

CPF Academic Updates



**Katie
Manthey**

Academic
Accountability
Manager

Overview

As you may know, Georgia is required to comply with federal education requirements as outlined by the U.S. Dept. of Education (USED). This compliance is determined in large part by the state's adherence to an overall "education plan" which is drafted at the state level and submitted to/approved by USED. This plan is commonly referred to as the state's "ESSA Plan" (ESSA = Every Student Succeeds Act).

Georgia's updated ESSA plan was approved by USED last year, and it required some adjustments to state performance targets, state designations and a few College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI) indicators and calculations. The CCRPI adjustments are reflected in the 2018 scores that were released by the Georgia Dept. of Education (GaDOE) in late October 2018.

State charter school leaders should already be fully aware of how the new calculations will impact their schools. This past November the SCSC approved updates to the Comprehensive Performance Framework (CPF) to ensure alignment between the SCSC's accountability measures and those encompassed within the state-approved accountability tool.

Performance Targets (Indicator 1, Measure 1a)

The adoption of Georgia's ESSA plan resulted in changes to how annual school performance targets are calculated and tracked. State performance targets are no longer generated, instead each school will have individual improvement targets calculated as 3% of the gap between a baseline and 100%. The baseline year is 2017 and targets are calculated for all students and all subgroups. This is the Closing the Gaps component of the CCRPI.

- [State Performance Targets](#) (out of date)
- [State Performance Targets calculation](#) (out of date)
- [State Improvement Targets](#) (current)

Performance Targets (Indicator 1, Measure 1a)

Previously: Meets Standard= The school met 100 percent of the State Performance Targets set by the state.

Now: Meets Standard= The school met 100 percent of the Improvement Targets set by the state.

The format of the measure is the same as previously written; the school must meet 100 percent of the targets to receive all available points (2 points). If the school does not meet 100 percent of the targets the school receives zero points on the measure.

State Designations (Indicator 1, Measure 1b)

As part of Georgia's ESSA plan the state updated the determination criteria and naming conventions related to the process for identifying schools that need additional support as part of Georgia's systems of continual improvement. The terms "Focus" and "Priority" will no longer be used.

Schools will be identified by differing criteria and grouped into three categories:

- [Targeted Support and Improvement \(TSI\) Schools](#)- schools that have consistently underperforming subgroups,
- [Comprehensive Support and Improvement \(CSI\) schools](#)- schools that rank in the lowest 5% of schools based on their three-year CCRPI average or have a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of less than or equal to 67%,
- [Turnaround Eligible schools](#)- the lowest 5 percent of schools in the state in accordance with the statewide accountability system.

State Designations (Indicator 1, Measure 1b)

Previously: Does Not Meet Standard= The school was identified as a “Focus” or “Priority” school.

Now: Does Not Meet Standards= the school was identified as a “TSI”, “CSI”, or “Turnaround Eligible” school.

No Change: Meets Standard= The school does not have a designation.

Academic Metrics Within the CPF

Previously (2017 and earlier), schools may satisfy annual academic requirements by:

Outperforming their comparison district(s) in all relevant grade bands on at least one of the following measures:

- **CCRPI Achievement,**
- **CCRPI Progress,**
- **Weighted CCRPI Score (“Single Score”),**
- **Value-Added Impact on Student Achievement**

OR by earning a “**Beating The Odds**” designation from GaDOE

CCRPI: Redesign

both are reported on a 0-100 point scale

Previous Design: 2012-2017

- Achievement (50 points)
 - Content Mastery (20 points)
 - Readiness (15 points)
 - Graduation Rate/Predictor (15 points)
- Progress (40 points)
- Achievement Gap (10 points)
- Challenge Points (up to 10 extra points)
 - ED/EL/SWD Performance
 - Exceeding the Bar

New Design: 2018-

- Content Mastery (30%, 30%, 30%)
- Readiness (20%, 20%, 15%)
- Graduation Rate (NA, NA, 15%)
- Progress (35%, 35%, 30%)
- Closing Gaps (15%, 15%, 10%)

Weights vary by grade band (elementary, middle, high)

Student Achievement (Indicator 2, Measure 1)

Previously: Is the school annually outperforming the district(s) it serves (as measured by grade-band CCRPI achievement scores)?

