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ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK: ANNOTATED

Core Question: Is the charter school’s education program a success?

Introduction

The Academic Performance Framework is intended to serve as a baseline to institute performance-based accountability for demonstrable pupil outcomes. As a baseline, this Academic Framework is aligned with the state accountability system and the standards for renewal within the recently revised California Education Code (pursuant to Assembly Bill 1505). In this way, the framework is deployed on an annual basis, measuring existing performance against the established renewal standards, thus creating a longitudinal view of calibrated performance-to-standard that ultimately culminates in high-stakes decisions on renewal and term length, or non-renewal. The framework is also based on work by the California Charter Authorizing Professionals (CCAP) and the Tri-State Alliance to Improve District-Led Charter Authorizing, the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA), FCMAT, the Charter Authorizers Regional Support Network (CARSNet), and several examples from California authorizers.

While this framework is aligned directly to the established renewal criteria in law, authorizers may adapt this framework through the inclusion of elements that make sense for their individual schools and, most importantly, the characteristics of the students they serve. A note of caution is warranted given the clarity of renewal standards in the statute: Authorizers are advised to ensure their annual performance-based oversight and the generation of annual reports that include an assessment of academic performance are consistent with renewal standards. The addition of elements or unique weighting of indicators that result in an authorizer reporting a charter school is in “good standing” when the same level of performance by the school places it in the “Low Track” eligibility under the statutory standard for renewal is problematic. Alternatively, an authorizer reporting a charter school’s educational program is not successful when the same level of performance by the school places it in the “High Track” eligibility under the statutory standard for renewal is problematic. Such disagreement between “yard sticks” does the school, public, students, and authorizer a disservice. Expectations conveyed through a framework that are aligned with expectations for renewal, especially if those expectations are external to the authorizer, provide for continuity and a continuum of actions that culminate in responsible, high-stakes decisions. The guidance and framework assume the majority of the data collection and reporting is the responsibility of the authorizer. However, authorizers may complete this framework or direct charter schools to complete sections of the framework - the responsibility for data collection may be shared between the authorizer and school.

Overview

The Academic Performance Framework is intended to be used annually, along with the frameworks for finance and operations/governance, to provide a measure of how well the charter school is meeting its obligations as outlined in the Four Core Performance Questions. The Annual Report Template is where the detailed academic framework is summarized and reported for multiple years. Therefore, it is the annual report that provides the longitudinal view or the arc of school performance over time, accounting for student growth and narrowing/closing achievement gaps. This framework should also be used to hold honest and supportive conversations with schools about their academic outcomes and inform an authorizer’s differentiated oversight. Indeed, the framework is designed to communicate to the public and the charter school how well the school is doing as it relates to the academic standards for renewal. The authorizer should be careful to share the information accurately and objectively to avoid or minimize any misunderstanding by the school and within the community.

Annotated Framework Structure

The framework is structured to gauge the academic performance of the charter school through outcomes. It is organized around indicators, measures, metrics, targets, and ratings. As mentioned previously, this framework is guided by the Four Core Performance Questions and aligned to the renewal criteria established in law and, as such, includes three sections or groups that include indicators and measures, along with examples. [[1]](#footnote-1)

* Group A: Standards and criteria described in EC 47605 and indicators and measures from the California Dashboard.
  + Applicable to all schools with Dashboard profiles
* Group B: Indicators and measures that the authorizer and school consider to be alternative, robust, measures of achievement/growth and postsecondary success. Ideally, these indicators and measures are included in the petition or MOU and will meet the “second look” and verified data[[2]](#footnote-2) provisions as outlined in Education Code Section 47607.2(a)(3)(B) and 47607.2(c).
  + Pursuant to state law, the second look provision is mandatory for schools in the Low Track and optional for schools in Middle Track. Group B is applicable to all schools, even if not required by law, and especially useful for small n-size and DASS schools.
* Group C: Mission-specific goals and Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS)[[3]](#footnote-3) Schools.
  + Group C goals are voluntary, applicable to all schools, and provide a nuanced view of performance on indicators of importance to the school and/or authorizer. They are mutually agreed upon by the school and authorizer.
* Performance Summary: The final section of the framework provides resources and an example for an authorizer to summarize the detailed performance of a charter school.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Definition | Example |
| Indicator | Categories of academic performance | *Student achievement* |
| Measure | General means to evaluate an aspect of an indicator | *Proficiency on state assessments* |
| Metrics | Method of quantifying a measure | *Percentage of students at proficiency or above on state assessment* |
| Targets | Thresholds that signify success in meeting the standard of performance for a specific measure | *75 percent of students at or above proficiency* |
| Rating | Assignment of a school’s performance into a category, based on how the school performs against a target | *If school meets target, then meets standard* |

