

Academic Oversight-Aligning Board Reports to the CPF

State Charter Schools
Commission of Georgia



**Katie
Manthey**

Academic
Accountability
Manager

Questions to Consider as a Board

- What is the board's role in academic oversight?
- What type of academic data are you reviewing?
- How frequently do you review academic data?
- How are you tracking progress on CPF indicators?
- Are you using interim assessments for progress monitoring?
- Are the interim/benchmark assessments your school employs aligned to state standards? How do you know?
- Broken down to what level i.e. school, grade level, subject, classroom, student, is data presented?
- What are different ways to be looking at the data? i.e. gap between schools score and district score from year to year.

Board's Role in Academic Oversight

- A high performing board both supports the school leader and holds her/him accountable
- The goal is to have a high-quality school that gets renewed at the end of the charter term
- To be renewed the school must meet SCSC Academic Standards as identified in the Comprehensive Performance Framework(CPF)
- Thus, the board must monitor the school's progress on the CPF, support and hold school leadership accountable for that progress

CPF Indicators

Is the school *outperforming its comparison district* in *all relevant grade bands* on any one (not all) of the measures below.

- CCRPI Achievement
- CCRPI Progress
- CCRPI Single Score
- Value-Added Impact Score, or
- is designated a Beating the Odds

Data included in CPF Indicators

1. Achievement-

- Content Mastery-Weighted performance on Georgia Milestone Assessments (**GMA**) in each subject area- ELA, math, science, social studies
- [Readiness](#)- ACCESS data, Lexile's, attendance, CTAE completion, EOPA completion, etc. ([Redesigned CCRPI Overview](#) page 8)
- Graduation Rate/ Predictor-Proficient or Distinguished Learner on **GMA**, 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rate (%), 5-Year Extended Cohort Graduation Rate (%)

2. Progress- Student Growth Percentiles- Weighted growth on **GMA** in ELA and math and growth on ACCESS for ELLs (annual state assessment for English language proficiency)

3. CCRPI Single Score- Includes Achievement, Progress and Achievement Gap (growth of students scoring in the bottom 25% on **GMA**) weighted based on the number of students in each grade band.

4. Value-added model- statistical analysis used to estimate a school's true impact on student achievement using **GMA** scores controlled for observable student characteristics (list of controls page 5 of [Academic Accountability Briefing, 2015-16](#)).

5. Beating the Odds- statistical analysis used to predict how a school would score on the CCRPI Single Score based on observable student characteristics (list of characteristics on [GOSA BTO webpage](#))

GMA results are used in each of the above indicators, but, Milestones scores are only released once a year. Boards should be meeting and reviewing academic data regularly. Thus, what is the board be reviewing in the meantime?

Benchmark Assessments

- To get renewed the school needs to meet SCSC Academic Standards each year of your charter term.
- SCSC Academic Standards include a variety of measures all which to some degree rely on [Georgia Milestones Assessment](#) (GMA) results the mandatory statewide summative assessment, EOG and EOC scores.
- The GMA System is aligned to the [Georgia Standards of Excellence](#) (GSE).
- Interim/benchmark assessments are a known method for tracking progress on summative assessments.
- Thus, board should monitor progress on interim assessments **that are aligned to the GMA & GSE.**

Benchmark and Curriculum Alignment

- Curriculum packages often include benchmark assessments. No curriculum package is completely aligned to GSE. School leadership and teachers can adjust to make lesson plans align.
- If GMA and interim assessments results are not where they should be, ask the school leader, who is doing curriculum mapping and assessment alignment?
- They should be able to provide an example. Be weary of claims by the curriculum provider.
- Support research into other curriculum providers. Reach out to other high-performing schools to see what benchmark assessments they are using.

