

2017-2018 CPF Updates

SECTION I: ACADEMICS

Amendment 1 [UPDATED TERMS]

Indicator 1, Measure 1a [State Performance Targets]		
Previously	Updated	Explanation
<p>Meets Standard= The schools met 100 percent of the State Performance Targets set by the state.</p> <p>Does Not Meet Standard= The school did not meet 100 percent of the State Performance Targets set by the state.</p>	<p>Meets Standard= The school met 100 percent (for all students and all subgroups) of the Improvement Targets set by the state in the Closing the Gaps component of the CCRPI.</p> <p>Does Not Meet Standard= The school did not meet 100 percent (for all students and all subgroups) of the Improvement Targets set by the state in the Closing the Gaps component of the CCRPI.</p>	<p>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 a target will be calculated for all students and all subgroups.</p> <p>The updated language clarifies that the CPF will now consider progress on the new Improvement Targets to align with the changes that came about as a result of ESSA. 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. If the school does not meet 100 percent of the targets the school receive zero points on the measure.</p>

Amendment 2 [UPDATED TERMS]

Indicator 1, Measure 1b [State Designations]		
Previously	Updated	Explanation
<p>Exceeds Standard= The school was identified as a “Reward” school.</p> <p>Meets Standard= The school does not have a designation.</p> <p>Does Not Meet Standard= The school was identified as a “Focus” or “Priority” school.</p>	<p>Exceeds Standard is eliminated.</p> <p>Meets Standard= The school does not have a designation.</p> <p>Does Not Meet Standards= the school was identified as “TSI”, “CSI”, or “Turnaround Eligible” school.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>High achieving or “Reward” schools are no longer being identified as part of GaDOE accountability. GaDOE will still identify schools that need improvement. Those schools will be identified by differing criteria and grouped into three categories: Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools, which are schools that have consistently underperforming subgroups, Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools, those 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%, and Turnaround Eligible schools, defined as the lowest 5 percent of schools in the state in accordance with the statewide accountability system. The terms “Focus” and “Priority” will no longer be used.</p> <p>The updated language will align the CPF to the terms in the State’s ESSA plan and naming conventions that will be used by GaDOE and other education entities.</p>

Amendment 3 [MEASURE CHANGED]

Indicator 2, Measure 1 [Academic Achievement]		
Previously	Updated	Explanation
Is the school annually outperforming the district(s) it serves (as measured by grade-band CCRPI achievement scores)?	Is the school annually outperforming the district(s) it serves (as measured by grade-band CCRPI content mastery scores)?	<p>As part of Georgia’s ESSA plan, GaDOE restructured the components of the state’s academic accountability system, the College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI). Previously, CCRPI achievement was made up of three sub components: content mastery- proficiency on Georgia Milestones, readiness- metrics (course completion, literacy, attendance) used to indicate if a student is prepared to move to the next grade band, and graduation rate. In the CCRPI restructuring, CCRPI achievement has been eliminated and each of the individual sub components become a standalone component of the overall CCRPI score. The updated language in the CPF replaces CCRPI achievement with CCRPI content mastery.</p> <p>After reviewing 2017 impact data generated from the redesigned version of CCRPI, SCSC staff found that using content mastery resulted in very similar scores compared to results when using the overall achievement category. Achievement and content mastery were more closely aligned to one another than achievement was to any of the other previous subcomponents. However, readiness and graduation rate will be considered through the CCRPI grade band score, discussed in the next amendment, and through the CCRPI single score. Additionally, in the CCRPI redesign, content mastery is weighted at 30% of the overall CCRPI score, second to progress at 35%. Thus, by using content mastery we are mirroring the emphasis of importance that GaDOE allocated to the content mastery component.</p>

Amendment 4 [NEW MEASURE ADDED]