DASS or Schools with Small Student Populations

There are numerous instances where a school’s mission and population served (e.g., DASS) or small student group sizes (i.e., n-size for subpopulation) will influence the type of measures or availability of measures the authorizer will see through the official Dashboard. A few important points related to DASS and schools with small n-sizes[[4]](#footnote-4):

* The intent of this framework is to align annual performance oversight with the renewal standards (i.e., tiers) in state law. Top, middle, and bottom tiers do not apply to DASS charter schools.
* Group A: An authorizer should report all performance for a DASS or small n-size school wherever it is reported through the Dashboard.
* Group B: An authorizer with a small n-size school or a DASS school should work closely with the school to determine alternative, robust, measures of achievement/growth and postsecondary success. Authorizers with schools not meeting n-size requirements for public reporting of subgroup performance through the Dashboard may use Group B measures to highlight subgroup performance while adhering to pupil privacy protections.
* Group C: Authorizers are required to consider DASS school performance on alternative metrics applicable to the population served. Authorizers are encouraged to only place those measures not meeting the criteria for inclusion in Group B in Group C. See notes and resources specific to DASS schools in Group C.

Group A: State Dashboard

This group of performance measures includes three indicators to evaluate the schools’ academic performance for one year.

1. Academic Performance

This indicator measures the performance of the school in the areas of English language arts, mathematics, college/career, and English learner progress.

Measure 1a: Differentiated Assistance

Description: Differentiated assistance is the second tier of assistance that one or more agencies is required by statute to provide to local educational agencies or schools that meet certain eligibility criteria. The third tier is intensive intervention, which is generally required based on persistent performance issues over a specified period of time.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Is the school in differentiated assistance? | Yes | No |

Measure 1b: English Language Arts

Description: According to the California Department of Education (CDE), this measure is based on student performance on either the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment or the California Alternate Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3-8 and grade 11.[[5]](#footnote-5) The metric used is Distance from Standard[[6]](#footnote-6) which measures how far, on average, students are from the lowest possible score to meet the standard.

Data Source: All data are sourced from a school’s and the state’s profile on the caschooldashboard.org, for eligible populations. The table below represents the template for all Academic Performance Indicators. For each measure following English Language Arts, an example will be used rather than repeating the template for each measure.

|  |
| --- |
| **Measure 1x: Insert Measure Here** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Points Below Standard and Rating** *(Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue)* | **Comparison with State Average** (Above, At, Below) |
| All Students |  |  |
| English Learners |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |  |
| Homeless |  |  |
| Foster Youth |  |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |  |
| American Indian |  |  |
| Asian |  |  |
| African American |  |  |
| Filipino |  |  |
| Hispanic |  |  |
| Pacific Islander |  |  |
| Two or More Races |  |  |
| White |  |  |

This framework uses the same color-coding convention used in the California Dashboard where red indicates the lowest performance and blue indicates the highest performance. In order from lowest to highest the colors are red, orange, yellow, green, and blue.

Authorizers are encouraged to visit the California Dashboard website for detailed information on metrics (e.g., points below standard, percent prepared) used to assess performance and improvement of schools. Reminder, if your schools have small n sizes and/or are DASS then you’ll capture available data from the Dashboard and focus on Group B and C indicators to assess the success of the school’s education program.

