



Indiana Department of Education
SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS



Accountability for Drop-Out Recovery High Schools

December 5, 2012

Agenda

- Dropout characteristics
- Alternative accountability challenges
- Why the A-F Model doesn't work for high schools serving dropouts
- Priorities for development of IDOE's framework
- Overview of proposed framework



Dropout Characteristics

- Nationally, an estimated 6.7 million youth, aged 16-24, have left high school without a diploma
 - About 9% of all youth in the U.S.
 - In Indiana, about **1 out of 5** students do not graduate each year
- Of those who re-enroll in an Adult Education Program after dropping out the first time, nationally, **only 1 out of 5 will earn a diploma**
- Common characteristics:
 - Young parents or caretakers
 - Homeless teens
 - Involvement in the criminal justice system
 - History of school disengagement (esp. absenteeism)



Indiana DWD Data

- Overall graduation rate of ABE students: 18%
 - Includes graduation with either a diploma or a GED
- 46% of ABE students exit prior to graduation
 - The remaining 37% are retained in programs
- Graduation rate of students who entered at a 9th grade level or above: 31%
- 39% of students who entered at a 9th grade level or above exit prior to graduation
 - The remaining 30% are retained in programs



Agenda

- Dropout characteristics
- Alternative accountability challenges
- Why the A-F Model doesn't work for high schools serving dropouts
- Priorities for development of IDOE's framework
- Overview of proposed framework



Alternative Framework Challenges

- Calculating a graduation rate for returning dropouts who are not in current “cohorts”
- Choosing appropriate and measurable accountability indicators
- Setting high, yet realistic, standards
 - All students can learn and succeed, but we also need to level the playing field for those dealing with adult circumstances
- Ensuring that the framework, as applied, differentiates failing schools
- Dis-incentivizing traditional schools from “dumping” weaker students



Agenda

- Dropout characteristics
- Alternative accountability challenges
- Why the A-F Model doesn't work for high schools serving dropouts
- Priorities for development of the IDOE's framework
- Overview of proposed framework



Indiana's A-F Model for High Schools

- **Graduation Rate:** 4-year cohort graduation rate (will be modified to include bonuses and penalties in 2014-2015)
- **Proficiency:** English I & Algebra I ECA - passage rates for 10th grade cohort
- **Improvement**(bonus points): improvement in passage rate from 8th grade to 10th grade and from 10th grade to graduation
- **College & Career Readiness:** AP, IB, approved dual credit, or approved industry certification.



Why A-F Doesn't Fit Dropout Recovery HS

In General:

- Dropout Recovery high schools like Excel are most akin to 11th-and-12th grade-only high schools



Why A-F Doesn't Fit Dropout Recovery HS

- Proficiency of 10th Grade Cohort: Use of ECA passage rate for a **10th grade cohort** is not a good fit for dropout recovery high schools:
 - Dropout recovery high schools cannot consistently identify a 10th grade cohort, and often progress students at a much faster rate than traditional high schools.
 - Schools are only allowed 3 testing windows per year. This does not always align with enrollment pattern of non-traditional students.



Why A-F Doesn't Fit Dropout Recovery HS

- Improvement: No true 10th grade cohort, from which improvement rate is calculated.
 - May be impossible to establish 8th grade ISTEP+ baseline for some students.
- College & Career Readiness: Few students take AP/IB exams, but dual credit or industry certification likely applies, so this is less of an issue.
 - Excel Center requires students who receive a waiver to also have an industry certification



Excel Center: A Model for Quality

- Average age of student is 27, median age is 23, and the age range is 16-65
- Only 20% of students are in an active graduation cohort
- Emphasis is on graduating students with a Core 40 diploma rather than a GED
 - 23% of graduates receive a waiver diploma
 - All waiver grads are required to earn an industry certification
- Persistence is about 50% across Excel Center campuses, compared with 31% of students statewide who enter ABE programs at a 9th grade level or above
 - Students who persist can make rapid gains in credit recovery, motivated by the end goal of a better-paying job or post-secondary education.



