

# CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS)

Kristen Stolpa, School Performance Director



## The Annual Performance Report

The annual performance report will summarize the school's cumulative performance data and compliance information from the Performance Frameworks, as collected by the Institute since the inception of the school's charter. These quantitative and qualitative analyses will provide guidance and direction for the school throughout its life span.

CSI Performance Frameworks 2012-2013	
Quality Indicator: Academic Performance	
1. Academic Achievement	
2. Academic Growth	
3. Growth Gaps	
4. Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (PSWR) – For High Schools Only	
5. Mission-Specific Measures	
Quality Indicator: Financial Performance	
1. Near Term Measures	
2. Sustainability Measures	
Quality Indicator: Organizational Performance	
1. Students and the Education Program	
2. Governance and Financial Management	
3. Health, Safety, And The School Environment	
4. Additional Obligations	

As evaluation ratings and tools may often be criticized for sterility and reductionism, it is the goal of the Institute to utilize the APR as a means for providing schools with in-depth explanation and analysis surrounding performance. For example, statistical analyses are conducted on multiple years of assessment data, as well as interim data (if possible, linking the two through alignment studies). This helps schools identify truly significant trends, as opposed to those that may be the result of sample size, mediating/moderating variables, or those that have a small effect size. For schools with limited resources, this helps prioritize the allocation of attention and resources throughout their improvement planning process.

## CARS NEXT STEPS...

- One** Assemble comparison data
- Two** Dashboard Trial Run
- Three** Work with external experts on weighting & measures
- Four** Development of mission-specific measures with schools

## The Performance Frameworks

The CSI Performance Frameworks have been developed in the areas of Academics, Finance and Organization. They span all primary areas of performance and compliance, detailing the measures and metrics by which CSI holds schools accountable. These documents should serve as a guide to schools.

It is the intention of the Institute to build upon the evaluation lens utilized by the State to include measures that may provide a more detailed and comprehensive summary of charter school performance. The distinguishing features between the CDE School Performance Framework report and the CSI Academic framework is the incorporation of trend and comparison data.

**Achievement**

- %Students Proficient/Advanced

**Achievement**

- %Students Proficient/Advanced
- Proficiency over Time
- Proficiency against Geographic District
- Proficiency against Similar Schools Statewide

**Growth**

- Median Growth Percentile

**Growth**

- Median Growth Percentile
- %Making Adequate Growth over Time
- Growth against Geographic District
- Growth against Similar Schools Statewide

**Growth Gaps**

- Median Growth Percentile

**Growth Gaps**

- Median Growth Percentile
- Proficiency against the State Average

**PSWR**

- Graduation Rate
- Dropout Rate
- Colorado ACT

**PSWR**

- Graduation Rate
- Dropout Rate
- Colorado ACT
- Remediation Rate

It is important to the Institute to ask how a school is performing over time, as well as whether the school is better serving the needs of students than area schools. It is also valuable to include measures outside of the academic realm that are strong predictors of charter viability, such as financial health and organizational sustainability.

These additional measures are coupled with the application of sensitive weighting so that the overall rating reflects the variation of importance these measures have upon high stakes decision-making around charter renewal or development, as well as to ensure preservation of alignment with the State.

## The Performance Calculator

This calculator is aligned to the Colorado system of accreditation, sharing the state assessment cut points, as well as the output of a rating along the same 4-tier performance continuum. The Performance Calculator also provides recommended achievement and growth targets for schools utilizing their historical performance on the state assessment to project realistic and rigorous objectives. In the future, the tool will allow for the incorporation of interim assessment results or primary grade data from measures that share a strong predictive validity with the CSAP/TCAP (such as NWEA), as well as mission-specific measures that evaluate school attainment along measures that may be used to determine the success of unique programming features at each school.

The target methodology incorporates historical trends in order to determine aggressive and realistic targets, rather than arbitrary selection: 2012: growth over time + ½σ; 2013: growth over time + σ. To combat negative trends or stagnation, more aggressive targets can be implemented.

Academic Achievement: Middle School										Points						
Measure-CSAP	2008	2009	2010	2011	Your status score	Your status points	Your trend score	Your trend points	Your geographic comparison score	Your geographic comparison points	Your statewide comparison score	Your statewide comparison points	Eligible Points	Earned Points	Weight With Indicator	Points
CSAP Reading	414	37.8	49.3	60.5	1	17.7	3						12	6	40	20.0
CSAP Writing	313	36.7	45.0	58.3	2	20.6	3						12	6	3	20.0
CSAP Math	265	35.3	42.2	53.8	2	18.5	3						12	6	3	20.0
CSAP Science				27.7	1								9	9	30	30.0
District Reading				47.0					13.5	3			9	9	30	30.0
District Writing				36.6					22.7	3			9	9	3	30.0
District Math				39.3					14.5	3			9	9	3	30.0
District Science				24.7					3.0	2			9	9	2	30.0
Statewide Comparison Reading				55.0					5.5	2			12	11	20	18.3
Statewide Comparison Writing				52.6					5.7	2			12	11	2	18.3
Statewide Comparison Math				54.0					-0.2	0			12	4	10	3.3
Statewide Comparison Science				23.2					-1.5	0			12	4	10	3.3
													<b>45</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>71.7</b>

In this example, state assessment metrics are used to evaluate the various measures that comprise the achievement indicator, including status, change over time, and comparison calculations.

Although the methodology underneath some of the scores is complex, the calculator itself is simple to use. The tool is not intended for the sole use of Institute staff. Rather, it could be as far reaching as the individual classroom. CSI and school staff will need only to enter their historical figures, and the calculator will produce a performance rating, as well as recommended future targets.

The total number of framework points earned will be divided by the number of eligible points.

In alignment with the state accreditation cut points, the calculator will forecast a school's rating, and ultimately, their plan type.

## Annual Accreditation: The Dashboard

The Dashboard serves as a way for the Institute to integrate selected information from the Performance Frameworks into a unified display. It aims to serve as a snapshot of overall school performance from year-to-year. This single rating will be based upon the output from the Performance Calculator, which utilizes all measures and metrics contained in the Academic Performance Framework and is aligned with the CDE SPF calculations where possible.



However, in some circumstances, this Academic rating may be modified by information or outcomes collected via the Financial and/or Organizational Performance Frameworks, as set forth in the CSI Accreditation Policy. As reflected in the Dashboard, if a school receives a "Does Not Meet" rating on items 1D or 1E of the Financial Performance Framework OR if a school is placed into Level 2 on the CSI Ladder of Compliance and has not made reasonable efforts to rectify the concerns, staff may recommend to the CSI Board that the school's Accreditation rating be lowered to Priority Improvement.

In all cases, the ratings presented on the CSI Dashboard are proposed ratings and are always subject to final approval by the CSI Board. Further, staff will implement appeal procedures, similar to those in place with CDE, for schools wishing to contest any proposed rating.