Georgia Standards
of Excellence



Assessments aligned
to Standards



Curriculum aligned
to Assessments

Breaking Down the Data

Board Members

- School level
- Grade level
- Subject Level
- Student subgroups
- Cohorts

School Personnel

- Everything under Board Members and,
- Teacher level
- Student level

Data: GMA results, Interim/benchmarks results aligned to GMA, ACCESS for ELL results (interim assessments for EL proficiency), attendance rate, graduation rate, students earning passing score in fine arts, world language, etc., credit for accelerated enrollment credit (Dual Enrollment, AP, IB), completion of advanced academic, CTAE, fine arts, or world language pathway, entering secondary education without needing remediation, achieving readiness on SAT/ACT, AP exams, EOPA national or state credential, etc.

Questions to think about when reviewing Data

- Are there gaps between grade levels in certain subjects?
- Are there gaps between certain student subgroups and the student body as a whole? Across subjects or focused in one area?
- Is there a correlation between attendance and test scores?

After areas in need of improvement are identified, what actions are you going to take to ensure progress? Work with school leader to improve the educational program

- Professional development for teachers i.e. in subjects with low scores
- In-depth curriculum review and mapping
- School improvement plans, after-school tutoring programs, etc.

Effective Board Academic Oversight starts with a firm foundation of knowledge

Before a board can provide proper academic oversight, ask meaningful questions, give directives, and take action a board should know what the expectations and requirements of the school are, so that they have a platform from which to work.

Read, review periodically, and keep for reference:

- Title 20
- ESSA
- IDEA
- Charter Contract
- School Policies
- School Handbooks
- School P&P Manuals
- Mission and Vision
- School Budget
- School Annual Report
- MKV
- FERPA
- Proposed and Adopted Educational Legislation
- SCSC Policies, Rules, and Regulations
- Glossary of Educational Terms, Acronyms, and Abbreviations

Review the measures that inform the following:

- CCRPI
- Value Add
- Beating the Odds
- CPF (Continuous Performance Framework)

Know when, where, and how the data for the scorecards is collected :

- MyTotalView
- SLDS
- Schedule for data submissions

Data provided for oversight and to inform decision making

Questions to consider when asking for data:

- What is the historical academic performance of the school?
- What academic goals has your school set for future years?
- What tools does the school use to monitor academic progress and project end of year academic performance? When are they administered?
- What data will help judge whether the school is meeting its academic goals?
- How is the school administration and staff using the data they currently collect to improve student achievement over time?
- What additional data must be collected and why?
- In what ways are students, parents, teachers, administrative staff, and principals involved in providing data, its collection, and its analysis?

More data is not necessarily better data

Relevant data needs to be presented in a manner that is timely, concise, complete, and readily digestible.

Data is useless:

- When the data is not valid and reliable.
- If relevant data has not been reported or has been omitted to give the impression that everything is fine or that progress is being made.
- If the data has been broken down to a level that creates a smoke screen or leads one to draw incorrect conclusions.
- If there is too much data to sift through to draw conclusions at all.
- If the data does not answer the questions asked.
- If appropriate questions are not asked after reviewing.
- If data analysis is not used for making thoughtful decisions and taking action.

Example of data that is not very useful as presented

Interim Assessment 1

IA 1 Completion by Course: 83.3%

Row Labels	Completed		Not Complete	
	# students	% students	# students	% students
+ Art	1095	67.30%	532	32.70%
+ Bus/Tech	1814	83.94%	347	16.06%
+ ELA	4928	86.61%	762	13.39%
+ Health/PE	1781	74.21%	619	25.79%
+ HST	4624	86.20%	740	13.80%
+ MTH	4783	84.76%	860	15.24%
+ Other Electives	822	78.44%	226	21.56%
+ SCI	4415	87.12%	653	12.88%
+ World Lang	1826	79.32%	476	20.68%
Grand Total	26088	83.34%	5215	16.66%

IA 1 Completion by P/F: 83.3%

Row Labels	Completed		Not Complete	
	# students	% students	# students	% students
Failing course	9153	66.77%	4555	33.23%
Passing Course	16935	96.25%	660	3.75%
Grand Total	26088	83.34%	5215	16.66%