Agenda

- Dropout characteristics
- Alternative accountability challenges
- Why the A-F Model doesn't work for high schools serving dropouts
- Priorities for development of IDOE's framework
- Overview of proposed framework



Priorities for Development of Alternative Framework

- Align as much as possible with existing A-F system
 - Assists with clarity of assessing school performance for general public
 - Helps avoid charges of “lower standards” for alternative schools
 - Allows for more streamlined data collection and reporting
- Engage stakeholder participation and support
- Maintain high academic standards
- Emphasize college and career readiness indicators
- Anticipate loopholes that might result in creation of “diploma mills”



Process for Development of Alternative Framework

- Gain approval from SBOE for alternative framework to be applied to any dropout recovery high school in future
- In December 2012, initiate the rule-making process to set forth the alternative indicators in administrative code
- Conduct an alternative accountability framework pilot during the 2012-13 academic year for all dropout recovery corporations in Indiana (e.g., Excel/Goodwill, DORS/Christel House)
- Adjust framework as needed based on pilot results
- Implement final framework beginning with the 2013-14 academic year
- Perform annual review of framework targets to ensure alignment with any state accountability framework changes



IDOE Accountability Framework for Drop-out Recovery Corporations: An Overview



Proposed Components of Alternative Framework

- Eligibility requirements to be assessed under alternative framework
- Performance indicators:
 1. **Graduation rate**
 2. **College and career readiness**
 3. **English 10 ECA – Pass rate for graduates**
 4. **Algebra I ECA – Pass rate for graduates**



Eligibility

- Model applies to corporations only, not to individual schools
 - In Indiana, charter schools are corporations
 - Traditional districts may choose to authorize a charter school if they wish to create this option in their communities
- Only corporations that have at least **60%** of the students enrolled within the corporation that 1) belong to a cohort that has already exited high school OR 2) are over the age of **18**, may be assessed under this model.
- Applies only to corporations serving a combination of grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12.



Eligibility

- The authorizer will apply for alternative accountability on behalf of the corporation to the SBOE; if approved, the IDOE will calculate the alternative score.
- The corporation will continue to receive a traditional A-F grade; the alternative framework grade will give another assessment of performance that more accurately reflects the work of the school to serve these students.
- The SBOE will publish two grades on the annual report card and on the IDOE website: traditional and alternative model grade.



Eligibility

- Additional barriers in place to prevent the creation of “silo” corporations:
 - Districts authorizing a “silo” dropout recovery corporation would have to enroll three out-of-cohort students for every two in-cohort students in order to meet eligibility requirements
 - Founding a “silo” corporation is a time-consuming, resource-intensive process
 - Two count days



Graduation Rate

Any student that belongs to an active graduation cohort will remain in that cohort:

- Under Indiana law, a corporation must be held responsible for an in-cohort student's graduation rate. It is most logical for this student's outcome to apply to the corporation in which the student is currently enrolled.

If a student is in a cohort that has already graduated, or is over the age of 18:

- Student will be reassigned to an expected graduation cohort based on the grade level assessment reported by the dropout recovery corporation at enrollment (through a combination of transcribed, verifiable ECA scores and TABE results).
- If a student graduates prior to their reassigned expected graduation cohort, then that student is “banked” until the year in which the student's reassigned cohort is to graduate.

There is no day requirement for these students to be included in the reassigned graduation rate calculations.



Graduation Rate

Procedure for cohort re-assignment for over-age students (based on Excel Center formula):

1. Each student starts with 4 points (senior status).

2. If the student has failed or not taken either ECA or GQE, subtract 1 point.

3. If enrolled before Jan. needing >10 credits, or after Jan. needing >5, subtract 1 point.

4. If TABE grade level equivalency is below 7, subtract 1 point.

0-1 points = Freshman
2 points = Sophomore
3 points = Junior
4 points = Senior

Note: The authorizer will verify that cohorts are being re-assigned in this manner. The rationale for any grade placements that differ from this process must be documented and explained by the corporation to the authorizer.