Indicator 2, Measure 3 [Achievement and Growth]		
Previously	Updated	Explanation
Schools could either meet standards by outperforming their district in all relevant grade bands on either CCRPI achievement or progress (or a combination). We did not consider CCRPI grade band score, which is the grade level score that is comprised of achievement, progress and other components.	Is the school annually outperforming the district(s) it serves (as measured by grade-band CCRPI score)?	<p>The CCRPI is calculated by grade band to generate grade band scores that includes achievement/content mastery, progress, readiness and graduation rate components. While schools have always been able to meet academic standards by outperforming the district on either CCRPI achievement (now content mastery) OR CCRPI progress (growth) components (or a combination), the CPF did not explicitly state that if a school outperformed on CCRPI grade band score, that would also be considering meeting standards.</p> <p>The CPF is updated to include a CCRPI grade band score measure, which will be the third measure in Indicator 2 of the academic section. The format and language of the measure will mirror the preceding measures, i.e. Meets Standard: The charter school earned a higher “overall grade band” score on the CCRPI than the district(s) included in its attendance zone in all grade bands served (elementary, middle, and/or high school) OR in all grade bands in which the school did not earn a higher CCRPI “content mastery” or “progress” score.</p> <p>After reviewing historical performance data, SCSC staff found that in most cases if a school was outperforming on the CCRPI grade band score, they were also outperforming on either CCRPI achievement, progress or single score. Thus, this change does not require updating any previous CPF scores. However, in an effort to afford our schools every opportunity to outperform and for transparency sake, SCSC staff agreed to include CCRPI grade band score as an additional measure.</p>

Amendment 5 [TERM REDEFINED AND EXPANDED]

Indicator 2, All Measures		
Previously	Updated	Explanation
Previously “same as” was defined as, the exact same score as the district.	The updated definition of “same as” has been expanded to include any score that is no more than 3 percent below the districts score.	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 achievement/content mastery, progress or grade bands score. During the 2018 SCSC policy retreat, commissioners agreed that if a school scored close to a district’s score then the school should be recognized as approaching. Thus, the definition of the term “same as” expanded from exactly the same, to no more than 3% below a district’s score. SCSC staff decided to use a 3% range as opposed to a specific number of points because CCRPI content mastery and progress indicators are weighted differently within the total CCRPI score (i.e. content mastery, 30 points and progress, 35 points).

Amendment 6 [CALCULATION ADJUSTED]

Second Look, Part B, Value-Added Impact Score		
Previously	Updated	Explanation
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.	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 scores.	<p>In previous years, value-added impact scores at the high-school level were calculated and reported at the subject level. 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. An all-subject score could not be calculated at the high school level because not all schools administered the same subjects. For instance, a K-12 school that was growing one high school grade at a time might administered only a few EOCs one year compared to a school fully serving grades 9-12.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>After consulting with GOSA representatives and Dr. Tim Sass (who runs the VAM) and his team at Georgia State University, it was agreed that these changes were in the interest of making the VAM more uniform across grade bands and mirror the state’s emphasis on the importance student achievement in ELA and math subjects. Additionally, SCSC staff reviewed impact data and no schools previous scores would be negatively affected by the adjustment. Language in the CPF has been updated to reflect these changes: The school can meet standards on the VAM if it has a statistically higher value-added impact score that the district(s) it serves in all relevant grade bands.</p>

Amendment 7 [LANGUAGE ADDED]

Academic Renewal Criteria		
Previously	Updated	Explanation
Previously, the CPF did not contain explicit language outlining renewal expectations in terms of performance on academic standards.	Language outlining expectations for a standard 5-year contract renewal and an abbreviated 3-year contract renewal has been added to the end of the academic section in the CPF.	<p>At the 2018 SCSC policy retreat commissioners agreed that in certain circumstances a school's track record of performance might warrant considering a few more years of data, thus granting a charter renewal for an abbreviated term of 3 years. This is the case for a school shows either consistent performance that was very similar to the district(s) it serves, although not outright outperforming, or a school that met standards in the last year of the charter term, thus the additional years of data are a chance for the school to prove that the improvements made are sustainable.</p> <p>The expectations for a standard 5-year charter renewal remain unchanged but have now been clearly added to the document: The school outperforms its comparison district(s) in all relevant grade bands at least 75% of the charter term.</p> <p>The CPF has been updated to include language that clarifies the expectations for both a standard 5-year contract renewal and an abbreviated 3-year contract renewal. The explanation also includes specific scenarios for when each renewal would be appropriate.</p>

SECTION II: OPERATIONS

Amendment 1 [STANDARD ADDED]

Operational Performance		
Previously	Updated	Explanation
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.	Certain measures have been updated to include an Approaches Standards category, where the school earns partial points.	<p>Originally in the operations section of the CPF, a school received points on a measure 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.</p> <p>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. The change does not apply to all measures in the operations section. For instance, measure 3a asks is all governing board members attend the training required by law. Board members either attend or they did not. There is no Approaches Standards category for this measure.</p>