

**Feedback &
Recommendations**

Academic Framework Study Session

Dr. Ildi Laczko Kerr, Vice President of Academics

Association Support

- The Association provides technical assistance to schools required to submit PMPs and DSPs:
 - Workshops:
 - Increase schools' ability to complete the required submissions
 - Clarify directions, submission requirements and evaluation criteria for PMPs and DSPs
 - Schools begin to develop their submission
 - Document review:
 - External evaluation prior to submission to identify areas of improvement

Academic Framework Feedback

- Academic quality is based entirely on state assessment results
- Timing of two separate evaluations leads to confusion about school quality
- Inconsistent feedback to schools between two statewide evaluations that use the same underlying data
 - A-F ratings are used inconsistently in Board decisions, i.e., “F” schools consequences
- No appeal process for Academic Framework

Academic Framework Feedback

- Transition concerns:
 - No A-F labels (2015 and 2016)
 - Fairness to charter schools
 - Impact on the Framework
 - Changing formula and its impact on future Frameworks
 - Timing of AZ MERIT results and SGP calculations will result in delayed Frameworks
 - SGP calculations for high schools and alternative schools (issue for ADE to resolve before data can be available for Framework)
 - Improvement scores for alternative schools are no longer available without AIMS retest

Academic Framework Feedback

- Good 2014 A-F results, yet charter does not meet expectations
- Poor 2014 A-F results, yet charter meets expectations
- Inconsistent results for C rated schools

Does Not Meets Level:

32 (20%) received a "B"

72 (45%) received a "C"

50 (31%) received a "D"

1 (1%) received an "F"

5 (3%) received no letter grade

Meets Level:

121 (45%) received an "A"

99 (37%) received a "B"

40 (15%) received a "C"

8 (3%) received a "D"

3 (1%) received no letter grade

Academic Framework Feedback

- Composite schools comparison doesn't accurately reflect the school's population
 - Significantly impacted special education
 - English Language Learner (proficiency levels) or
 - Regional impact (i.e., rural, reservation, border)
- Comparison to the state average is problematic for alternative schools when 80% of alternative schools are charter schools

Academic Framework Recommendations

- Determine whether the 2015 Framework will be delayed or suspended due to the timing and availability of data
- Consider additional measures of school quality that can supplement assessment scores, i.e., re-enrollment/persistence rates, attendance rates, course work progress and completion (HS)
- Clarify the role of A-F labels in Board's decision making

Academic Framework Recommendations

- Create a more nuanced composite school comparison that includes additional data to better evaluate school performance
- For alternative schools- consider creating a state average baseline that does not change annually for a point of comparison
- Consider an appeals process similar to ADE's A-F substantive appeals

Academic Interventions DSP/PMP

- No consideration for schools that are near the meets cut score- whether your 1 or 15 points away schools must complete the same information
- Conflict between “tell your story” directives and “only if you present your data this way” evaluation
 - Directions and expectations are unclear, despite technical assistance documents
- Year over year comparisons invalid between different assessment systems, yet schools are scored poorly if they don’t report

Academic Interventions: DSP/PMP

- Inconsistent school improvement expectations compared to Title I, ESS, etc.
- Lack of regard for other accreditation models and processes
- Evaluation rubrics lack specificity and leave room for subjectivity during review process
- Evidence and documentation expectations are unclear and (at times) seem unreasonable

Academic Interventions: DSP/PMP

- Some DSP guiding questions are redundant and therefore cause confusion
- Length of DSP (blank template is nearly 40 pages) is overwhelming and time consuming
 - Schools have 30 days to complete which forces schools to utilize many staff members to complete in a timely manner
- PMP template is difficult to complete- formatting issues with text boxes result in lost content

Academic Interventions: DSP/PMP

- Timing and feedback
 - Some schools are required to write DSPs within 6 months of one another
 - Due to the volume of PMPs and DSPs, schools may not receive timely feedback on their submission
 - Inconsistent feedback from staff across years results in confusion regarding the expectations PMP and DSP submissions
 - This leads schools to believe that there is too much subjectivity in the evaluation process

DSP/PMP Recommendations

- Tier schools reporting requirements based on the level of performance (Far Below and Does Not Meet) on the Framework
- Differentiate the PMP and DSP requirements for schools based on:
 - Framework results- overall score and specific areas
 - Previous performance on DSP submissions or Frameworks

DSP/PMP Recommendations

- Clarify expectations for content and data by providing exemplars for schools to review prior to submission
- Develop reasonable expectations for school improvement reporting
 - Focus reporting on priority areas- not all areas can be addressed simultaneously
- Consider DSP submissions in two phases
 - Phase 1: Data Review, if data meet then no additional submissions required
 - Phase 2: If data review does not meet, complete template specifically addressing areas that do not meet

DSP/PMP Recommendations

- Consider a peer-review process for DSP evaluations to increase capacity, timeliness and transparency
- Consider other external evaluations of school quality- accreditations, etc. in the evaluation of schools' performance
- Identify essential questions for the DSP template and eliminate redundant or confusing questions

Questions?