IA 1 Completion by GL: 83.3%

Row Labels	Completed		Not Complete	
	# students	% students	# students	% students
7	1	100.00%		0.00%
8	387	92.14%	33	7.86%
9	7973	78.47%	2187	21.53%
10	8580	82.68%	1797	17.32%
11	5044	87.86%	697	12.14%
12	4091	89.32%	489	10.68%
unknown	12	50.00%	12	50.00%
Grand Total	26088	83.34%	5215	16.66%

Example of data that is misleading

Graduation Summary

Total number of 12 th grade students	<u>755</u>
Total number of seniors cleared to graduate in May 2017	<u>625</u>
Participated in Graduation Ceremony 6/3/17	<u>459</u>
82% of the senior class (all cohorts) were cleared for graduation	
Associate Degrees earned (summer)	2 (3 additional pending for summer)

Cohort Summary

Cohort Year	Total in 12 th Grade	Cleared for Graduation	Unable to Graduate May 2017	Graduation Rate
2014	3	2	1	66%
2015	20	12	8	60%
2016	72	48	24	67%
2017	638	552	85	87%
2018	12	11	1	90%

Example of data that is incomplete

	ELA						Math					
	Developing & Above			Proficient & Above			Developing & Above			Proficient & Above		
	SY17	SY16	Change	SY15	SY16	Change	SY15	SY16	Change	SY15	SY16	Change
3	65%	60%	5%	30%	29%	1%	63%	64%	-1%	26%	26%	0%
4	62%	59%	3%	34%	28%	5%	66%	62%	4%	29%	27%	2%
5	67%	72%	-5%	31%	35%	-4%	48%	53%	-5%	18%	21%	-3%
6	70%	64%	6%	39%	36%	3%	66%	61%	5%	25%	26%	-1%
7	70%	70%	0%	34%	35%	0%	67%	68%	-1%	31%	31%	1%
8*	81%	78%	3%	41%	38%	3%	62%	63%	-1%	23%	22%	1%
Overall	69%	67%	2%	35%	33%	1%	62%	62%	0%	25%	25%	0%

	Science						Social Studies					
	Developing & Above			Proficient & Above			Developing & Above			Proficient & Above		
	SY15	SY16	Change	SY15	SY16	Change	SY15	SY16	Change	SY15	SY16	Change
5	64%	64%	0%	36%	32%	3%	60%	61%	-1%	20%	17%	3%
8	55%	54%	1%	28%	22%	6%	66%	55%	11%	27%	19%	8%
Overall	60%	59%	1%	32%	27%	4%	63%	58%	5%	24%	18%	6%

More data is not necessarily better data

Relevant data needs to be presented in a manner that is timely, concise, complete, and readily digestible.

Data is useful when it:

- Measures student progress
- Makes sure all student populations are served effectively
- Measures program effectiveness
- Assesses instructional effectiveness
- Guides curriculum decisions
- Allocates resources wisely
- Promotes accountability
- Creates transparency for stakeholders
- Meets state and federal reporting requirements
- Maintains educational focus
- Indicates trends to inform plans and find solutions

Examples of useful and relevant data

Enrollment Metrics as 9/22

Grade	Total Active, Approved
K	625
1	691
2	732
3	828
4	928
5	1042
6	1165
7	1482
8	1658
9	1839
10	1915
11	1139
12	860
Grand Total	14904

New vs Returning Students by Grade Level

As of 9/22/17	New Count	New Percentage	Returning Count	Returning Percentage	Total
Kindergarten	627	100%	0	0%	627
1st Grade	339	48.71%	357	51.29%	696
2nd Grade	305	41.38%	432	58.62%	737
3rd Grade	366	44.15%	463	55.85%	829
4th Grade	455	49.03%	473	50.97%	928
5th Grade	520	49.76%	525	50.24%	1045
6th Grade	630	54.17%	533	45.83%	1163
7th Grade	694	46.73%	791	53.27%	1485
8th Grade	694	41.78%	967	57.84%	1661
9th Grade	783	42.16%	1074	57.84%	1857
10th Grade	670	34.50%	1272	65.50%	1942
11th Grade	396	35.39%	723	64.61%	1119
12th Grade	6	0.72%	832	99.28%	838
TOTALS	6485	43%	8442	57%	14927

Board actions or interventions for poor academic results

- **Create a Board developed Academic Dashboard and Report**

- **Send out Board developed Surveys**

(A 360 degree survey instrument is best where input is sought from students, parents, teachers, staff, and administrators...make sure that you structure questions to allow for criticism and to identify areas for improvement.)

