



**Academic
Framework
Recommendations**

October 13, 2015



Our Specific Suggestion for “Interim”

- Prudent & Savings of Taxpayer Dollars to not issue ratings
- Would allow time for thoughtful review of the Academic Framework itself
- Insufficient data to make any other recommendation

[9-28-15 input to AZ State Board for Charter Schools Academic Framework subcommittee](#)



ASBCS Transition Plan

We support the Academic Framework Subcommittee's recommendation:

“Do not issue FY 2015 dashboards, revise methodology for FY 2016 academic dashboards and issue FY 2016 dashboards in Summer 2016:

- a) Review measures and weighting with consideration to the new assessment and the new statewide accountability system; and
- b) Implement new dashboard methodology and revisions to the Framework in FY 2017”



Promising Academic Framework

The District of Columbia's Public Charter School Board's Alternative **Education** Accountability Framework

<http://www.dcpccb.org/policy/designation-alternative-accountability-system>

- This system allows charter schools to design with staff a unique set of goals with traditional and/or non-traditional measures, metrics, and targets unique to the school's program
- Arizona State Board for Charter Schools could add schools that serve a high special education or other "high risk" population to schools already on ADE's alternative school list



Our next Full Consortium meeting

Friday, Oct 16, 2015

11 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Ombudsman West Charter

2909 West Bell Road

Phoenix

<http://www.azaec.org/>



Thank You!

We appreciate your continued collaboration
as academic accountability is refined for
all Arizona students.





TO: Arizona State Board for Charter Schools

FROM: Arizona Alternative Education Consortium

RE: Academic Framework: Short-term outcome of “interim” Dashboards and longer-term “big picture” revisions

DATE: September 25, 2015

Thank you very much for considering this stakeholder input as part of your Academic Framework subcommittee deliberations and recommendations to the full Board.

We have diligently discussed options regarding the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools’ Academic Performance Framework and particularly specific suggestions for “interim” 2015, possibly 2016, Dashboards while interpretation, application, even calculation of data associated with the new state-wide assessment are being worked out.

Our specific suggestion for 2015, possibly 2016:

It seems prudent and a savings of taxpayer dollars to **only issue data for 2015 and 2016 and not rate schools with Exceeds, Meets, Does Not Meet, or Fars Fall Below.**

Statewide data would still provide a basis for charters that are undergoing renewal, early renewal, or five-year interval reviews. Data will be available for components of the existing Framework, Indicator 2 – Student Achievement (Proficiency), 2a Percent Passing & 2b Subgroup Proficiency, as well as Indicator 4 – Post-Secondary Readiness, 4a. Graduation and 4b. Academic Persistence. Schools could supplement that data with their mission-driven data to document Student Progress over Time (Growth).

This would allow time for a thoughtful review of the Academic Framework itself, plus include results from at least two years of data from the new statewide assessment as the Board solidifies expectations and sets criteria based on real data, rather than conjecture.

Our members who include data specialists and people with research expertise have reached the strongest consensus on this recommendation.

Vision: College & career (post-secondary education & workplace) ready school completion through accountable alternative education



Another option – the below average performance criteria:

We discussed the possibility of using the Arizona Department of Education’s (ADE) interim Reward, Focus, and Priority labels.

According to ADE, almost sixty percent of schools will not receive those interim labels.

Further, three-quarters of our member schools do not support or only partially support the below average performance criteria. Please refer to our memo of 9-16-15.

Option of using the existing Dashboard and “reweighting”:

In the spirit of trying to make a recommendation that aligns with the 9-28-15 agenda items, we actively discussed and considered making a recommendation of using items 2, Proficiency, 2a Overall & 2b Subgroups and 4 College and Career Readiness (Graduation) 4a. Graduation and 4b. Academic Persistence.

Interim ratings would have a maximum of 65 rather than 100 points, and the weightings would be the same. A school would “meet” with 63% of the 65 points, 40.95.

However, there are serious limitations to this solution:

1. Our member (and some non-member alternative school leaders with whom we have spoken) do not support the current method of only looking at 5th year cohort graduates. ADE has already revised their model for alternative high schools to include 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th year cohorts. Unfortunately, the 2014 data publicly available on the ADE website does not disaggregate their College and Career Readiness Index by the two components that comprise it, Graduation Rate and Academic Persistence. We are unable to make a data-informed recommendation about a criterion, expectation, for Graduation Rate including 4th through 7th year cohort graduates at alternative high schools.
2. Even though school-level AzMERIT results should be available next month, only one year of data should not be used to make decisions. It is not a sound thing to do. The Framework for Alternative Schools does compare alternative schools to the statewide alternative school average, yet 75% of alternative schools are charter schools. The existing Framework expectation is that a school “meet or exceed average statewide

Vision: College & career (post-secondary education & workplace) ready school completion through accountable alternative education



alternative school performance.” It is not statistically possible for more than half the alternative schools to meet that expectation.

In the research world, it is acceptable to say there is insufficient data to come to a conclusion.

We are unable to make a specific recommendation because there is insufficient data to inform decision-making.

Our best recommended longer-term option:

We are encouraged by the sentiments we have heard from the current Board members that the Academic Performance Framework itself should be revamped and updated.

In 2011-12, we conducted research on other states’ frameworks and were actively involved in development of Arizona’s 2012 Academic Framework for Alternative (charter) Schools.

Our member schools are very enthusiastic about an Arizona version of the District of Columbia Public Charter School Board’s Alternative Accountability System.

We think it would be productive for the Academic Performance Framework subcommittee to convene a meeting, or as many as needed, to discuss specifically further development of a framework that works for schools with a mission to educate high risk or unique student populations.

We respectfully request that such meetings be convened.

Thank you again for this opportunity to provide input.

Vision: College & career (post-secondary education & workplace) ready school completion through accountable alternative education