



THE NEW WORLD OF ESSA

Maintaining Charter Accountability During a Transition in State Accountability Systems

NACSA CONFERENCE WORKBOOK

2016

Policy Boot Camp: Notes

What do I want to know more about? What new change could impact (or support) my authorizing work?

Timeline

What deadline is my state aiming for? March or July 2017?

Assessments and Accountability

ESSA Statute: 1111(c)(5) Accountability for charter schools.- The accountability provisions under this Act shall be overseen for charter schools in accordance with State charter school law.

Transparency and Equity

Ideas for new information I may want to use....

Transition and the Charter School Program

Have you asked your state to provide a "crosswalk" to the new state accountability system when it is finalized?

My Involvement and Other Notes

Check out Page 21 of the Transition Guide: How to Get Involved!

Practice: Renewal Scenario

Part A (20 minutes)

Group Activity: Decide on a renewal protocol to use during the 16/17 and 17/18 school years.

1. Determine what (if any) additional information you will collect and consider, or what existing information you will reweight.
2. Determine what (if any) choices the charter schools will have.
3. Make a recommendation for Main Street Charter School and list the factors that contributed to your decision.

NOTES

Part B (25 minutes)

Discussion

1. What from this scenario resonates with your portfolio? What approaches will you consider?
2. How could your tools (like annual reports, or your performance framework) better help you get through this transition?

NOTES

The Scenario

Main Street Charter School opened in August 2012 and must be closed or renewed by June 2017. Elm Park Charter School opened in August 2013 and must be closed or renewed by June 2018.

In addition to the performance reports on the following pages, this is what you know:

- 1) You have only two options: a 5 year renewal or closure.
- 2) Your renewal protocol gives you considerable discretion to make decisions. You must weight academics as the most important factor (>33%) and performance in Years 3 and 4 more than Years 1 and 2.
- 3) Your charter contract allows you to adjust performance metrics and weights of each metric in the event the state makes modifications to the state assessment and/or accountability system. For example, you can substitute different growth data (based on, for example, the NAEP assessment) or you can give one metric more weight if another metric is not available.
- 4) You've been through an assessment transition recently. In 13/14 your state made the switch to the PARCC assessment from the STAR assessment. The state did not calculate growth data for the 13/14 school year but did give schools a proficiency rating. All across the state there was marked drop in proficiency, but generally schools had the same relative distribution—a school that scored within one range under STAR scored in that range under PARCC. When the PARCC transition was announced, you gave schools significant notice that you would use the new PARCC test for their academic metrics immediately. This included schools in the first round of renewals with the new test data. Metrics in all charter contracts would be updated to their new PARCC equivalent.

5) This is what you know from the state

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Your state has suspended the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AYP from the 15/16 school year. AYP was reported as an independent data point and also made up 25% of schoolwide proficiency and growth scores. See <i>parameters below</i> • Teacher evaluations for the 15/16 and 16/17 school year. | <p>Your state has not issued any guidance yet on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AYP: You don't know how the state will "cross walk" the old system to the new system— if they'll do it including AYP or without AYP. • You know that USED suspended HQT requirements in phases in 2016, but do not have guidance from the state as to which teacher quality requirements were in effect to govern the 15/16 school year. | <p>The state has also provided the following notices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report card based on 16/17 data is supposed to be released by December 2017 and will include proficiency data. It will include growth data, but it may be calculated differently. <i>The state is warning that it may be delayed.</i> • The state curriculum standards may change, but schools will probably use PARCC for 16/17 assessments. |
|--|---|---|

6) This is how the following metrics are calculated:

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>State growth scores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25%: percentage of students that met AYP • 37.5%: percentage of students that grew at least one grade-level in reading proficiency • 37.5%: percentage of students that grew at least one grade-level in math proficiency • A score of 70% qualifies as "meets proficiency" | <p>State proficiency scores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25%: percentage of students that met AYP • 37.5%: percentage of students that demonstrate grade-level reading proficiency • 37.5%: percentage of students that demonstrate grade-level math proficiency • A score of 70% qualifies as "meets proficiency" under STAR. A score of 60% qualifies as "meets proficiency" under PARCC. | <p>Your academic performance framework includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20%: schoolwide AYP score • 40%: Growth • 35%: Proficiency • 5%: If have, mission-specific goals. Otherwise +5% to proficiency. • <i>You don't have a strict cut score, but generally, a score of 65% qualifies as "meets academic benchmarks".</i> |
|--|--|--|

| Main Street Charter School | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | Year 1: 12/13 | Year 2:13/14 | Year 3:14/15 | Year 4:15/16 |
| Academic | Meets standards. Proficiency: 65% AYP: 70% Growth: 75% | Proficiency: 50% AYP: 60% Growth: Not provided | Does not meet standards. Proficiency: 60% AYP: 65% Growth: 60% | Proficiency: 62% AYP: Not provided Growth: 65% |
| Notes | STAR Test | PARCC transition year. Only proficiency data available. | PARCC. 75% test participation. | PARCC. 75% test participation. |
| Financial | Meets standards | Does not meet standards | Meets Standards | Meets Standards |
| Notes | | CSP grant ends | | |
| Organizational | Meets standards. | Does not meet standards | Does not meet standards | Unknown |
| Notes | | Didn't meet teacher quality requirements | Didn't meet teacher quality requirements. You put the school on an improvement plan. | Under improvement plan on teacher quality requirements |

School Specific Information

Main Street Charter School is the only Montessori Elementary school. It is located in an affluent area but draws a mix of students from all across the city. It has a very involved parent committee that has dedicated representatives on the governing board.