- **Conduct an Academic Audit**

(Review the complete academic program including curriculum, tools & instruments used, instructional methods, monitoring practices, data collection & analysis, instructional staff capacity, collaborative practices, class sizes, educational contractors, leadership, school environment & culture, and transparency.)

- **Seek out best practices from high performing schools**

- **Partner with the SCSC staff for help, guidance, and support**

- **Make changes even if they may be difficult or unpopular**

(Change is hard and often habits have been formed that are hard to break.)

Effective Academic Oversight

- Educate yourself on your school's obligations, its legal requirements, historical performance, and its academic program.
- Read all reports and communications in detail and ask questions.
- Trust, but verify the data you are receiving by conducting audits.
- Collect data in multiple ways.
- If results do not match the picture painted in Board reports and meetings start questioning the data presented. It may be factual, but presented in a manner that is misleading and/or lacking pertinent data.
- Be active in developing how and what data is actually presented.
- When opportunities exist, accept explanations, but not excuses. Request the plan to address the deficiency/issue, the timeline, how it is going to be monitored, and require monthly updates on the progress toward accomplishing the objective.
- 90% of all academic conversations should be about where you are, what is being done to address deficiencies, the progress toward meeting goals, and how to improve the program, services, and stakeholder satisfaction.



FOOTHILLS
EDUCATION
CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL



Reporting Academic Data
to the Board

About Foothills...

- Foothills is a second-chance opportunity for students who have not been successful in a traditional day school
- Foothills operates on an evening schedule - Mon. -Thurs. from 4:00 to 9:00 p.m.
- Foothills has ten sites across Georgia - 7 partner districts and 3 corrections sites
- Our mission: *Foothills Education Charter High School is a community and state resource for students who want to earn a high school diploma in order to be successful in post-secondary and career options.*

Preparing Board Reports – Academic Data

- We think about the board members and their present level of knowledge about the data
 - For Foothills, board members are the Superintendents of partners schools – deep level of understanding of academic and accountability data
 - If board members need a refresher, we think about organizational tools that may help tie the data and accountability measures together: for instance,
 - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1It0P_qhkfrCHzOX-mLsPCKqEI2ueUEyP0K4GSZSWec8/edit?usp=sharing
- We think about presenting data in a clear and concise manner
- We honor requests for specific information and data that have been made by the board

Sample Accountability Measures Matrix

Foothills Academic Accountability Measures

- I. **Charter School Annual Report** - is distributed annually in September and the first draft is due in early November. Tab 4 focuses on Academic Accountability is divided into the sections outlined below for Foothills.

Section	Who sets target?	What is the data source?	Which students are included?	When do we get the data?	Accountability connections?	Do we fill it in on the charter report?
End of Course Performance Targets - State Performance Targets	The GaDOE has set the state performance target for each academic content area over time. <i>Note: This will likely change with ESSA and will be based upon growth at a school, not the same target for all schools.</i>	CCRPI - weighted content achievement. .5 for Level II 1 for Level III 1.5 for Level IV	Only FAY (Full Academic Year) students	Not until CCRPI is released. Usually Nov/Dec.	<u>CCRPI</u> Weighted Content achievement is used in the overall CCRPI score and to determine red, yellow and green subgroup flags. <u>SCSC Framework</u> If we meet all of the state performance targets, we get 2 points.	The Charter Report is distributed before this information is available. We leave it blank for now. These scores will be pre-populated and sent back to us after CCRPI release.
End of Course Performance Targets - Percent of students scoring at Developing or above on the Georgia Milestones EOGs and EOCs	Technically, there is no target. The target is what we scored the year before. Our goal is to do better than the prior year.	GaDOE summary sheets that are released in May/June.	All students who took EOCs.	May/June	None - this section is not connected to accountability. It is just for our information. It does not affect CCRPI or the SCSC Framework.	Since this data is available before distribution of the report, it is pre-populated.
State Designations: Reward, Focus or	The GaDOE. <i>Note: The designations will change with</i>	The GaDOE releases a list of school designations.	n/a	Every 3 years. May change with ESSA?	<u>CCRPI</u> - n/a <u>SCSC Framework</u> 2 points for reward school;	It will be pre-populated. Currently, Foothills

