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

Six 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 not able to demonstrate the implementation of comprehensive systems, as defined in the DSP evaluation criteria, and were also not able to demonstrate that their academic performance is improving through the presentation of year-over-year comparative data. These Charter Holders were able to demonstrate the implementation of limited systems, as defined in the DSP evaluation criteria.

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 six 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 at least a limited curriculum system, a limited assessment system, a limited instructional monitoring system, and a limited professional development system, and, if required a limited system for ensuring students in grades 9-12 graduate on time, and a limited system for keeping students motivated and engaged in school. 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 and were unable to demonstrate evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of each of the required comprehensive systems.



Because each Charter Holder has failed to provide evidence of systems in place and failed to provide evidence of a means of demonstrating improved year-over-year comparative data, but has demonstrated implementation of some limited improvement efforts, Board staff is recommending that the Board implement heightened monitoring of these Charter Holders. In alignment with previous Board actions, staff is recommending this heightened monitoring include the submission of a revised PMP and quarterly submission of evidence of implementation of the PMP and data that will be able to demonstrate academic performance measures that align with the Board's measures. If this monitoring demonstrates that the Charter Holder has not enhanced its improvement plan to implement comprehensive systems and/or the Charter Holder's academic performance is not improving, the Charter Holder may be brought before the Board for further consideration.

Entity ID	Charter Name	School Name	School Type (Grades)	2012 Academic Performance	2013 Academic Performance	2014 Academic Performance
4352	Intelli-School, Inc.	Intelli-School - Paradise Valley	Alternative (9-12)	62.5/C-ALT	72.5/D-ALT	52.92/D-ALT
78966	Akimel O'Otham Pee Posh Charter School, Inc.	Akimel O'Otham Pee Posh	Traditional (3-5)	67.5/B	35.94/D	33.12/D
78997	GAR, LLC	Student Choice High School (79022)	Alternative (9-12)	55/D-ALT	73.75/C-ALT	66.25/C-ALT
		Student Choice High School (90737)	Alternative (9-12)	NR/A-ALT	73.75/D-ALT	53.75/D-ALT
		Student Choice High School Tatum Campus	Alternative (9-12)	44.64/C-ALT	72.5/D-ALT	55.36/D-ALT
79947	Arizona Community Development Corporation	La Paloma Academy	Traditional (K-8)	51.88/C	49.38/C	61.88/B
		La Paloma Academy (Lakeside)	Traditional (K-8)	50/C	51.25/C	53.75/C
		La Paloma Academy-South	Traditional (K-8)		44.38/D	39.38/D
85807	StarShine Academy	StarShine Academy	Alternative (K-12)	70/B-ALT	57.29/D-ALT	48.96/D-ALT
90199	Academy Del Sol, Inc.	Academy Del Sol	Traditional (K-8)	NR/B	88.12/A	61.88/C
		Academy Del Sol - Hope	Traditional (K-8)	98.75/B	76.25/D	42.5/D



Board Options

Option 1: The Board may vote to implement heightened monitoring of these Charter Holders. Staff recommends the following language: I move that the board direct staff to implement heightened monitoring of these Charter Holders. Specifically, the Charter Holders identified in this staff report shall 1) submit a revised PMP no later than June 15, 2015, using a template provided by Board staff and 2) submit evidence of the implementation 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 along with data and analysis to demonstrate improvements in academic performance at quarterly intervals (September 15, December 15, March 15, June 15) until the Charter Holder's Academic Dashboards demonstrate improved academic performance or until further consideration of the Charter Holder's academic performance by this Board. If these Charter Holders do not submit acceptable PMPs, do not submit evidence of the implementation of comprehensive systems at the quarterly monitoring, or if the academic performance of the schools operated by these Charter Holders does not improve as reported at quarterly monitoring or through the Academic Dashboard, 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.