Now: Is the school annually outperforming the district(s) it serves (as measured by grade-band CCRPI content mastery scores)?

CCRPI Scores

Scores are reported for each component: content mastery, progress, readiness, graduation rate, closing gaps, with summative scores generated at the grade band level (elementary, middle, high) and an overall score weighted based on the enrollment in each grade band (for districts or schools serving more than one grade band).

School Year	System Name	School Name	Grade Cluster	Content Mastery Points	Progress Points	CCRPI Score	Single Score
2018	Commission Charter Schools	Charter School A	E	29.7	37.6	79.4	77.0
2018	Commission Charter Schools	Charter School A	M	29.9	31.3	70.0	77.0
2018	Commission Charter Schools	Charter School A	H	34.0	35.8	79.2	77.0

Amendment 4- Combined Achievement and Growth (Indicator 2, Measure 3)

Previously: Within the First Look metrics, schools could meet standards by outperforming their comparison district(s) in all relevant grade bands on either CCRPI achievement (content mastery) or progress (or a combination).

Now: Schools can meet by outperforming in all relevant grade bands on CCRPI content mastery, progress, OR Grade Band Score(or a combination).

Academic Metrics Within the CPF

Schools may satisfy annual academic requirements by:

Outperforming their comparison district(s) in all relevant grade bands on at least one of the following measures:

- **CCRPI Content Mastery,**
- **CCRPI Progress,**
- **CCRPI Grade Band Score,**
- **CCRPI Single Score (weighted by grade band enrollment),**
- **Value-Added Impact on Student Achievement**

OR by earning a “**Beating The Odds**” designation from GaDOE

Comparison Districts

Starting with 2018 CCRPI scores, the SCSC will use two different calculations to generate comparison scores:

- The first comparison is the same as in previous years, the school's score is compared to score of the district(s) included in its attendance zone. If a school serves one district it is compared to that district's score. If it serves multiple districts it is compared to the simple average of those districts. If the school has a statewide attendance zone, then the school is compared to the state average.
- The second comparison looks at the districts from which the school actually enrolls students. Using the FTE System of Residency report the SCSC weighted district CCRPI scores based on the number of students enrolled from each district. Thus, whether the school's attendance includes one district, multiple districts, or statewide, the school is only being compared to the scores for districts from which it actually enrolls students. Additionally, the score is weighted based on enrollment. For instance, if a school enrolls 80% of its students from District A and 20% from District B, then the comparison score will be comprised of 80% of District A's CCRPI score and 20% of District B's CCRPI score.

A school will be considered meeting standards if it outperforms using either of the comparison calculations. This applies to all CCRPI indicators in the CPF.

Academic Section, Approaches Standards

A school is approaching standards if it performed the same as or higher than the district(s) it serves in at least one—but not all—of the grade bands served, on CCRPI content mastery, progress or grade band score.

Previously: “same as” was defined as, the exact same score as the district.

Now: “same as” is expanded to include any score that is no more than 3 percent below the district’s score.

Value-Added Model Updates

In previous years, value-added impact scores at the high-school level were calculated and reported at the subject level based on EOC results.

This varied from how scores are calculated and reported at the elementary and middle school levels, where an overall grade band score is calculated from the subject-level scores.

For a school to be considering meeting on the high school level, it had to outperform the district in the majority of tested EOC courses.

Value-Added Impact Scores			
Grade Band/Course	Charter School	Comparison District	Statistically Different from District Average
Elementary	0.0283	-0.0409	Higher
Middle	-0.0405	0.0040	No
9th Grade Literature	0.1212	-0.0460	Higher
American Literature	-0.0237	-0.0668	No
Algebra 1	-0.2951	0.0329	Lower
Biology	0.1962	-0.0269	Higher
Economics	-0.0921	0.0234	No
Geometry	-0.3958	0.0723	Lower
Physical Science	0.1849	-0.0694	Higher
U.S. History	-0.0674	-0.0669	No

Value-Added Model Updates

Starting in the 2016-17 school year, Georgia Milestone exams in science and social were no longer administered in every grade from 3-8. Thus, the all-subject value-added score for elementary and middle schools changed to include only ELA and math scores.