Graduation Rate

- Schools may only make cohort re-assignment into grades 9 through 12:
 - Disallows schools from “stashing” students below grade 9
 - Prevents initial assignment of students to 13th grade in order to avoid accountability



Graduation Rate

- Corporations are required to submit annual student transfer reports to the authorizer, detailing individual transfer codes.
 - Acceptable transfer codes include: graduation, drop out, and transfer for in-cohort students only to a different school corporation.
- A student transfer audit will be automatically triggered and conducted by the authorizer if students are transferred for any others reasons as reported on the mobility code report. The authorizer will report the outcome of any such audit to the corporation and to the SBOE, and the graduation rate data set will be adjusted per authorizer recommendation to include any students who transfer from the corporation for unacceptable reasons.



Graduation Rate Targets

Based on revised cohorts, each school will be issued a *PRELIMINARY* graduation rate, with the following point totals:

Grad Rate	Points	Justification
75.0 – 100%	4.00	2010-11 statewide average non-waiver graduation rate = 78.9%.
67.5 – 74.9%	3.50	
60.0 – 67.4%	3.00	61% of ABE students who entered with a 9 th grade level or above as measured by TABE are retained for at least one grade level
52.5 – 59.9%	2.50	
45.0 – 52.4%	2.00	
37.5 – 44.9%	1.50	
30.0 – 37.4%	1.00	DWD graduation rate (diploma or GED) of ABE students who entered with a 9 th grade level or above as measured by TABE is 31%. DWD general persistence rate is 37%.
Less than 30%	0.00	Overall ABE graduation rate is 18%.



Graduation Rate **BONUS**

Score shall be raised by **1 point** if **13.2%** of students that did not graduate within four (4) years do so in five (5) years.

- Aligned with target of 13.2% in the traditional A-F framework; the target will be reassessed after the pilot results are available
- The bonus of 1 point is double the traditional A-F bonus of 0.5 point
- Avoids double-counting any students but gives credit for graduations which occur outside of the revised cohort
- Gives credit to students who leave drop-out recovery and return—perhaps multiple times, due to difficult life circumstances



College/Career Readiness (CCR)

- This section of the alternative model will be the same as under the traditional A-F system, except with higher, more rigorous targets.
- *The model considers the percentage of graduates that meet **one** of the following criteria:*
 1. Score 3, 4, or 5 on at least one AP exam;
 2. Score 4, 5, 6, or 7 on at least one IB exam;
 3. Earn three (3) verifiable college credits from the Priority Liberal Arts or CTE course lists; or
 4. Earn an IDOE-approved industry certification



College/Career Readiness (CCR) Targets

CCR Points are assigned using the following targets:

Percentage of students	Points	Justification
50.0 – 100%	4.00	Targets are 2x higher than the A-F CCR targets.
36.8 – 49.9%	3.00	
23.4 – 36.7%	2.00	
10.0 – 23.3%	1.00	
00.0 – 9.9%	00.00	



ECA Passage Rates

The model takes ECA, ISTAR or GQE proficiency rates for *graduates* into account:

- Mirrors A-F consideration of proficiency rates for 10th grade cohort, but considers *graduating students* instead of 10th grade cohort
- Allows inclusion of ECA, ISTAR, or GQE from earlier enrollment in past schools. (Similar to 8th grade inclusion of ECA scores for High School A-F model.)
- Dis-incentivizes overuse of waiver diplomas by lower-quality “diploma mill” schools



ECA Passage Rates Targets

ECA Passage Rate Points are assigned using the following targets:

Pass Rate	Points	Justification
90 – 100%	4.00	Aligned with current A-F targets
85 – 89.9%	3.50	
80 – 84.9%	3.00	
75 – 79.9%	2.50	
70 – 74.9%	2.00	
65 – 69.9%	1.50	
60 – 64.9%	1.00	
Less than 60%	0.00	



ECA Passage Rates BONUS

- An ECA proficiency improvement bonus would allow opportunity for a bonus that is not tied to graduation rates; however, data that would guide selection of targets is currently limited
- We will ask pilot participants to track the following:
 - Improvement in ECA passage percentage from when students entered, until they exited, for three different data points (students retained for 81 days, 90 days, and 100 days)
 - 81 days is half of the 162-day requirement
 - Days must be consecutive; no pause to reflect students who drop out and return later on
- Justification: Though average growth in traditional school corporations is one year in 162 days, average growth at Excel is two years in 162 days.
 - But since different corporations will have a different length of and/or number of terms, we will capture data across three points in time.



