

SCSC Academic Accountability Update

State Charter School Performance
2013-2014

State Charter
Schools
Commission
of Georgia



SCSC Mission Statement

The mission of the State Charter Schools Commission of Georgia is to improve public education throughout the state by authorizing high quality charter schools that provide students with better educational opportunities than they would otherwise receive in traditional district schools.

Academic Accountability Metrics

- **State Accountability Metric: College and Career Readiness Performance Index**
 - In 2012, the CCRPI replaced the previously used Adequately Year Progress (AYP) determination in Georgia.
 - The CCRPI includes scores that easily communicate to the public how a school is doing.
 - The overall score is based on a school's performance in three major categories: 1) academic achievement, 2) student growth and progress, and 3) achievement gap reduction.
- **SCSC Accountability Metric: Value-Added Impact on Student Achievement**
 - In addition to evaluating CCRPI performance, the SCSC contracts with the Governor's Office of Student Achievement (GOSA) to conduct a value-added analysis of state charter school performance which assesses state charter schools based on their ability to positively impact the unique student populations they serve.
 - The value-added model controls for observable student characteristics and prior academic performance in order to generate an "impact score" for each school.
 - The value-added method adjusts for the observable characteristics of students so that schools can be equitably compared regardless of their differing student populations.

Explanation of CCRPI

A school and district's overall score is based on points earned in three major areas:

1. Achievement (60 possible points; 54.5% of total possible score)

- Content Mastery on state standardized tests in core subjects.
- Post High School Readiness (e.g.: career pathways, ACT/SAT/AP/IB exam performance, world language coursework, reading/writing skills, and attendance).
- Graduation rate (Four- and five-year graduation rates with more weight given to the four-year rate) in high school or a "Predictor for High School Graduation" for elementary and middle schools (an additional, different look at CRCT performance).

2. Progress/ Growth (25 possible points; 22.7% of total possible score)

- Measured by the percentage of students earning typical or high growth on state assessments. This percentage is derived from Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs), which compare a student's growth with other students with similar past achievement.

3. Achievement Gap Reduction (15 possible points; 13.6% of total possible score)

- Based upon schools' achievement gap size and change in that gap. The gap is measured between the schools' bottom 25% of students and the state average.¹
- In addition to the three major areas, schools may receive "Challenge Points" to add to their scores (up to 10 possible points).
 - Schools may receive these points if they have a significant number of Economically Disadvantaged students, English Learner students and Students with Disabilities meeting expectations.
 - Schools can also receive points for going beyond the targets of the CCRPI by challenging students to exceed expectations and participate in college and career ready programs.

Explanation of Value-Added Method

- The value-added method adjusts all student-level test scores to a normalized score so the statewide mean is zero and the standard deviation is one.
 - *Example:* A student whose score equals the statewide average would have a normalized score of zero.
- Using normalized scores, the value-added method estimates the relationship between current test scores and A) prior test scores and B) observable student characteristics like free/reduced-price lunch status, disability status, gender, etc.
 - *Example:* When estimating the effect of student characteristics on 9th-grade Lit. EOCT scores, the impact of being female is 0.114. This means that all else being equal, girls—on average—have a normalized score that is 0.114 higher than boys.
- Using estimated impacts of prior scores and student characteristics, the value-added method enables the construction of a predicted score for each student. Once determined, this predicted score is compared to the student's actual score.
 - *Example:* If a student does as well as one would expect based on his/her observable characteristics and prior scores, the difference between the student's actual and predicted scores will equal zero.
- To obtain an estimate of a school's effect (or its impact on student achievement), the value-added method averages the difference between actual and predicted scores across all students in a school.
 - *Example:* If all of the students in a school were performing as well as one would expect based on their observable characteristics and prior scores, the school effect would equal zero. These school effects are calibrated so that the average school in the state should have a school effect of zero.