Data Sources

- GOSA - Beating the Odds Determination, Value Added Measures
- GaDOE - EOC Summary Reports, CCRPI Reports, Special Education Reports, Graduation Rates, Financials, Climate Surveys, CPI report
- SCSC - Comprehensive Performance Framework Scores, monitoring visit reports
- DRC - Raw data for EOCs
- SLDS - enrollment data, EL/SWD data, growth data; state comparisons
- Infinite Campus (SIS) - Credits earned, graduates, attendance, enrollment, school of origin

Data Points Included - Site Level

New Superintendents want to know the history:

- How does Foothills impact their District?
- How many students attend? Which schools do they come from?
- Why did they transfer? How many were actual dropouts?
- How many attended for credit recovery only?

Site Level Data - provided monthly

- Credits earned
- Number of graduates
- Attendance
- Enrollment
- School of Origin

Note: Foothills has someone prepare monthly progress reports that are verified by registrars and site directors.

Sample - Site report (June 2017)

KM8
ST9

- <https://simbli.eboardsolutions.com/Meetings/Attachment.aspx?S=4189&AID=85508&MID=2630>



FOOTHILLS
EDUCATION
CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL

**Monthly Site Report:
June 2017**

Slide 26

KM8 What I would like you to point out is the differences between the Drop-outs, attendance, graduates, credits completed (the academic related indicators) at each site. Do you all track and note the differences/gaps between sites and then focus intervention strategies at those sites based on what you find? If so, please highlight that and give the example. You could always add another slide that shows the two sites data side by side and then explain what action you took at which site and why.

Katie Manthey, 11/16/2017

ST9 Added a few more slides from our July 2017 performance review. We don't really have a site by site example.

Student Test, 11/26/2017

Sample Board Summary - July 2017

Metric	2015-16	2016-17 (thus far)
Number of Sites	7	9
Number of Students	1707 unique students, 1549 FTE eligible	2663 unique students, 2165 FTE eligible
% SWD Students	14.06 (n=240)	13.1 (n=349)
Number of Credits Earned	1726	2211
Number of Graduates	135 (full year through Aug 19)	151 (through July 1)

Data Points Included - Achievement

● Achievement Data

- High level/broad stroke summaries of progress on EOCs provided to Board
 - More detailed staff reports that include site level breakdowns of achievement indicators on each EOC are condensed to include cumulative, summary information for the Board
 - Monthly progress reports inform how we think we may be progressing toward the major accountability measures

Note: Foothills has a second person providing detailed information EOC performance that is shared with staff for curriculum work and has recently employed an Accountability Coordinator to help oversee the entire data collection/accountability cycle.

Sample Communication of EOC Data- July 2017

Weighted content mastery – **ALL** students
(June 2016 and June 2017)

Subject	2016		2017	
	n-size	%	n-size	%
9th Lit	48	47.91	50	47
Am Lit	54	36.4	56	33.9
GSE Alg	3	33.3	17	23.5
GSE Geom	4	62.5	29	24.1
Phy Sci	40	30	72	25.6
Bio	34	33.8	67	34.3
US Hist	47	43.2	114	47.8
Econ	100	48	158	43.7

Weighted content mastery – **FAY** students
(Actual CCRPI 2016 and projected June
2017)

Subject	2016		2017	
	n-size	%	n-size	%
9th Lit	25/53	52	26	38.5
Am Lit	25/62	36	36	37.5
GSE Alg	TFS	TFS	TFS	TFS
GSE Geom	TFS	TFS	17	35.3
Phy Sci	26/57	26.9	43	23.2
Bio	TFS	TFS	42	33.3
US Hist	38/109	35.5	51	38.2
Econ	41/119	46.3	78	40.4

