



Arizona State Board for Charter Schools

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

SUBCOMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 28, 2015

Academic Performance Framework

A.R.S. 15-183

R. The sponsoring entity of a charter school shall have oversight and administrative responsibility for the charter schools that it sponsors. In implementing its oversight and administrative responsibilities, the sponsor shall ground its actions in evidence of the charter holder's performance in accordance with the performance framework adopted by the sponsor. The performance framework shall be publicly available, shall be placed on the sponsoring entity's website and shall include:

1. The academic performance expectations of the charter school and the measurement of sufficient progress toward the academic performance expectations.
2. The operational expectations of the charter school, including adherence to all applicable laws and obligations of the charter contract.
3. Intervention and improvement policies.



Academic Performance Framework

Academic Performance Expectations

- Indicators
- Measures

Models

- Traditional School
- Small School
- Alternative School



Academic Performance Expectations

A Charter Holder meets the Board’s academic performance expectations if all schools operated by the Charter Holder receive an Overall Rating of “Meets Standard” or “Exceeds Standard” in the two most recent fiscal years that State assessment data is available.



Academic Framework Structure

Indicator	Measure	Metric
Student Progress over Time	1.a	Adequate growth: Student growth percentiles (SGP)
	1.b	Adequate growth lowest 25%: SGP
		Improvement (Alternative Schools)
Student Achievement	2.a	School-wide student proficiency
	2.b	Comparative proficiency: statewide composite
	2.c	Comparative proficiency: individual subgroups
State Accountability	3	State grading system
Post-Secondary Readiness	4.a	Graduation rate
	4.b	Academic Persistence (Alternative Schools)



Pink indicates measure may not be available for FY 2015
 Red indicates measure will not be available for FY 2015 or FY 2016



Weighting of the Academic Framework

Measure	Traditional and Small Charter Schools Weight			Alternative Charter Schools Weight		
	Elementary and Middle	High School	K-12	Elementary and Middle	High School	K-12
1a. SGP	25%	15%	20%	30%	5%	15%
1b. SGP of Bottom 25% (Improvement for alternative high schools)	25%	15%	20%	20%	25%	25%
2a. Percent Passing	15%	20%	15%	15%	20%	15%
2b. Composite School Comparison (Not used for alternative schools)	15%	15%	10%	NA	NA	NA
2c. Subgroup proficiency	15%	15%	15%	10%	10%	10%
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	5%	5%	5%	10%	5%	5%
4a. High School Graduation Rate	NA	15%	15%	NA	15%	15%
4b. Academic Persistence – (Alternative Schools)	NA	NA	NA	15%	20%	15%



Student Growth

- A Student Growth Percentile (SGP) calculates each student’s progress in comparison to his or her academic peers—students with similar performance on previous assessments.
- A student with an SGP of 50 demonstrated higher growth than at least half of his academic peers across the state with similar performance in current and past years.
- A school median SGP of 50 indicates that at least half of the students in the school showed more growth than at least half of their academic peers with similar performance across the state in current and past years.

Measure	Traditional and Small Charter Schools Weight			Alternative Charter Schools Weight		
	Elementary and Middle	High School	K-12	Elementary and Middle	High School	K-12
1a. SGP	25%	15%	20%	30%	5%	15%
1b. SGP of Bottom 25% (Improvement for alternative high schools)	25%	15%	20%	20%	25%	25%
Total Growth	50%	30%	40%	50%	5%*	27.5%*

*Does not include improvement



Improvement

- Non-proficient students showing an increase in AIMS performance levels from one test administration to the next in the same subject
- Unlike SGP, includes both FAY and non-FAY students
- Cannot be calculated for FY15 due to change in state assessment
- AzMERIT is course based rather than content area based

	Traditional and Small Charter Schools Weight			Alternative Charter Schools Weight		
Measure	Elementary and Middle	High School	K-12	Elementary and Middle	High School	K-12
1b. SGP of Bottom 25% (Improvement for alternative high schools)	25%	15%	20%	20%	25%	25%
Total Improvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	25%	12.5%*

*1/2 of the weight is K-8 SGP bottom 25%



Student Achievement

- Proficiency on state assessments for math and reading
- Based on FAY students only
- Comparative proficiency to a statewide composite
- Comparative proficiency for individual subgroups

Measure	Traditional and Small Charter Schools Weight			Alternative Charter Schools Weight		
	K-8	High School	K-12	K-8	High School	K-12
2a. Percent Passing	15%	20%	15%	15%	20%	15%
2b. Composite School Comparison	15%	15%	10%	NA	NA	NA
2c. Subgroup proficiency	15%	15%	15%	10%	10%	10%
Total Proficiency	45%	50%	40%	25%	30%	25%



State Accountability

- A-F Letter Grade rating from the Arizona Department of Education (ADE)
 - SB 1289 (2015) suspended A-F for FY 2015 and FY 2015 and requires the State Board of Education (SBE) to identify “below average” schools for FY 2015 and FY 2016
 - ADE has developed interim criteria to fulfill the intent of ESEA flexibility as the state transitions assessment systems and develops a new state accountability system
 - In June 2016, ADE will identify qualifying Reward, Focus and Priority schools using FY 2014 – FY 2016 data
 - Not all schools will receive an RFP label

	Traditional and Small Charter Schools Weight			Alternative Charter Schools Weight		
Measure	K-8	High School	K-12	K-8	High School	K-12
3a. A-F Letter Grade State Accountability System	5%	5%	5%	10%	5%	5%