List of Value-Added Controls

- Prior-year test scores,
- Gender,
- Foreign-born indicator,
- Race/Ethnicity,
- ESOL enrollment,
- Free/reduced-price lunch eligibility,
- Gifted status,
- Primary-language-not-English indicator,
- Disability status (fifteen specific disability categories),
- Number of schools attended in the current year,
- An indicator for students who changed schools from the prior year,
- Number of disciplinary incidents in the prior year,
- Attendance in the prior year, and
- The difference between a student's age (in months) and the modal age of students in the same grade (i.e. "overage" in grade).

CCRPI and Value-Added Impact

- Both the CCRPI and the Value-Added Impact Metric are useful school-level accountability tools; however, they were created for different purposes and include different performance indicators.
- Because value-add impact scores are produced by comparing actual and predicted student performance on state standardized assessment while also controlling for student demographics, there are instances in which the following scenarios may occur:
 - A school may be outperforming its comparison district on the CCRPI, yet it has a negative value-add impact score. This indicates that the school's actual performance was lower than its predicted performance (given the characteristics and performance history of the school's student population). In other words, the school was predicted to perform at an even higher level.
 - A school may not be outperforming its comparison district on the CCRPI, yet it has a positive value-add impact score. This indicates that the school's actual performance exceeds its predicted performance (given the characteristics and performance history of the school's student population). In other words, the school was predicted to perform at a lower level.

2014 State Charter School Performance CCRPI Scores and Value-Added Impact Scores

Overall Performance

- CCRPI (State Accountability Metric):
 - 38% of all state charters outperformed comparison districts as measured by overall CCRPI single scores.
- Value-Added Impact on Student Achievement:
 - No state charters outperformed their comparison districts in all relevant grade bands served.
 - 8% of all state charters performed at the same level as comparison districts in all relevant grade bands served.

2014 State Charter School Performance CCRPI Scores and Value-Added Impact Scores

Performance by Grade Band

■ CCRPI (State Accountability Metric):

- 50% of state charters serving students in **elementary** grades (K-5) outperformed comparison districts.
- 36% of state charters serving students in **middle** grades (6-8) outperformed comparison districts.
 - 9% of state charters serving students in **middle** grades (6-8) performed at the same level as their comparison districts.
- 22% of state charters serving students in **high** school grades (9-12) outperformed comparison districts.

■ Value-Added Impact on Student Achievement:

- 13% of state charters serving students in **elementary** grades outperformed comparison districts.
 - 13% of state charters serving students in elementary grades performed at the same level of comparison districts.
- 18% of state charters serving students in **middle** grades outperformed comparison districts.
 - 45% of state charters serving students in middle grades performed at the same level as comparison districts.
- 0% of state charters serving students in **high** school grades outperformed comparison districts.
 - 56% of state charters serving students in high school grades performed at the same level as comparison districts.

National Charter School Performance Data: Center for Research on Educational Outcomes (CREDO), *NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOL STUDY 2013*

- In reading—
 - 25% of charters outperformed traditional public schools.
 - 56% of the charters produced no significant difference.
- In math—
 - 29% of charters outperformed traditional public schools in math.
 - 40% produced no significant difference.
- States willing to close low performers had the best overall results.
 - In D.C., children attending D.C. charter schools did better in both reading and math when compared with those attending traditional public schools.
 - Louisiana, Tennessee and Rhode Island also showed strong results.
 - Nevada, Ohio, Oregon and Pennsylvania were among the weakest performing.

“The charter sector is getting better on average, but not because existing schools are getting dramatically better; it is mainly driven by opening higher performing schools and by closing those that underperform.”

“Our analysis suggests that the standards of performance are set too low, as evidenced by the large number of underperforming charter schools that persist.”

“More focus is required of authorizers and charter school governing boards to set high performance and accountability standards and hold charter schools to them.”

Next Steps

- Student performance at many state charter schools has considerable room for improvement.
- The SCSC is working to finalize a comprehensive performance framework that will make academic, financial, and operational accountability expectations even more transparent for schools and stakeholders.
- The goal is for each commissioner, governing board, parent, and student to better understand how a school is performing on an annual basis.

Questions