Example: ACME Charter School

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure 1b: English Language Arts** | | |
| **Group** | **Points Below Standard and Rating** (color) | **Comparison with State Average** (Above, At, Below) |
| All Students | -4.8 | Below (State -2.5) |
| English Learners | N/A |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |
| Homeless |  |
| Foster Youth |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | -12 | Above (State -30.1) |
| American Indian | N/A |  |
| Asian |  |
| African American |  |
| Filipino |  |
| Hispanic | -12.5 | Above (State -26.6) |
| Pacific Islander | N/A |  |
| Two or More Races |  |
| White | -19.1 | Below (State +30.7) |

English Language Arts Comparisons: English learners (Informational)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Current English Learners** | **Reclassified English Learners** | **English Only** |
| 101.1 pts below standard | 15.1 points below standard | 0.5 points below standard |
| Below State (90.6 pts below std) | Below State (4 pts above std) | Below State (9.4 pts above std) |

Measure 1c: Mathematics

Description: According to the California Department of Education (CDE), this measure is based on student performance on either the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment or the California Alternate Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3-8 and grade 11. The metric used is Distance from Standard which measures how far, on average, students are from the lowest possible score to meet the standard.

Data Source: All data are sourced from a school’s and the state’s profile on the caschooldashboard.org

Example: ACME Charter School

|  |
| --- |
| **Measure 1c: Mathematics** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Points Below Standard and Rating** (color) | **Comparison with State Average** (Above, At, Below) |
| All Students | -96.3 | Below (State -33.5) |
| English Learners | N/A |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |
| Homeless |  |
| Foster Youth |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | -105.2 | Below (State -63.7) |
| American Indian | N/A |  |
| Asian |  |
| African American |  |
| Filipino |  |
| Hispanic | -103.7 | Below (State -62.2) |
| Pacific Islander | N/A |  |
| Two or More Races |  |
| White | -80.3 | Below (State +1.4) |

Measure 1d: English Learner Progress

Description: According to the California Department of Education (CDE), this measure is based on the current English learners making progress toward English language proficiency or maintaining the highest level as measured by the ELPAC.

Data Source: All data are sourced from a school’s and the state’s profile on the caschooldashboard.org

Example: ACME Charter School

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **English Learner Progress** | **Performance Level** | **Comparison with State** |
| 49% making progress | Low | Above (State 48.3%) |

Measure 1e: College/Career (high school only)

Description: According to the California Department of Education (CDE), this measure is reported as the percentage of high school graduates who are placed in the “Prepared” level on the College/Career Indicator. It is based on multiple measures including, but not limited to: CTE Pathway Completion, a-g Completion, Leadership/Military Science, College Credit Courses, AP Exams, and combined four-and five-year graduation rate.

Data Source: All data are sourced from a school’s and the state’s profile on the caschooldashboard.org

Example: ACME Charter School

|  |
| --- |
| **Measure 1e: College/Career** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Percent Prepared** | **Comparison with State Average** (Above, At, Below) |
| All Students | 38.2% | Below (State 44.1%) |
| English Learners | 12.3% | Below (State 16.8%) |
| Students with Disabilities | 2.8% | Below (State 10.8%) |
| Homeless | 18.6% | Below (State 25.9%) |
| Foster Youth | N/A |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 14.6% | Below (State 35.8%) |
| American Indian | N/A |  |
| Asian | N/A |  |
| African American | 13.3% | Below (State 23.7%) |
| Filipino | N/A |  |
| Hispanic | 14.9% | Below (State 36.1) |
| Pacific Islander | N/A |  |
| Two or More Races | 27.9% | Below (State 49.7%) |
| White | 26.7% | Below (State 53.8%) |

1. Academic Engagement

This indicator measures the performance of the school in the areas that reflect the engagement of students and include chronic absenteeism, graduation rate, and access to a broad course of study.

Measure 2a: Chronic Absenteeism

Description: According to the California Department of Education (CDE), this measure reports the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 8 who are absent 10 percent or more of the instructional days they were enrolled.

