ITEMS SUBJECT TO STATE BOARD APPROVAL

• AOI schools
• Alternative schools
  • CCRI graduation rate component
  • Three year accountability transition plan
Accountability of

ARIZONA ONLINE INSTRUCTION
Arizona Online Instruction

**In accountability**

- All letter graded AOIs were charter
  - Five AOIs letter graded
- Subject to all metrics:
  - Growth
  - Reading/Math proficiency
  - Graduation rate
  - Percent tested
  - Dropout Rate
  - ELL

**Characteristics of data**

- Large proportion of dual enrolled students
- Credit recovery vs. credit acceleration students
- Attendance calculated in minutes
- Lacks a traditional calendar
- Extended EOY window
### Why not use the same models?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Model</th>
<th>Alternative Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Largely excludes non-FAY students</td>
<td>• Designed for schools serving a minimum percentage of DEFINED student groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business rules designed for a true “traditional” “brick and mortar” (BM) schools</td>
<td>• Online education serves multiple purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Small schools data pooling not representative of high student mobility</td>
<td>• No subgroup data used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outstanding Questions

- Are 2014 AOI letter grades final in late receipts only?
- How to validate GRADUATION RATE data?
- Where does a CCRI fit?
- Can parent/student SURVEYS enhance accountability data?
- Accountability for Reading & Math students only?
AOI Accountability: Possible Elements

- Percent Passing FAY only
- Percent Passing ALL students
- Improvement
- SGP All
- SGP B25
- CCRI Graduation Rate Course data
- Persistence
- ELL
- Dropout
- Survey Data?
New Approach to Data: Graduation Rate

• FY2014 letter grades will reflect increased graduation rate accountability
  • FY2015: 15% graduation & 10% course data
• Improve graduation rate **measurement**
  • Contributions to graduation of credit recovery students
  • Logistics of following dual-enrolled students
  • Possible adjustment of cohort definition for only non dual-enrolled students (FAY & non-FAY)
2014 A-F Letter Grades Alternative Schools Model

CCRI GRADUATION RATE COMPONENT
Current practice

- Additional points awarded outside the model (0 or 3)
- Average annual increase in school-level rate
- Uses only 5-year cohort graduation rate

### Graduation Rate Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Rate Criteria</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-Year Average of 5-Year Grad Rate ≥ 48%</td>
<td>0 or 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Year 5-Year Grad Rate ≥ 52%</td>
<td>1% Average Annual Point Increase</td>
<td>0 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Year 5-Year Grad Rate &lt; 52%</td>
<td>2% Average Annual Point Increase</td>
<td>0 or 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Board Approved CCRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Model</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15% 4-, 5-, 6-, &amp; 7-year cohort graduation rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Continued accountability for graduation rate
- 2014: Implement graduation rate component only
- 2015: Implement full CCRI to include C&C Participation/Success
2014 Integration

- Weights approved by SBE in 2014 would be carried into 2015
- Implement graduation component only
  - Allows further development and inclusion of course participation/success data
  - Eases transition for multiple criteria added to accountability
- Utilize 2014 STCC data as lagged data in 2015
- Continue to use lagged adjusted cohort calculation

Adj. cohort graduation rate = \[
\frac{\text{No. in cohort who graduated within X years}}{\text{Original cohort} + \text{Transfers in} - \text{Transfers out}}
\]
Possible Calculation Methods
## Method A: 4 to 6 year equally weighted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grad Year</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Point value</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-year</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>x .32</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>x .44</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-year</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>x .55</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-year</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x .58</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 points max</td>
<td></td>
<td>15pts (rounded)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROS
- Encourages on-time graduation policy
- Weighs 5 & 6 year completions as equally important

### CONS
- Exacerbates unlikely expectation to graduate “alt” student “on-time”
Method B:  
5 year weight = 6 year weight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grad Year</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Point value</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-year</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x .32</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>x .44</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-year</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>x .55</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-year</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x .58</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30 points max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 pts (rounded)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROS**
- Recognizes very real hindrances to on-time graduation
- 5- & 6-year grads make up largest group sizes

**CONS**
- Incongruous
- May marginalize younger and older students
2014 through 2016

TRANSITION OF ALT SCHOOL MODEL
Current Alternative Model & Letter Grading

Growth Score
70% weight

Composite Score
30% weight

Growth
‘ALL Students’
Pooled 3-yr Median SGP
(Grades 3-8 & 10)

Academic Outcomes
Percent Passing AIMS & AIMS A
• ELL
• Reclassification
• Graduation Rate
• Academic Persistence

Growth Improvement
Increase in AIMS Performance Level

*High school only
Alternative High Schools

2014
- AIMS %P 25%
- CCFI Grad 15%
- SGP ALL 30%
- Improve 30%

2015*
- SGP 25%
- AIMS %P 25%
- CCRI 25%
- Improve 25%

2016
- SGP ALL 25%
- New test 25%
- CCRI 25%
- Improve 25%

*Carry over 2014 assessment data and data reported for 2014 CCRI. Hold harmless.
Maintaining a Distribution-based Scale

- Continued use in 2014 and during transition
- Minimizes disruption to accountability norm for alt schools
- School grades change based on relative performance

GOAL:
- Establish a fixed scale for all models beginning with 2017 letter grades based on 2015 performance & 2016 distribution.
Possible Transition of Distribution Scale

2014
• Use distribution scale as it currently exists?

2015
• Use distribution scale as it currently exists?

2016
• Distribution scale as it currently exists & 2016 cut scores used for 2017?

2015 data will include:
• 2014 AIMS
• 2015 AZELLA & academic persistence
• Updated cohort graduation rates
• C&C Participation & Success data entered in FY 2014
Further A-F development

• Explore further criteria to establish A-F and A-F Alt model point scales during transition years

• Continuing to research UNIVERSAL college and career participation and success metrics
  • Deliver impact data to field winter FY2015

• Increase accessibility and utility of student and school-level data

• Collaborating with other states to ease transition of new assessments
What’s next?

• ADE continues to collect feedback from field regarding full CCRI and proposed scales
• Propose grad rate weights for alternative schools model to SBE
• Propose timeline and integration to SBE in March
  • Submitted timeline to USED
• LEAs continue reporting student-level course data through STCC
  • ADE further builds data storage capacity for other CCRI indicators (i.e. AP, ACT, NSC, ASVAB, etc.)