Final Grade

- Apply the alternative accountability model to all students.
- Average the final weighted scores together from the four indicators for a Preliminary Grade.

Indicator	Weight
Graduation Rate	40%
College & Career Readiness	30%
English 10 ECA Pass Rate for Graduates	15%
Algebra I ECA Pass Rate for Graduates	15%

- **Final penalty: Subtract one (1) point if fewer than 80% of students who fail the ECA after two administrations receive a waiver diploma without also receiving an IDOE-approved industry certification.**
 - This incentivizes graduating students with higher-quality diplomas
 - In Year 2, the threshold will increase to **87.5%**, and from Year 3 forward, the threshold will be set at **95.0%**



Final Grade

Assign a final accountability grade based on the following table:

Final Overall Score	Assigned Grade
3.51 – 4.00 points	A
3.00 – 3.50 points	B
2.00 – 2.99 points	C
1.00 – 1.99 points	D
0.00 – 0.99 points	F

Ranges are aligned with current A-F ranges



Acknowledgements

- Goodwill Education Initiatives
- Public Impact
- Indiana Charter School Board



Discussion



Resources

Barber, V. (2005). *Mapping the Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM)* [PowerPoint]. California Department of Education. Retrieved from: www.edcoe.k12.ca.us/supts/documents/11-05PowerPoint.ppt

Belfield, C.R., Levin, H.M., & Rosen, R. (2012). *The Economic Value of Opportunity Youth*. Corporation for National and Community Service. Available at: http://www.serve.gov/new-images/council/pdf/econ_value_opportunity_youth.pdf

California Department of Education webpage (2012). *Alternative schools accountability model: CalEdFacts*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/am/cefasm.asp>

Carver, R.C., Lewis, L., & Tice, P. (2010). *Alternative schools and programs for public school students at risk of educational failure: 2007-08*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010026.pdf>

Colorado Department of Education. (2012). *Accountability for alternative education campuses: Policy guidance*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/Downloads/AECPolicyGuidance.pdf>

Ernst, J. L. (2010). *Are alternative growth goals warranted for Colorado's alternative education schools and students?* Denver, CO: Colorado League of Charter Schools. Retrieved from: http://www.charterschoolquality.org/media/1175/AlternativeGrowthGoals_Colorado.pdf

McIlroy, L. (2012). *Proposed parallel A-F model for alternative schools*. Arizona Department of Education. On file with author.



Resources

Medler, A. (2011). *Understanding performance in charter schools that serve large proportions of at-risk students: Accountability for alternative education campuses*. On file with author.

National Alternative Education Association. (2009) *Exemplary practices in alternative education: Indicators of quality programming*. Greenwood, AK: Author. Retrieved from: http://the-naea.org/Exemplary_Practices_in_Alternative_Education/

Rath, B., Rock, K., & Laerriere, A. (2012). *Helping Over-Age, Under-Credited Youth Succeed: Making the Care for Innovative Education Strategies*. Our Piece of the Pie, Inc. Available at: <http://www.opp.org/docs/Helping%20Over-Age%20Under-Credited%20Youth%20Succeed%20-%20OPP,%20July%202012.pdf>

Reyna, R. (2012). *Creating and College and Career Readiness Accountability Model* [PowerPoint presentation]. National Governors Association. Available at: <http://www.aypf.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/documents/Ryan%27s%20Final%20Slides.pdf>

Rumberger, R.W. (2011). *Dropping Out: Why Students Drop Out of School and What Can Be Done About It*. Harvard University Press.