Data Source: All data are sourced from a school’s specific profile on the caschooldashboard.org, for eligible populations

Example: ACME Charter School

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure 2a: Chronic Absenteeism** | |
| **Group** | **Percent Chronically Absent** |
| All Students | 25.2% |
| English Learners | 42.1% |
| Students with Disabilities | 26.5% |
| Homeless | N/A |
| Foster Youth |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 30.5% |
| American Indian | N/A |
| Asian |
| African American |
| Filipino |
| Hispanic | 29.3% |
| Pacific Islander | N/A |
| Two or More Races |
| White | 15% |

Measure 2b: Graduation Rate

Description: According to the California Department of Education (CDE), this measure reports the percentage of students completing high school.

Data Source: All data are sourced from a school’s specific profile on the caschooldashboard.org, for eligible populations

Example: ACME Charter School

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure 2b: Graduation Rate** | |
| **Group** | **Percent Graduated** |
| All Students | 76.5% |
| English Learners | 61.4% |
| Students with Disabilities | 63.6% |
| Homeless | 68.6% |
| Foster Youth | N/A |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 71.3% |
| American Indian | N/A |
| Asian |
| African American | 73.3% |
| Filipino | N/A |
| Hispanic | 71.8% |
| Pacific Islander | N/A |
| Two or More Races | 79% |
| White | 90.9% |

1. Conditions and Climate

This indicator measures the performance of the school in the areas that are related to the attitudes, behaviors, and performance of students.

Measure 3a: Suspension Rates

Description: According to the California Department of Education (CDE), this measure reports the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 8 who have been suspended at least once in a given school year.

Data Source: All data are sourced from a school’s specific profile on the caschooldashboard.org, for eligible populations.

Example: ACME Charter School

| Measure 3a: Suspension Rates | |
| --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Percent Suspended** |
| All Students | 0% |
| English Learners | 0.3% |
| Students with Disabilities | 0% |
| Homeless | 0.9% |
| Foster Youth | N/A |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 0.1% |
| American Indian | N/A |
| Asian | 0% |
| African American | 0% |
| Filipino | 0% |
| Hispanic | 0.1% |
| Pacific Islander | N/A |
| Two or More Races | 0% |
| White | 0% |

Additional Dashboard Measures

There is a series of additional measures related to academics reported for schools on the Dashboard that are not included in the Academic Framework. These measures assess aspects of the academic program that support student achievement but do not measure student achievement directly. Below is a list of those measures, by indicator, and where each appears within this toolkit.

Indicator: Academic Performance

* Measure: Implementation of Academic Standards
  + Location: Operational Framework

Indicator: Academic Engagement

* Measure: Access to Broad Course of Study
  + Location: Operational Framework

Indicator: Conditions and Climate

* Measure: Teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilitates
  + Location: Operational Framework
* Measure: Parent and Family Engagement
  + Location: Operational Framework, additional indicator or within LCAP
* Measure: Local Climate Survey
  + Location: Operational Framework, LCAP

Group B: Beyond the Dashboard

The group of performance measures included here allow the charter school and the authorizer to mutually establish and measure school performance on robust alternative data that would not otherwise be available to the authorizer via the Dashboard’s state and local indicators. They complement the dashboard measures, providing a more holistic assessment of student performance through the inclusion of academic growth indicators. The indicators below are provided as they appear in state law.

1. Academic Growth

This indicator measures the performance of the school in achieving measurable increases in student achievement.

Measure 4a: Increases in Student Achievement

Description: Education Code Section 47607.2(b)(3)(A) defines measurable increases in student achievement as at least one year’s progress for each year in school. While the law does not specify the types of assessments that are required to be used to measure growth, authorizers striving for alignment between their annual performance monitoring and the standards of renewal must ensure that the assessments used to measure academic growth meet the state verified data standard[[7]](#footnote-7) (Educ. C. section 47607.2(c)). Authorizers are strongly encouraged to work with their schools to meet this standard using the list established by the State Board of Education.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Data Source: Provided by the school, verified and reported by authorizer

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Does the school meet the verified data standard?[[9]](#footnote-9) | Yes | No |

Example: ACME Charter School

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Does the school meet the verified data standard? | Yes | No |