Graduation Rates

- For traditional and small schools, the Framework uses a 4-year cohort graduation rate calculated by ADE which is evaluated against targets that are based on the state target of achieving a 93% graduation rate by 2020
- For alternative schools, a 3-year average of the 5-year graduation rate is used

	Traditional and Small Charter Schools Weight			Alternative Charter Schools Weight		
Measure	K-8	High School	K-12	K-8	High School	K-12
4a. High School Graduation Rate	NA	15%	15%	NA	15%	15%



Academic Persistence

- The percentage of students who remained enrolled in school from the previous year
- Students must enroll in either the same school or a different school by October 1

Measure	Traditional and Small Charter Schools Weight			Alternative Charter Schools Weight		
	K-8	High School	K-12	K-8	High School	K-12
4b. Academic Persistence – (Alternative Schools)	NA	NA	NA	15%	20%	15%



State Accountability Transition

FY 2015 Dashboards

- Data required to run the FY 2015 dashboards is not available until January 2016
- ADE's Accountability Department projects that FY 2015 dashboards could be delivered to ASBCS by **April 2016**.
- The Accountability Department projects FY 2016 dashboards to be available in **July 2016**.

Estimated Data Availability Schedule

The data reporting schedule below refers to the availability of this information statewide. While there is NO embargo on any of the data below so schools may report their own rates, ADE will report this information with Accountability business rules applied. **Updated July 2015.*

August 2015	Graduation 4, 5, 6, and 7 year Rate (s)
August 2015	Persistence Rate
August 2015	Dropout rate
*September 2015	Reclassification on AZELLA rate
August 2015	AZELLA Test Participation Rate
August 2015	AIMS & AIMS A Science Proficiency
November 2015	College and/or Career Readiness Index Information
November 2015	ELA/Math/Science Test Participation Rate
November 2015	AzMERIT (All Subjects) Pass or CCR rate
January 2016	Student Growth Percentiles
January 2016	NCSC pass rate
February 2016	Reward, Focus, Priority PILOT Determinations

Arizona's Accountability Transition Plan

Arizona's Accountability Transition Years: Reward, Focus, & Priority								
School Year	August	October-November	December	January	February	March	June	July
2014-2015	Year 1 of new Assessment aligned to Arizona standards							
					Suspend A-F for FY15 and FY16 based on SB1289; Develop criteria for Reward, Focus, & Priority	SBE adopts new Priority criteria to identify "below average" schools for FY15 and FY16 as required by SB1289	Request ESEA Waiver with updated criteria, current priority & focus schools;	Begin reporting available 2014-2015 data ASAP
2015-2016	Development of Arizona's new state accountability system							
		2014-2015 student achievement data available, reported	Submit revised accountability legislation	Submit AMOs	Use new criteria to EXIT Cohort 1 Focus & Priority schools based on 14-15 data.		Use new criteria to identify qualifying Reward, Focus, & Priority schools using FY14 (Priority), FY15, and FY16 data.	<u>PILOT</u> new state accountability system based on 2015-2016 data (informational purposes)
2016-2017	First year of Implementation of Arizona's Revised State Accountability System							
	Begin Year 1 of implementation for newly identified Focus & Priority schools						Use new criteria to identify and/or exit qualifying Reward, Focus, & Priority schools using FY14 (Priority A-F points) thru FY17 data.	Issue 2017 Accountability determinations based on 2016-2017 data; Request to realign ESEA criteria with new state system.

ASBCS Transition Plan

Option 1

Revise methodology for FY 2015 and FY 2016 and issue FY 2015 dashboards in Spring 2016 and FY 2016 dashboards in Summer 2016:

- a) redistribute weights for measures that are not available in FY 2015; or
- b) replace measures that are not available for FY 2015; or
- c) populate dashboards with existing methodology and use prior year data for measures that are not available for FY 2015.

Considerations:

- Delayed data availability and uncertainty around impact of new assessment data
- Student growth percentiles may not be available for high school students for FY 2015 and currently make up 30% of traditional and small school overall rating for high schools
- State Accountability profiles currently make up 5% of the overall rating (10% of the overall rating for K-8 alternative schools) and are not available for FY 2015 or FY 2016
- Improvement scores for alternative schools will not be available with AzMERIT and make up 25% of high school overall rating



Option 2

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.

Considerations:

- Implications of having a gap in academic performance dashboards
- FY 2015 data could be used for impact analysis to inform Board decision-making
- The Board will have a better understanding of the new statewide accountability system and how it can be incorporated into the Framework



Recommendation – Option 2

- Implementation
 - Continue to use the most recent available data and apply the revised academic intervention schedule to continue annual monitoring, reviews, renewals, expansion and other charter holder amendment notification requests
 - Allow charter schools to use available AzMERIT data to characterize their academic improvement until the next dashboards are available
 - Conduct focus group meetings with stakeholders to establish new methodology for FY 2016 and beyond
 - Use FY 2015 data to pilot a new methodology for calculating the dashboards
 - Release FY 2016 dashboards in Summer 2016



Proposed Timeline

ASBCS Academic Performance Framework Transition Plan					
School Year	July - August	September	October - January	February - April	May
2015-2016	Revision of the Board's Academic Performance Framework				
			Develop methodology for FY 2016 Academic Performance dashboards	Pilot new dashboards with FY 2015 data	Revise new dashboard criteria as necessary
2016-2017	Implementation of the Board's revised Academic Performance Framework				
	Issue FY 2016 dashboards based on new methodology	Begin annual monitoring for FY 2017 based on FY 2016 dashboards			

