
AGENDA ITEM: Academic Performance Reviews – DSPs Demonstrating Comprehensive Systems**Issue**

Seven Charter Holders who had been assigned DSPs because they 1) failed to meet the Board's academic performance expectations, and 2) operate one or more schools that had earned a letter grade of D were able to demonstrate the implementation of comprehensive systems, as defined in the DSP evaluation criteria, but were unable to demonstrate that their academic performance is improving through the presentation of year-over-year comparative data.

Background

A.R.S. § 15-183.R requires the Board to ground its action in evidence of the charter holder's performance in accordance with the performance framework, which includes the academic performance expectations of the charter school and the measurement of sufficient progress toward the academic performance expectations. The Board's Academic Performance Framework and Guidance document includes an Academic Intervention Schedule that requires the submission of a Performance Management Plan (PMP) or Demonstration of Sufficient Progress (DSP) when the charter holder fails to meet the Board's academic expectations. Charter Holders, that had previously submitted a PMP, operating one or more schools that failed to meet the Board's academic performance expectations and that had earned a letter grade of D were required to submit a DSP due on January 7, 2015. Charter Holders assigned DSPs in this group were identified as having earned a letter grade that the Board has identified as Falls Far Below.

A DSP is used by the Board to determine whether a charter holder that fails to meet the Board's academic expectations has demonstrated sufficient progress toward the academic performance expectations. The evaluation criteria for a DSP are provided in the Board's Academic Performance Framework and Guidance document (Appendix E). A.R.S. § 15-183.I.3 states, in part, that the Board may revoke a charter at any time if the charter school fails to meet or make sufficient progress toward the academic performance expectations set forth in the performance framework.

The seven Charter Holders listed in the table below were required to submit a DSP due on January 7, 2015. Through their DSP Report submission and site visits completed by Board staff, each Charter Holder was able to demonstrate evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a comprehensive curriculum system, a comprehensive assessment system, a comprehensive instructional monitoring system, and a comprehensive professional development system, and, if required a system for ensuring students in grades 9-12 graduate on time, and a system for keeping students motivated and engaged in school. However, each failed to demonstrate sufficient progress toward the Board's academic performance expectations. Specifically, these Charter Holders were unable to provide data to demonstrate their academic performance is improving.

Because each Charter Holder has provided evidence of systems in place and a means of demonstrating improved year-over-year comparative data, Board staff is recommending that the Board allow these operators additional time to demonstrate the effectiveness of the comprehensive improvement plans described above and continue to monitor them through the Academic Intervention Schedule.



Entity ID	Charter Name	School Name	School Type (Grades)	2012 Academic Performance	2013 Academic Performance	2014 Academic Performance
6446	Edkey, Inc. dba Sequoia Charter School	Sequoia Charter Elementary School	Traditional (K-6)	51.88/C	64.38/B	43.12/D
		Sequoia Secondary School	Traditional (7-12)	54.69/C	40/D	45.62/C
79876	Kaizen Education Foundation dba Summit High School	Summit High School	Alternative (9-12)	58.75/C-ALT	48.96/D-ALT	46.67/D-ALT
81001	Pinnacle Education - Tempe, Inc.	Pinnacle High School-Tempe	Alternative (9-12)	47.5/C-ALT	48.75/D-ALT	33.75/D-ALT
		Pinnacle Online High School	Alternative (8-12)	70.63/C-ALT	67.31/NR	54.61/NR
81011	Pinnacle Education - Casa Grande, Inc.	Pinnacle High School-Casa Grande	Alternative (9-12)	58.75/C-ALT	57.5/D-ALT	56.25/D-ALT
81050	Edkey, Inc. dba Sequoia School for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing	Sequoia School for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing	Traditional (K-12)	35.66/D	31.99/D	31.99/D
90034	Imagine Prep Coolidge, Inc.	Imagine Prep Coolidge	Traditional (6-12)	50/C	41.91/D	43.38/D
4320	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Community Schools	Salt River High School	Traditional (7-12)	37.5/D	41.56/D	41.88/D
		Salt River Accelerated Learning Academy	Alternative (9-12)	46.43/NR	46.05/NR	46.05/NR



Board Options

Option 1: The Board may vote to continue monitoring these Charter Holders through the Academic Intervention Schedule as set out in the Academic Performance Framework and Guidance document. Staff recommends the following language: I move that the board direct staff to continue monitoring these Charter Holders through the Academic Intervention Schedule as set out in the Academic Performance Framework and Guidance document. If the academic performance of the schools operated by these Charter Holders, as reported on the Academic Dashboard, does not improve through the continued implementation of the improvement plans identified in the these FY2015 DSP evaluations, the Board will again review the performance of these Charter Holders and may impose disciplinary action at that time.

Option 2: The Board may vote to bring one or more of these Charter Holders for individual consideration of non-compliance at the next scheduled Board meeting. The following language is provided for your consideration: A.R.S. § 15-183.I.3 states, in part, that the Board may revoke a charter at any time if the charter school fails to meet or make sufficient progress toward the academic performance expectations set forth in the performance framework. Because these Charter Holders [*or specify particular charter holders*] have failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward the academic performance expectations set forth in the performance framework [*if specifying particular charter holders, identify circumstances that distinguish them*], I move that the board direct staff to prepare individual staff reports for each of these Charter Holders [*or specify particular charter holders*] and add them to the May Board agenda for individual consideration of non-compliance.