The school is using NWEA MAP.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall, the charter school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, defined by at least one year’s progress for each year in school.[[10]](#footnote-10) | Yes | Emerging | No |

Insert table with evidence to support determinations above

Example: ACME Charter School

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall, the charter school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, defined by at least one year’s progress for each year in school[[11]](#footnote-11). | Yes | Emerging | No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Measure : Student Progress/Growth | |
| Grade 4-6  Continuously Enrolled Students | Conditional Growth Index  0 = Average Progress  -X = Worse than average  +X = Better than average |
| All Students | Average 0.45  Range (-0.70, 1.66) |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Average 0.05  Range (-1.01, 1.10) |
| Hispanic | Average 0.36  Range (-0.96, 1.67) |
| White | Average 0.33  Range (-0.99, 1.05) |

1. Postsecondary Outcomes

This indicator measures performance of the school in achieving strong postsecondary outcomes as defined in law.

Measure 5a: Postsecondary Success

Description: Education Code Section 47607.2(b)(3)(B) defines strong postsecondary success as college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.

Data Source: Provided by the school, verified and reported by authorizer

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall, the charter school has achieved strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers. | Yes | Emerging | No |

Insert table with evidence to support determinations above

Example ACME Charter School

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall, the charter school has achieved strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers. | Yes | Emerging | No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure: CTE Completers and placement into fields post K-12** | |
| **Group** | **Percent of CTE Completers Placed within 2 Years** |
| All Students | 89.9% |
| English Learners | 86% |
| Students with Disabilities | 65% |
| Homeless | 95% |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 71.3% |
| African American | 93.3% |
| Hispanic | 71.8% |
| Two or More Races | 79% |
| White | 90.9% |

Group C: Mission-Specific Goals (Optional); DASS

The final group of performance measures included here allows the charter school to report on specific indicators that are of material[[12]](#footnote-12) importance to their school’s mission and by extension the community the school serves. In other words, if the five indicators and various measures within the Academic Performance Framework do not uniquely capture the academic performance of the school in relation to its mission, then Group C is where the school and authorizer may mutually agree on specific indicators to include. Consistent with Group B, the indicators in Group C should be reflected in the most recent petition or MOU governing the school. Finally, Group C will aggregate to the annual report; however, these measures do not factor into the prescriptive renewal criteria established in law.

1. Mission Specific Goals (Non-DASS)

This indicator measures the performance of the school in achieving specific goals that relate to the school’s mission.

Measure 6a: Mission Specific Goals

Description: Provide a description of the mission-specific goals and the measures used to assess them.

Data Source: Provided by the school

Note: There are many resources available to authorizers and schools to aid in the design of mission specific goals. See resources linked below the following note for DASS goals.

1. Mission Specific Goals (DASS)

This indicator measures the performance of DASS schools in achieving specific goals (those deemed to be “alternative metrics”) that relate to the school’s mission and population served.

Measure 7a: Alternative Metrics

Description: A DASS school’s alternative metrics are established through mutual agreement between the authorizer and charter school during the school’s initial operation. DASS schools should have multiple alternative metrics to offer a fulsome view of the school’s performance in improving outcomes for the population they serve.

Data Source: Subject to the metric, verified by authorizer

Note: There are many resources available to authorizers and schools to aid in the design of goals for use with DASS schools.

* Through a U.S. Department of Education Dissemination Grant, the National Charter School Institute developed the A-Game: Advancing Great Authorizing and Modeling Excellence to support charter school authorizers measure the quality and effectiveness of alternative education campuses.
  + <https://nationalcharterschools.org/a-game-grant/>
* The State University of New York (SUNY) Active Ingredients project seeks to provide authorizers with meaningful way to integrate “co-academic” measures in accountability systems especially for schools serving vulnerable populations.
  + <https://www.newyorkcharters.org/active-ingredients/>
* The National Association of Charter School Authorizers has a host of resources and examples for authorizers working with schools to design goals. Most of the resources are available on their AuthoRISE platform.
  + <https://qualitycharters.sabacloud.com/Saba/Web_spf/NA7P1PRD091/app/dashboard>
* The California Charter School Association published a brief on alternative accountability that provides tools to emphasize individual student growth.
  + https://calcharters.app.box.com/s/j133fxso0gpgk98s8swd7z8qgtvs6kb9