Sample Communication of EOC Data - Jan 2018

Foothills Education Charter High School													
3-Year Trend Data - EOCs													
Subject	FY16				FY17				FY18 (thru Dec)				
	n-size	% Level 2 & above (All)	n-size	CCRPI Weighted Content Mastery (FAY)	n-size	% Level 2 & above (All)	n-size	CCRPI Weighted Content Mastery (FAY)	n-size	% Level 2 & above (All)	Weighted Content Mastery (All)	n-size	Weighted Content Mastery (Projected FAY*)
9th Lit	52	69.23%	25	52.00%	67	52.24%	26	34.61%	30	67.86%	45.00%	24	45.83%
Am Lit	67	61.20%	25	36.00%	71	56.34%	40	37.50%	54	66.67%	46.30%	34	48.53%
Algebra	TFS	TFS	TFS	TFS	27	48.15%	19	28.90%	29	34.48%	22.41%	16	28.13%
Geom	TFS	TFS	TFS	TFS	45	46.67%	22	40.90%	23	65.22%	45.65%	15	50.00%
Phy. Sci	53	49.06%	26	26.92%	94	41.49%	48	26.04%	29	51.72%	36.21%	25	34.00%
Biology	43	46.51%	14	25.00%	87	45.98%	45	33.33%	24	33.34%	27.08%	20	27.50%
US Hist	107	58.87%	38	35.52%	142	65.49%	64	42.18%	60	62.70%	47.50%	47	48.94%
Econ	104	63.47%	41	46.30%	186	62.36%	82	39.63%	59	62.07%	46.61%	42	48.81%

Sample communication of Supports & Interventions based on Data – July 2017

- Tutoring Program
- EOC Prep Protocol: USA Testprep
- Addition of Special Education Director and Coordinators
- Increased academic planning/mentoring protocols
- Course pacing monitoring
- Strategic Planning Supported by Carl Vinson Institute of Government @ UGA
- Student Incentives
- Community Support: Food Bank, Chamber of Commerce Leadership activities
- AdvancED review: monitoring visits schedule for Feb 2018.
- Follow-up with all 15-16 departures underway to provide additional assistance
- Collaboration with Mountain Ed and Coastal Plains

Data Points Included - Accountability

- **Accountability Data** - as each major accountability measure is released, a detailed report is shared with Board
 - CCRPI - Nov/Dec - Supt. will share the report and discuss overall score and each component. Because of monthly progress reports, there are generally no surprises.
 - VAM Scores - Feb. - shared with Board and talk about the relation to the CPF
 - BTO scores - March - shared with Board and talk about the relation to the CPF
 - CPF - Feb? - shared with Board. Because of monthly progress reports and the review of each of the accountability measures as they are released, the scores on the CPF are not a surprise.

Sample Communication of CCRPI/BTO Data

CCRPI Highlights					
	2016 FH	2016 State	2017 FH	2017 State	SCSC Framework Connection
Achievement	12.8	34	13.1	34.6	If FH achievement score = state achievement score, we get 60 pts. If FH achievement score > state achievement score, we get 96 pts. No points for 2017.
Progress	30.1	34.3	30.1	35.2	If FH progress score = state progress score, we get 60 pts. If FH progress score > state progress score, we get 96 points. No points for 2017.
Achievement	3.3	6.7	n/a	6.7	n/a
ETB	0.5	0.4	0	0.6	n/a
Challenge	0	0.7	0	0.5	n/a
Overall Score	46.7	75.7	48	77	Second look indicator: If FH overall score > state HS overall score, we get 96 points. No points for 2017.
Beating the Odds Highlights					
	2016 Predicted DC Score	2016 Actual DC Score	2017 Predicted DC score	2017 actual DC Score	
BTO Scores	55.2	46.2	53.2	48	Second look indicator: If FH is designated as BTO = 96 points. No points for 2017
Foothills still has the opportunity to academic points on the Comprehensive Performance Framework via Second Look Criteria: Value Added Measures (GOSA)					