Silva, E. *Bulding a Dropout Recovery Movement*. Youth Transitions Funding Group, Connected by 25 Blog. Available at: <http://cby25.blogspot.com/2012/04/building-dropout-recovery-movement.html>

Supharukchinda, S. (2012). *District and School Accountability in Colorado* [PowerPoint presentation]. Colorado Dept. of Education. Available at: <http://www.aypf.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/documents/Somoh%27s%20Final%20Slides.pdf>

Yost, D. *Interim Report on Student Attendance Data and Accountability, State of Ohio*. Ohio State Auditor's Office. Available at: <http://www.ohioauditor.gov>



Existing Alternative Frameworks: Trends

- Assess the alternative school first under existing traditional framework
- Add or substitute measures in traditional frameworks, especially those that address:
 - Mission-focused goals
 - Student engagement
- Redistribute the relative weighting or change cut-points within traditional accountability frameworks
- Provide opportunities to earn bonus points
- Require a nationally-normed assessment to obtain more accurate information on growth and status
- Place greater emphasis on post-secondary readiness



Examples of Existing Alternative Frameworks

Arizona
California
Colorado



Arizona

The recently adopted accountability framework for alternative schools, including those for dropout recovery, includes:

- Growth (weight=70%):
 - Pooled three-year median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) score
 - Improvement in performance level (high school students)
- Proficiency (standard or alternative state assessment) (weight=30%).

The framework awards additional points based on:

- Percentage of English Language Learner students reclassified as fluent
- Graduation rate
- “Academic persistence” (the percentage of students “who return to any public school the following school year.”)



California

2000-2009: Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM):

- An alternative school chooses 3 performance indicators from a BOE-approved list:
 - Improved Student Behavior
 - Suspension
 - Student Punctuality
 - Sustained Daily Attendance
 - Student Persistence
 - Attendance
 - Writing
 - Reading
 - Mathematics
 - Promotion to Next Grade
 - Course Completion (or average courses completed)
 - Credit Completion (or average credits completed)
 - High School Graduation
 - GED Completion
 - GED Section Completion



California (continued)

- **2011:** A new law allows 10 Dropout Recovery high schools “to report the results of an individual pupil growth model that is proposed by the school and certified by the Superintendent...[who]...shall...certify [the] model if it meets all of the following criteria:
 - (1) The model measures learning based on valid and reliable nationally normed or criterion-referenced reading and mathematics tests.
 - (2) The model measures skills and knowledge aligned with state standards.
 - (3) The model measures the extent to which a pupil scored above an expected amount of growth based on the individual pupil’s initial achievement score.
 - (4) The model demonstrates the extent to which a school is able to accelerate learning on an annual basis.



Colorado

- All AECs receive data under the traditional accountability framework, but accountability is based on a separate rubric
- Alternative rubric uses 3 of the same performance indicators with 1 modified indicator
 - Different weights and cut-points
- Districts may submit supplemental measures from a specified list for the DOE's review.



Colorado (continued)

Mandatory standard indicators and measures:

- **Academic Achievement (weight=15%):** percentage of students proficient in reading, math, writing, and science
- **Academic Growth (weight=35%):** median student growth percentiles (SGPs) in reading, math, and writing
- **Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (weight=30%):** completion rate, dropout rate, average composite ACT score (compared to how students in other Colorado alternative schools score)
- **Student Engagement (weight=20%):** attendance rate and truancy rate



Colorado

Menu of Optional, Supplementary Measures:

- Graduation rate (4, 5, 6, or 7-year cohort graduation rate)
- Successful transition (“percent of students experiencing a positive transition after attending this school”)
- Post-completion success (“the percent providing proof of planned college enrollment, enlistment, or employment”)
- Workforce readiness (based on tests like Work Keys or Test of Adult Basic Education)
- Credit/course completion (percent of students who complete the number of credits/courses necessary to remain on track to graduate)
- Student re-engagement (students who had dropped out, but who re-enrolled)
- Returning students
- Socio-emotional or psychological adjustment (based on “reliable, research-based psychosocial instruments”).