Academic Performance Summary

The final section of the Academic Performance Template provides an authorizer with the steps and resources needed to summarize the academic performance of a school. The first step is to review Group A by applying the renewal standards in law to assess the annual performance of the charter school as measured within this framework. Performing this simulation will allow the authorizer to answer the question as to whether the charter school is on track to meeting the academic renewal standards in law. The second step is to review Group B indicators for clear and convincing evidence of student progress. The third step is to review the Group C indicators to assess how well the school is making progress on mutually agreed upon goals. Finally, this information is aggregated and summarized in the Annual Report. The Annual Report includes a section for the authorizer to convey this information across multiple years (at least 2 years) while also attending to the fiscal health and the effectiveness of the operations and governance of the school.

Overview of the Performance Summary Process

Diagram

Description automatically generated

Academic Review

Criteria to Determine Renewal Track[[13]](#footnote-13)

1. Based on the colors received for all the state indicators on the California School Dashboard (Dashboard).
   1. All students/All state indicators: Any school that receives a green or blue on all their state indicators in the two most recent consecutive years for schoolwide (i.e., all students group).
      1. High Track
   2. All students/All state indicators: Any school that receives a red or orange on all their state indicators in the two most recent consecutive years for schoolwide (i.e., all students group).
      1. Low Track

Schools that do not meet the first criteria are subject to Criteria #2. Please note that unlike Criteria #1 above, this review is restricted to academic indicators (ELA, Math, CCI, and ELPI) and performance determinations under Criteria #2 are based on overall status of the school and student groups, and how they compare with statewide averages for the two previous Dashboard years.

1. Academic indicators/Achievement gap: Any school that meets the following:
   * All students group: School must be the same status or better than the statewide average for each academic indicator (i.e., ELA, Math, CCI, ELPI).
   * Subgroups: A majority of underperforming subgroups have a higher status than the statewide average status for that subgroup.
     + Underperforming subgroup – Those subgroups at the state level that perform below the statewide average.
     + Per the California Department of Education “For the July 2020 charter school performance file, these student groups were: White, Asian, Filipino, and Two or More Races. (Note: The ELPI does not have student groups; however, the school must have a higher status than that of the statewide average.)”
     + If yes to both all student and subgroup metric, then school is High Track. If no, continue to steps below.
   * All students group: School must be the same status or below than the statewide average for each academic indicator (i.e., ELA, Math, CCI, ELPI).
   * Subgroups: A majority of underperforming subgroups have a lower status than the statewide average status for that subgroup.
     + If yes to both all student and subgroup metric, then school is Low Track.

Schools that do not qualify for High or Low track are placed in the Middle Track.

Application of Group B Indicators

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| High Track | Informative purposes only |
| Middle Track | Second look provision is allowable if school performance on the Dashboard state and local indicators does not demonstrate clear case for renewal.  Group B indicators provide opportunity for clear and convincing evidence of measurable increases or strong postsecondary outcomes. |
| Low Track | Second look provision is required to assess whether the school presents clear and convincing evidence of measurable increases or strong postsecondary outcomes. |

Example: Group A Review ACME Charter School

Please note that this example is not a formal review for purposes of renewal, rather it is a review to assess the trajectory of performance toward a standard of renewal. For example, only one year of data is used in this example rather than the required two consecutive years for renewal purposes.

Review the color for all student group performance across the Dashboard

For this year, the Math and ELA All Student group performance is orange and yellow. According to the criteria for renewal tracks, if the school maintains this level of performance at the time of renewal then it would qualify for the Middle Track.



The authorizer may extend their review to include other Dashboard metrics in Group A to identify areas of strength and more defined areas in need of improvement.