Note: For FY18, CCRPI is re-designed under ESSA and will be calculated differently. Improvement targets are specific to each school and are defined as 3% of the gap between a baseline and 100%

Note: Poverty Data and FRL

Sample Beating the Odds Communication



Foothills Education Charter High School
Planning and Implementation Grant Update

January Grant News

- Foothills did not Beat the Odds in 2016 or 2017, *but growth did occur.*
- The DC Score is what each school was predicted to score and what they actually scored. Foothills Actual Single Score (DC) increased from 46.2 in 2016 to 48 in 2017 (+1.8).
- The DC Rank is where each school was predicted to rank (out of the 2145 schools the state used in 2017 and 2141 schools in 2016) and where they actually ranked. Foothills' difference in the predicted rank showed a more dramatic increase, jumping by 131 schools.
- The DC Percentile is the percentile where each school was predicted to rank (out of the 2145 schools the state used in 2017 and 2141 schools in 2016) and the percentile where they actually ranked. Foothills increased by 6.3 percentile points based upon expectations and results.

Sample CPF report - May 2017

PREVIOUS

IV. C. 1. Comprehensive Performance Framework: 2015-2016

Meeting Agenda	
▶ I. Call to Order	
▶ II. Approve Agenda	
▶ III. Approve Minutes from ..	
▼ IV. Superintendent's Repo ..	
▶ A. Staff	
▼ B. Students	
▶ 1. Student Enrollment	
▶ 2. Monthly Progress Repor ..	
▶ 3. Newsletters	
▶ 4. Graduates	

Details

Section 1: Academic Performance - 1/100

Indicator 1: [State and Federal Accountability System](#)

Indicator 2: [Student Achievement and Student Growth](#)

Section II: Financial Performance - 100/100

Indicator 1: [Near-Term Measures](#)

Indicator 2: [Sustainability Measures](#)

Section III: Operational Performance - 86/100

Indicator 1: [Educational Program Compliance](#)

Indicator 2: [Financial Oversight](#)

Indicator 3: [Governance](#)

Indicator 4: [Students and Employees](#)

Indicator 5: [School Environment](#)

Indicator 6: [Additional Continuing Obligations](#)

Add'l attachment with details of each indicator

Looking Ahead...

- EOC achievement is an identified area of need for Foothills.
 - Identified by numerous sources: curriculum team, support team, CNA, Board
- To address need, Foothills:
 - Hosted Summer 2017 administrative retreat focused on strategic plan; developed strategies based on staff input. Developed district improvement plan and each site developed an action plan.
 - 2017-2018 - Implementing regional administrative quarterly impact checks with 2-3 sites meeting to review status and progress of action plans
 - Leveraged federal funds in a way to implement a EOC specific tutoring program at each site
 - Applied for and received a Federal Charter Implementation Grant focused on improving EOC scores
 - Working with data teams with representatives from each site to better understand formative data and the impact on EOC. Detailed information will be shared with staff - high level summary data will be shared with the Board.
 - Partnership with Georgia Center for Assessment for improving EOC scores

Final Thoughts...

Keep it simple and timely - there are many other things to be shared with the Board

There should not be any surprises. When Superintendent gets data - good or bad - it is shared immediately with board.

All data are posted on website - very transparent

Make sure Board understands data presented - allow time for questions and follow through

Be responsive to the needs of the Board. Know your audience.

The Superintendent is managing the Board and the board meetings in partnership with the board chair. Always preview information with the board chair to make sure all critical information is on the agenda; amend if necessary. Don't overload the agenda or nothing will be understood.



Questions?

Contact Info:

Katie Manthey, SCSC- katie.Manthey@scsc.georgia.gov

Angela Lassetter, Georgia Cyber Academy- gtbigbee@bellsouth.net

Brittan Ayers, Foothills [-brittan.ayers@foothillscharter.org](mailto:brittan.ayers@foothillscharter.org)