

NEIL ABERCROMBIE
GOVERNOR



CATHERINE PAYNE
INTERIM CHAIRPERSON

STATE OF HAWAII
STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL COMMISSION
(‘AHA KULA HO‘ĀMANA)
1111 Bishop Street, Suite 516, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Tel: 586-3775 Fax: 586-3776

RECOMMENDATION SUBMITTAL

DATE: February 13, 2014

TO: Catherine Payne, Vice Chairperson and Interim Chairperson

FROM: Catherine Payne, Chairperson
Performance and Accountability Committee

AGENDA ITEM: Action on School-Specific Measures Within Academic Performance
Framework Regarding Assigned Weights and Tiered Weighting System

I. DESCRIPTION

That the Commission adopt a two-tiered weighting system for School-Specific Measures with the requirements and rubric described below.

II. AUTHORITY

Pursuant to Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”) §302D-2, “[a]ny charter school holding a charter to operate under Part IV, subpart D, of chapter 302A, as that subpart existed before July 11, 2006, and any charter school holding a charter to operate under chapter 302B as it existed before June 19, 2012, shall be considered a charter school for the purposes of this chapter under a charter contract with the commission unless the charter contract is revoked, transferred to another authorizer, or not renewed, or the charter school voluntarily closes.”

Section 4.1.1 of the State Public School Charter Contract provides that “the School’s academic performance under this Contract shall be evaluated based on the School’s record of performance according to the State accountability system as may be amended from time to time consistent with State and federal requirements and shall give due consideration to the School’s performance based on any Commission-approved school-specific indicators adopted by the School.”

III. BACKGROUND

As approved by the Ad Hoc Committee, acceptable and appropriate School-Specific Measures are student centered, measuring content, skill, opinion, or participation; and is data derived from students, parents, and/or teachers. Based on previous submissions of schools’ self-evaluations and

engagement with individual schools, the list below outlines some of the possible measures and their anticipated assigned tiers.

Type	Example Measures	Value	Notes
Quantitative Measures	NWEA/Star/SchoolRise/Achieve3000/Galileo	25% Tier	Submitted assessment reports derived directly from the evaluation program
	NAEP	25% Tier	
	DIBBLES	25% Tier	
	AP Exams	25% Tier	
	Self-created formative assessments	25% Tier	
	GED/Credit Capture programs	25% Tier	
	College Work and Readiness Assessment	25% Tier	
	SAT/PSAT	25% Tier	
	Explore/Plan (Non-Accountability)	25% Tier	
Qualitative Measures	School Quality Survey	10% Tier	*Duty of verifying the validity and reliability of survey data falls upon the school. *Performance ratings and associated rubrics to be submitted with the proposed measure.
	Newly developed In-House assessments.	10% Tier	
	School Specific Survey	10% Tier	
	Recurring Enrollment	10% Tier	
	Teacher Retention	10% Tier	
	Opinion and Participation Measures	10% Tier	

Characteristics of Each Tier

Staff recommended a two-tiered system with one tier assigned the highest allowable weight, and a second tier with a lower allowable assigned weight for the Academic Performance Framework.

Below are the expected characteristics for each tier. The highest tier (the 25% Tier) comprised of the highest weight allocation, assumes the highest degrees of impact, rigor, and reliability for each proposed measure. These factors, in addition to the stage of development, the amount of longitudinal data available and its alignment to the schools mission, determine whether a measure falls into the highest tier. Measures falling short of these criteria will be considered as 10% Tier measures for the first year and could be revisited when all criteria are met. 25% Tier measures are approved after discussion with the Commission staff and all associated reports, supporting data, and rubrics have been submitted.

10% Tier measures allow for flexibility and innovation. While also student centered, a 10% Tier measure can be in its development state and can be adjusted from year to year. These measures allow time for development of the reporting mechanism and associated scales and rubrics.

25% Tier Measures	10% Tier Measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reportable Quantitatively • Student outcome centered • Sets Annual targets • Leaves Room for improvement • Consistent to performance • Performance data derived by student performance or assessment. • Significantly impacts a large number of students • Critical to the school meeting its mission/vision • High degree of rigor in the measure • Longitudinal Data is available • Always Externally validated • Five year commitment to the measure • Never Experimental • Approved after formal discussion with the Commission staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reportable Quantitatively • Student Outcome Centered • Sets annual targets • Leaves Room for improvement • Consistent to performance • Data generated by Student, Parent, or Teacher by way of survey. • Impacts small to moderate group(s) of students • Aligned to mission/vision • Lesser degree of rigor • Longitudinal data is sparse • Can be internally validated • Can change from year to year • Can be experimental • Less formal discussion

Tiered Weight Rubric

	10% Tier	25% Tier
Data Provider (Student, Parent, Teacher)	Data Derived from student, parent, and/or teacher	Data results from student assessments
Rigor	Measure indicates a low to moderate degree of rigor	Measure indicates proven high degree of rigor
Impact	Impact of the measure is small to moderate compared to the overall population	Significantly impacts students
Stage of Development	Measure is in first or second year of implementation	Measure has been implemented at least three years at the school
Data	Reporting standard, rubrics and performance scales in development	Fully developed reports, rubrics and performance scales based on at least three years of data

Schools will submit singular or combinations of measures for approval. Based on the outlined criteria for each tier, staff will determine the appropriate weighting for each measure within each school’s proposal.

Process

Schools will submit School-Specific Measure(s) to staff for feedback and approval. Staff will review each proposal and apply the aforementioned criteria to determine the appropriate tier, if either, for each measure. If a school submits more than one measure, staff will use the same method on each measure. No combination of measures will exceed the maximum weight allowance for a School-Specific Measure. Staff will contact the school for feedback and agreement in determining the appropriate assigned weighting.

IV. DECISION MAKING STATEMENT

Staff recommended a system comprised of two tiers: one comprised of the most rigorous and impactful measures, and the other tier comprised of developmental and less rigorous measures. This system is preferable as it allows schools the flexibility to develop and test their own internal measures and also factor in the highly impactful assessment measures currently collected at the school. Staff proposed that the most rigorous and impactful measures be a 25% Tier measure (with a corresponding 25% weight) and the developmental and less rigorous measure be a 10% Tier measure (with a corresponding 10% weight).

The Committee adopted staff's recommendations as described above.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Motion to the Commission:

“Moved that the Commission approve a two-tiered weighting system with the requirements and rubric described in this submittal and with 10% Tier and a 25% Tier.”