Example: Group B Review

ACME Charter School met the verified data requirement by using an assessment identified by the California Department of Education and using that assessment as intended. They chose a measure of growth (NWEA MAP Conditional Growth Index) which is a metric that shows how student growth compares to the growth of other students nationwide. Importantly, CGI allows for growth comparisons to be made between students performing at different points on the achievement distribution.

The results provide clear and convincing evidence that continuously enrolled students in grades 4-6 at ACME Charter School are increasing their achievement (growth) at a rate that is better than average when compared to the national group.





Example: Group C Review

This section of the review may include a very few if any indicators or a robust set of indicators for school that qualify for DASS. In any event, this section would proceed as Group A and B above with the authorizer drawing a conclusion based on the evidence within the Group C area of the framework.

Resources to learn more about renewal standards

* California Charter Authorizing Professionals
  + Several renewal resources and presentations may be located through the CCAP Resource Library.
    - https://calauthorizers.org/resource-library/
  + California Department of Education
  + Legislation Impacting Charters - <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/ab1505.asp#perform> This webpage is a portal to numerous resources of interest to charter schools and authorizers, including the following:
  + A data file that contains charter school performance levels (i.e., High, Middle, Low) for over 1,130 schools.
  + <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/documents/ab1505results2020.xlsx>
  + Determining Charter School Performance Category Flyer that provides an overview of the criteria and descriptions to qualify schools for performance levels.
    - https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/documents/determinecharterperf.pdf

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK: TEMPLATE

Core Question: Is the charter school’s education program a success?

Group A: State Dashboard

1. Academic Performance

Measure 1a: Differentiated Assistance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Is the school in differentiated assistance? | Yes | No |

Measure 1b: English Language Arts

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Measure 1b: English Language Arts | | |
| **Group** | **Points Below Standard and Rating** *(Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue)* | **Comparison with State Average** (Above, At, Below) |
| All Students |  |  |
| English Learners |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |  |
| Homeless |  |  |
| Foster Youth |  |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |  |
| American Indian |  |  |
| Asian |  |  |
| African American |  |  |
| Filipino |  |  |
| Hispanic |  |  |
| Pacific Islander |  |  |
| Two or More Races |  |  |
| White |  |  |

English Language Arts Comparisons: English learners (Informational)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Current English Learners** | **Reclassified English Learners** | **English Only** |
| *School performance ->* |  |  |
| *Relative to state ->* |  |  |

Measure 1c: Mathematics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure 1c: Mathematics** | | |
| **Group** | **Points Below Standard and Rating** *(Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue)* | **Comparison with State Average** (Above, At, Below) |
| All Students |  |  |
| English Learners |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |  |
| Homeless |  |  |
| Foster Youth |  |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |  |
| American Indian |  |  |
| Asian |  |  |
| African American |  |  |
| Filipino |  |  |
| Hispanic |  |  |
| Pacific Islander |  |  |
| Two or More Races |  |  |
| White |  |  |

Measure 1d: English Learner Progress

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **English Learner Progress** | **Performance Level** | **Comparison with State Average** |
|  |  |  |

Measure 1e: College/Career (high school only)

| **Measure 1e: College/Career** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Points Below Standard and Rating** *(Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue)* | **Comparison with State Average** (Above, At, Below) |
| All Students |  |  |
| English Learners |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |  |
| Homeless |  |  |
| Foster Youth |  |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |  |
| American Indian |  |  |
| Asian |  |  |
| African American |  |  |
| Filipino |  |  |
| Hispanic |  |  |
| Pacific Islander |  |  |
| Two or More Races |  |  |
| White |  |  |

1. Academic Engagement

Measure 2a: Chronic Absenteeism

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure 2a: Chronic Absenteeism** | |
| **Group** | **Points Below Standard and Rating** *(Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue)* |
| All Students |  |
| English Learners |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |
| Homeless |  |
| Foster Youth |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |
| American Indian |  |
| Asian |  |
| African American |  |
| Filipino |  |
| Hispanic |  |
| Pacific Islander |  |
| Two or More Races |  |
| White |  |