In order align calculations for high-schools with elementary and middle schools, only ELA and math EOC (9th Grade Lit., American Lit., Algebra, and Geometry) scores will be used to compute high school scores.

This change also allows an overall, all-subject score to be computed at the high school level, as every school no matter what grades they serve should have ELA and math scores.

Value-Added Model Updates

Previously: A school serving high school grades had to outperform its district(s) in a majority of EOC tested courses on value-added impact scores in order to be considered meeting standards for that grade band.

Now: A school serving high school grades will meet standards in that grade band if it outperforms the district(s) it serves on overall value-added impact score.

BTO: Redesign

Previous Design: 2012-2017

Variables:

- School Size using Enrollment Count
- % Asian, Black, Hispanic, Multi-racial, Native American, SWD, ELL
- % Economically Disadvantaged using Free/Reduced Price Lunch and Direct Certification (2 models)
- Churn Rate (Student Mobility)
- Grade Cluster

New Design: 2018-

Variables:

- School Size, stratify model by 3 size groups
- % Asian, Black, Hispanic, Multi-racial, SWD, ELL, Female
- % Economically Disadvantaged using Direct Certification
- Churn Rate
- Grade Cluster
- Non-traditional school status

Beating the Odds Updates

Instead of just having “BTO” and “Did not BTO” tiers, one additional tier will provide context for both stakeholders and the media about a school’s performance.

- **Beating the Odds** - Above Top Confidence Interval
- **Within Expected Range** – Equal to or Below Top Confidence Interval, Above Bottom Confidence Interval
- **Below Expected Range** – Equal to or Below Bottom Confidence Interval

<https://gosa.georgia.gov/beating-odds-analysis>

SCSC expectations remains unchanged, school must be designated as Beating the Odds to be considered meeting standards.

Academic Renewal Criteria

The expectations for a standard 5-year charter renewal are that a school must meet academic standards at least 75% of the charter term (or 3 out of 4 years).

However, under certain circumstances a school may be eligible for an abbreviated charter term of 3 years.

In order to promote transparency and the decision-making logic around these instances, terms for granting an abbreviated charter renewal have been spelled out within the CPF document.

Operations added Approaches Standard

Originally a school received points on a measure in the Ops section of the CPF if it complied with the laws outlined and received zero points if they were out of compliance.

Schools requested that there be some way to earn partial points if they corrected identified compliance issues in a timely manner.

- For instance, if an issue was identified during the monitoring visit at the beginning of the school year and the school corrected the issue within a specified number of days, then the school should not receive zero points for that measure.

However, that requires a follow-up round of monitoring. Now that the SCSC has an operational accountability manager dedicated full-time to operational compliance, follow-up monitoring can and is being conducted.

Thus, if a school is found to be out of compliance, but remedies the issue within a specified timeline, the school can earn an Approaches Standard rating for that measure and receive partial points.

Operations Approaches Standard

Previously: In the operations section of the CPF, schools could earn a designation of either Meet Standards and receive the maximum points or Does Not Meet Standards and receive zero points.

Now: Certain measures have been updated to include an Approaches Standards category, where the school earns partial points.

This change applies to measures 1c, 3a, 3b, 3d, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f, 5a, 5c, 5d, 5e, and 6a in the operations section.

CPF Updates Timeline

- Proposed CPF updates were shared with school leaders and board chairs in mid October 2018.
- Those updates were then presented to SCSC commissioners at the Oct. 31st SCSC meeting.
- On Nov. 1st, the SCSC hosted a webinar for schools to ask questions and share comments on the proposed updates. A recording of the webinar was distributed to school representatives who could not attend live. Feedback on the proposed changes was open for public comment and review for the following weeks.
- The SCSC voted to adopt the CPF updates at the Nov. 14th SCSC meeting.
- The updates have been incorporated into the CPF and posted on the SCSC website.
- 2017-18 CPF scores will be shared with schools this month and presented publicly at the February 27th Commission meeting.

Questions?