

## Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2014: Notes for Appendices B and C

### 2012-13 Adequate Yearly Progress Status and State Performance Ratings

Like brick-and-mortar schools, full-time virtual schools are evaluated annually for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The AYP definition is based on expectations for growth in student achievement. The performance standards must increase over time until they reach 100 percent in 2013–14. AYP is thus obtained for full-time virtual schools. The AYP rating takes into account the following components: state reading and mathematics assessment results; state reading and mathematics assessment participation rates; attendance rates for elementary and middle schools; and graduation rates for secondary schools. California and Iowa are the only two states with full-time virtual schools that reported results based on AYP.

Forty two states have successfully obtained waivers of the current AYP calculations and performance targets in order to focus on robust accountability systems that meet the intent and purposes of the ESEA statute. Such states have introduced growth measures in their states' grading or rating categories. The resulting performance ratings obtained from these states reflects the new accountability system.

It should be noted, however, that state rating categories vary considerably. Some assign a letter grade, or calculate a composite performance index score for overall academic performance, while others provide a mixture of growth, performance, and post-secondary readiness and success. Often, state ratings are based on the use of multiple measures, with some states like Colorado deriving their ratings based on the calculation of student growth percentiles (a growth model) as well as a calculation of adequate growth (or growth-to-proficiency). Below are links to state accountability systems:

#### *Alaska*

<http://education.alaska.gov/reportcardtothepublic/>

<http://education.alaska.gov/akaccountability/InfographicSD.pdf>

Schools are assigned a ranking based on the total number of percentage points earned on the Alaska School Performance Index (ASPI) out of a possible 100. Based on the percentage of overall points earned, schools received one of five star ratings: 5 stars (94-100%); 4 stars (85-93.99%); 3 stars (65-84.99%); 2 stars (55-64.99%); and 1 star (0-54.99%). School performance ratings are based on multiple measures of academic performance: academic achievement, school progress, attendance rate, graduation rate, and college and career readiness.

<http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/virtual-schools-annual-2014>

## *Arkansas*

<http://arc.arkansas.gov/ql/k12>

<http://www.arkansased.org/divisions/communications/pressroom>

Arkansas schools received one of five performance ratings: Exemplary; Achieving; Needs improvement; Needs improvement focus; and Needs improvement priority. Schools are held accountable for the proficiency gap or growth gap on Benchmark or End-of-Course exams and the graduation rate gap for all students and student subgroups.

## *Arizona*

<http://www.azed.gov/research-evaluation/a-f-accountability/>

<http://www.azed.gov/research-evaluation/files/2013/08/2013-a-f-letter-grades-guide-for-parents.pdf>

Arizona's A-F letter grade system evaluates both academic outcomes and academic growth.

## *California*

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ar/>

California's accountability system measures the performance and progress of a school that are based on results of statewide tests at grades two through twelve. A school's Base and Growth Academic Performance Index (API) is a composite number representing the results of these tests. AYP results are also reported.

## *Colorado*

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview>

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/coloradogrowthmodel>

Schools are assigned a ranking based on the total number of percentage points earned on the School Performance Framework (also known as the Colorado Growth Model) out of a possible 100. Based on the percentage of overall points earned, Colorado schools/districts received one of five performance ratings: distinguished (80-100%); meets expectations (51-79%); accredited with improvement plan (40-50%); accredited with priority improvement (34-39%); and accredited with turnaround plan (up to 33%). School performance ratings are based on multiple measures of academic performance: academic growth, academic proficiency, academic growth gaps, and post-secondary and workforce readiness.

<http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/virtual-schools-annual-2014>

### *Washington, D.C.*

<http://osse.dc.gov/service/dc-esea-accountability-classification-forms-amc-listings-flexibility-waiver-highlights>

Schools are assigned to an accountability category (Tiers 1 to 3) based on overall achievement and progress in closing achievement gaps.

### *Florida*

<http://doeweb-prd.doe.state.fl.us/eds/nclbspar/year1213/main1213.cfm>

<http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/>

Florida's school accountability system relies on a performance index to assign each school an A-to-F letter grade.

### *Georgia*

<http://gosa.georgia.gov/report-card>

Georgia new school accountability system reports achievement results by grade level, student group and assessment/exam. The system provides feedback to schools and school districts on: a) the percentage of students meeting state standards for each assessment; and b) student groups making progress toward the final performance goal.

### *Hawaii*

<http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/AdvancingEducation/StriveHIPerformanceSystem/Pages/home.aspx>

Hawaii's new school accountability system uses multiple measures of student achievement, growth and readiness for success after high school, including: reading and math scores; end-of-course science assessments; ACT scores; high school graduation rates; and college enrollment.

### *Idaho*

<http://devapps.sde.idaho.gov/reportcard>

Idaho's school accountability system relies on a five-star rating system to assign each school an overall score ranging from 0-100. Under the new system, the state uses measures such as academic growth, graduation rates and indicators of success in college and the workforce.

<http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/virtual-schools-annual-2014>

## *Illinois*

<http://illinoisreportcard.com/>

Schools earn points for their performance and progress on a variety of student outcome measures including: performance and trends on standardized tests; student growth; attendance rate; and dropout and on-track rates.