Measure 2b: Graduation Rate

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure 2b: Graduation Rate** | |
| **Group** | **Points Below Standard and Rating**  *(Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue)* |
| All Students |  |
| English Learners |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |
| Homeless |  |
| Foster Youth |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |
| American Indian |  |
| Asian |  |
| African American |  |
| Filipino |  |
| Hispanic |  |
| Pacific Islander |  |
| Two or More Races |  |
| White |  |

1. Conditions and Climate

Measure 3a: Suspension Rates

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure 3a: Suspension Rates** | |
| **Group** | **Points Below Standard and Rating**  *(Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue)* |
| All Students |  |
| English Learners |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |
| Homeless |  |
| Foster Youth |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |
| American Indian |  |
| Asian |  |
| African American |  |
| Filipino |  |
| Hispanic |  |
| Pacific Islander |  |
| Two or More Races |  |
| White |  |

Group B: Beyond the Dashboard

1. Academic Growth

Measure 4a: Increases in Student Achievement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Does the school meet the verified data standard? | Yes | No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure 4a: Increases in Student Achievement** | |
| Group | Achieved at least one year’s progress? |
| All Students |  |
| English Learners |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |
| Homeless |  |
| Foster Youth |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |
| American Indian |  |
| Asian |  |
| African American |  |
| Filipino |  |
| Hispanic |  |
| Pacific Islander |  |
| Two or More Races |  |
| White |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall, the charter school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, defined by at least one year’s progress for each year in school. | Yes | Emerging | No |

1. Postsecondary Outcomes

Measure 5a: Postsecondary Success (college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to peers)

| **Measure 5a: Postsecondary Success (college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to peers)** | |
| --- | --- |
| Group | Rating *(Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue)* |
| All Students |  |
| English Learners |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |
| Homeless |  |
| Foster Youth |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |
| American Indian |  |
| Asian |  |
| African American |  |
| Filipino |  |
| Hispanic |  |
| Pacific Islander |  |
| Two or More Races |  |
| White |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall, the charter school has achieved strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers. | Yes | Emerging | No |

Group C: Mission-Specific Goals (Optional); DASS

1. Mission Specific Goals (Non-DASS)

Measure 6a: Mission Specific Goals

| **Measure 6a: Mission Specific Goals** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Rating** *(Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue)* |
| All Students |  |
| English Learners |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |
| Homeless |  |
| Foster Youth |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |
| American Indian |  |
| Asian |  |
| African American |  |
| Filipino |  |
| Hispanic |  |
| Pacific Islander |  |
| Two or More Races |  |
| White |  |

1. Goals (DASS)

Measure 7a: Alternative Metrics

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure 7a: Alternative Metrics** | |
| **Group** | **Rating** *(Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue)* |
| All Students |  |
| English Learners |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |
| Homeless |  |
| Foster Youth |  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged |  |
| American Indian |  |
| Asian |  |
| African American |  |
| Filipino |  |
| Hispanic |  |
| Pacific Islander |  |
| Two or More Races |  |
| White |  |

1. These toolkits are intended as a resource for authorizers. Authorizers should consult legal counsel before finalizing their templates and guidance. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. By January 1, 2021, the state board shall establish criteria to define verified data and identify an approved list of valid and reliable assessments that shall be used for this purpose. https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/ab1505.asp#verifdata [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. DASS is the state accountability system for alternative schools and alternative schools of choice and includes modified methods of measurement for accountability indicators, when appropriate.  [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Authorizers should be cautious when using measures based on small n-sizes due to concerns over validity. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/> and https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/index.asp [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/acadindcal.asp [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Data from nationally recognized, valid, peer-reviewed, and reliable sources that are externally produced, including measures of postsecondary outcomes. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. By January 1, 2021 the State Board of Education shall establish criteria to define “verified data” and identify an approved list of valid and reliable assessments. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/ab1505.asp#verifdata [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The best resource to determine “one year’s progress” will be published by the provider of the assessment instrument. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Something is material if it is relevant and significant to the outcome. In the context of this Toolkit, the authorizer should consider whether the information would be relevant and significant to decisions about whether to renew, non-renew, or revoke a charter [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/documents/determinecharterperf.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-13)