The school has mediocre academic performance. It is performing below other schools in the neighborhood but is about average for the city as a whole. Only 75% of students took assessments in 14/15 and 15/16, part of the opt-out movement. It ran into a bit of financial trouble when it didn't find replacement funding when its start-up grant ended, and solved the budget problem by shifting resources from payroll. To do this it laid off a handful of its more experienced teachers, which led some other teachers to resign, and it has struggled to recruit quality teachers and stay in compliance with state teacher quality requirements since. This was the subject of its improvement plan in 14/15.

Parent satisfaction with the school is high. When you visit the school some of the classrooms seem disorganized, and teacher morale is a bit mixed, but the students seem happy and engaged.

| Elm Park Charter School | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | Year 1: 13/14 | Year 2:14/15 | Year 3:15/16 | Year 4:16/17 |
| Academic | Does not meet standards. Proficiency: 25% AYP: 50% Growth: Not provided Mission-specific: 100% | Does not meet standards. Proficiency: 35% AYP: 55% Growth: 40% Mission-specific: 100% | Does not meet standards. Proficiency: 40% AYP: Not provided Growth: 35% Mission-specific: 100% | Unknown results. <i>Data delayed until December 2017</i> <i>Anticipated:</i> proficiency data from PARCC, no AYP data, growth (may be different methodology). |
| Notes | Transition year. Only proficiency data available. | PARCC. Put on probation for academics- goal of 10% improvement in each area, each year. | PARCC. Remains on academic probation. | |
| Financial | Does not meet standards | Meets standards | Does not meet standards | Unknown results <i>Anticipated:</i> Will have full financial data. |
| Notes | Cash flow. Did not receive CSP grant. | | Cash flow. Used 15/16 funds for final late 14/15 payroll. | |
| Organizational | Does not meet standards | Meets standards | Does not meet standards | Unknown results <i>Anticipated:</i> May get retroactive information on 15/16 teacher quality standards, likely no 16/17 teacher quality standards |
| Notes | Lax internal conflict of interest controls. Corrective action letter sent. | | No information on teacher quality standards, internal conflicts of interest again | |

School specific information:

Elm Park Charter School is affiliated with a small, regional CMO network. The CMO has a focus on “civic engagement” and includes mission-specific goals concerning student community service in its charter contract. While the other two charter schools in the network perform on par with the neighborhood schools, and above the city average, this campus has struggled to get off the ground. This third campus was opened in a heavily Hispanic neighborhood, whereas the other campuses were in the city suburbs. Academics have been a problem from the start, with the school performing below average for the city and just below the neighborhood schools. Parent survey’s reveal about average satisfaction with the school, ranking “school climate” as high.

The spinoff of the original charter leadership into a separate CMO has been plagued with a series of conflict-of-interest missteps. When you visit the school you observe that the back office looks to be staffed by CMO personnel that rotate through the three campuses. As a result administrative issues take longer than they should to get resolved. You also see that there is little governing board oversight of the CMO executive director. The campus is staffed with young teachers that are very committed to the school’s mission, though some struggle with classroom management.

You placed the school on a probation plan after the Year 2 evaluation because of low academic performance. Year 3 showed some academic progress in growth and proficiency, but not enough to satisfy the probationary terms, and some of the original organizational problems resurfaced.

When you make a renewal decision it is anticipated that you’ll have one year of complete academic data from Year 2, and three years of incomplete academic data from Years 1, 3, and 4.

Let's Talk About It! Communications and Messaging

What are the ESSA messages out there right now?

Non-punitive, accountability “restart” or “pause, local control, others...

PAC-It!

Does your message inspire the action you want (purpose), resonate with your audience, and is conveyed through the right channel?

| MESSAGE | Purpose | Audience | Channel | Partners |
|---------|---|---|--|----------|
| | <i>Make renewal easier, inform schools...</i> | <i>Schools, authorizing board, state...</i> | <i>Public forum, meeting, formal notice...</i> | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

State Huddle

What is one thing I'm going to research about my state and the ESSA transition?

What is a message we could work on together?

What is one activity our State could do that will make this transition easier for us? Who could we contact about that?

Contact information. Who is here and how are we going to stay in touch about ESSA?