFB an increase of in the percentage of students who scored approaches (+6%) and no change in the percentage of students scoring meets. • This data does not speak to the percentage of non-proficient students increasing their score. • Student by student internal data is provided. No analysis was conducted. A quick view of this data indicates that many students demonstrate declines in performance from year to year. • The charter holder provided 3 anecdotal "case studies" to show improved performance. No data was provided to support this is an accurate reflection of performance. Further the case studies indicate that students are removed from remediation, but no data was provided to support these changes in student status. Rather the charter holder's representatives indicate that these are based on informal assessment and teacher observation. • The charter holder provided "raw data" indicating student performance on AIMS. No analysis was conducted by the charter holder. A quick review indicates that several students show no improvement.
[D.4]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved academic performance in Improvement – Reading **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Improvement – Reading.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:**

	• the data provided included spring and fall AIMS for 2013, the 2014 data includes fall and spring for 2014 and fall 2015. This data includes 10th grade students as well as retesting students. • This data shows that there is a decrease in the percentage (-14%) of students who scored Meets. The data shows an increase in the percentage of students who scored approaches (+16%) and a decrease in the percentage (-2%) of students scoring FFB. • This data does not speak to the percentage of non-proficient students increasing their score. • Student by student internal data is provided. No analysis was conducted. A quick view of this data indicates that many students demonstrate declines in performance from year to year. • The charter holder provided 3 anecdotal "case studies" to show improved performance. No data was provided to support this is an accurate reflection of performance. Further the case studies indicate that students are removed from remediation, but no data was provided to support these changes in student status. Rather the charter holder's representatives indicate that these are based on informal assessment and teacher observation.
[D.5]	**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 provided included spring and fall AIMS for 2013, the 2014 data includes fall and spring for 2014 and fall 2015. This data includes 10th grade students as well as retesting students. • This data shows that there is a decrease of in the percentage (-6%) of students who scored FFB an increase of in the percentage of students who scored approaches (+6%) and no change in the percentage of students scoring meets. • Student by student internal data is provided. No analysis was conducted. A quick view of this data indicates that many students demonstrate declines in performance from year to year. • The charter holder provided 3 anecdotal "case studies" to show improved performance. No data was provided to support this is an accurate reflection of performance. Further the case studies indicate that students are removed from remediation, but no data was provided to support these changes in student status. Rather the charter holder's representatives indicate that these are based on informal assessment and teacher observation.
[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 provided included spring and fall AIMS for 2013, the 2014 data includes fall and spring for 2014 and fall 2015. This data includes 10th grade students as well as retesting students. • This data shows that there is a decrease in the percentage (-14%) of students who scored Meets. The data shows an increase in the percentage of students who scored approaches (+16%) and a decrease in the percentage (-2%) of students scoring FFB. • Student by student internal data is provided. No analysis was conducted. A quick view of this data indicates that many students demonstrate declines in performance from year to year. • The charter holder provided 3 anecdotal "case studies" to show improved performance. No data was provided to support this is an accurate reflection of performance. Further the case studies indicate that students are removed from remediation, but no data was provided to support these changes in student status. Rather the charter holder's representatives indicate that these are based on informal assessment and teacher observation.
[D.7]	**n/a**
[D.8]	**n/a**
[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 do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Math.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • the data provided included spring and fall AIMS for 2013, the 2014 data includes fall and spring for 2014 and fall 2015. This data includes 10th grade students as well as retesting students. • This data shows that there is a decrease of in the percentage (-6%) of students who scored FFB an increase of in the percentage of students who scored approaches (+6%) and no change in the percentage of students scoring meets. • Student by student internal data is provided. No analysis was conducted. A quick view of this data indicates that many students demonstrate declines in performance from year to year.

	• The charter holder provided 3 anecdotal "case studies" to show improved performance. No data was provided to support this is an accurate reflection of performance. Further the case studies indicate that students are removed from remediation, but no data was provided to support these changes in student status. Rather the charter holder's representatives indicate that these are based on informal assessment and teacher observation.
[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 do not demonstrate evidence of improved academic performance in Percent Passing Subgroup, FRL – Reading.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved academic performance because:** • the data provided included spring and fall AIMS for 2013, the 2014 data includes fall and spring for 2014 and fall 2015. This data includes 10th grade students as well as retesting students. • This data shows that there is a decrease in the percentage (-14%) of students who scored Meets. The data shows an increase in the percentage of students who scored approaches (+16%) and a decrease in the percentage (-2%) of students scoring FFB. • Student by student internal data is provided. No analysis was conducted. A quick view of this data indicates that many students demonstrate declines in performance from year to year. • The charter holder provided 3 anecdotal "case studies" to show improved performance. No data was provided to support this is an accurate reflection of performance. Further the case studies indicate that students are removed from remediation, but no data was provided to support these changes in student status. Rather the charter holder's representatives indicate that these are based on informal assessment and teacher observation.
[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 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:** • No data or analysis was provided to speak to this measure. • Student by student internal data is provided. No analysis was conducted. A quick view of this data indicates that many students demonstrate declines in performance from year to year

	• The charter holder provided 3 anecdotal "case studies" to show improved performance. No data was provided to support this is an accurate reflection of performance. Further the case studies indicate that students are removed from remediation, but no data was provided to support these changes in student status. Rather the charter holder's representatives indicate that these are based on informal assessment and teacher observation.
[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 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:** • the data provided included spring and fall AIMS for 2013, the 2014 data includes fall and spring for 2014 and fall 2015. This data includes 10th grade students as well as retesting students. • This data shows that there is no change in the percentage of students who scored Meets. The data shows a decrease in the percentage (-13%) of students who scored approaches and an increase in the percentage (+12%) of students scoring FFB. • Student by student internal data is provided. No analysis was conducted. A quick view of this data indicates that many students demonstrate declines in performance from year to year. • The charter holder provided 3 anecdotal "case studies" to show improved performance. No data was provided to support this is an accurate reflection of performance. Further the case studies indicate that students are removed from remediation, but no data was provided to support these changes in student status. Rather the charter holder's representatives indicate that these are based on informal assessment and teacher observation.
[D.13]	**Charter holder indicated the intended purpose of the document was to demonstrate:** improved performance in High School Graduation Rate **The documents provided do not demonstrate evidence of improved performance in High School Graduation Rate.** **The documents provided do not demonstrate improved performance because:** • The data from high school graduation rate indicates 9% graduation rate in 2013 and 30% in 2014. • The charter holder provided 3 anecdotal "case studies" to show improved performance. No data was provided to support this is an accurate reflection of performance. Further the case studies indicate that students are removed from remediation, but no data was provided to support these changes in student status. Rather the charter holder's representatives indicate that these are based on informal assessment and teacher

	observation.