## *Indiana*

<http://www.doe.in.gov/accountability/f-accountability>

Indiana's school accountability system relies on a performance index to assign each school an A-to-F letter grade.

## *Iowa*

<https://www.educateiowa.gov/sites/files/ed/documents/2013StateReportCard.pdf>

[https://www.educateiowa.gov/education-statistics#State\\_Report\\_Cards](https://www.educateiowa.gov/education-statistics#State_Report_Cards)

Iowa's accountability system requires all school districts/schools to annually demonstrate improvement towards the state's annual goals in reading and mathematics. To be deemed proficient schools must earn a standard score that meets or exceeds the state-designated standard score. Schools are also evaluated to determine whether or not they make a year's growth from one year to the next.

## *Kansas*

<http://svapp15586.ksde.org/rcard/>

Schools are awarded points based on the state's new accountability system (Assessment Performance Index or API). The API relies on multiple indicators: academic performance, academic growth, proficiency gap reduction and reduction in the percentage of students scoring below proficiency.

## *Massachusetts*

<http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/reportcard/rc.aspx?linkid=37&orgcode=01140900&fycode=2013&orgtypecode=6&>

<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/accountability/>

Massachusetts' new accountability system relies on a 100-point performance and performance index (PPI) aimed at narrowing proficiency gaps. The PPI is based on multiple indicators: narrowing proficiency gaps in ELA, mathematics, and science; growth in ELA and mathematics; annual dropout rates; and cohort graduation rates.

<http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/virtual-schools-annual-2014>

## *Michigan*

<http://www.michigan.gov/cepi>

[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/ScorecardGuide\\_426897\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/ScorecardGuide_426897_7.pdf)

Schools are assigned a ranking based on the total number of percentage points earned on the Michigan Scorecard Colors and Points System. Based on the percentage of overall points earned, schools/districts are rated with a five-color scale: Green—attain 85% or greater of possible points; Lime—attain at least 70% but less than 85% of possible points; Yellow—attain at least 60% but less than 70% of possible points; Orange—attain at least 50% but less than 60% of possible points; and Red—attain less than 50% of possible points.

## *Minnesota*

<http://minncan.org/report-cards/>

School performance ratings (Minnesota's new Multiple Measurement Rating or MMR system) are based on multiple measures of academic performance: proficiency; student growth, and achievement gap reduction, and graduation rate.

## *New Hampshire*

<http://my.doe.nh.gov/profiles/profile.aspx?s=28605&year=2013>

New Hampshire's schools are assigned to an accountability category based on overall achievement and progress in closing achievement gaps.

## *Nevada*

<http://www.nevadareportcard.com/di/>

Schools are assigned a ranking within a five-star performance rating system.

## *Ohio*

<http://reportcard.education.ohio.gov/Pages/default.aspx>

<http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Data/Accountability-Resources/Explanation-of-Ohio-s-new-Report-Card.pdf.aspx>

An overall letter grade for the school or school district is calculated based on components/categories: achievement, progress, gap closing, graduation rate, K-3 literacy and postsecondary readiness. The six components/categories are considered collectively to determine the school and school district ratings.

<http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/virtual-schools-annual-2014>

## *Oklahoma*

<http://www.ok.gov/sde/accountability-state-testing-results>

<https://sdeweb01.sde.ok.gov/Transparency/ReportCards/>

Oklahoma's school accountability system relies on a performance index to assign each school an A-to-F letter grade in each of the following four categories: overall achievement on all state assessments, progress/growth in reading and math for all students, progress/growth in reading and math for the lowest-performing 25 percent of students, and whole school performance.

## *Oregon*

<http://www.ode.state.or.us/data/reportcard/reports.aspx>

In Oregon, schools are eligible for Model, Focus or Priority status. Schools are assigned to an accountability category (Levels 1 to 4) based on overall achievement and progress in closing

achievement gaps. The new accountability system is based on multiple measures: academic achievement, academic growth, subgroup growth, and (for high schools) graduation and subgroup graduation rates.

## *Pennsylvania*

<http://www.paschoolperformance.org/SelectCounty>

Schools are evaluated on achievement using the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA), participation in those tests, and on attendance or graduation rate.

## *South Carolina*

<https://www.ed.sc.gov/data/report-cards/2013/district.cfm?ID=4701>

South Carolina's school accountability system relies on a performance index to assign each school an A-to-F letter grade ranging from 0-100.

## *Tennessee*

<https://www.tn.gov/education/reportcard/2013.shtml>

[http://www.tn.gov/education/accountability/doc/acct\\_info\\_sheet.pdf](http://www.tn.gov/education/accountability/doc/acct_info_sheet.pdf)

Tennessee uses assessment data to measure student growth through the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System, or TVAAS. School performance is measured by the percentage of students meeting annual targets. Schools are held accountable for meeting: a) achievement targets based on graduation rates and student proficiency in reading,

<http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/virtual-schools-annual-2014>

mathematics and science; and b) achievement gap closure targets that aim to narrow gaps among several student subgroup comparisons.

### *Texas*

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/index.html>

An index score between zero and 100 is calculated for each of the four indices: student achievement, student progress, closing performance gaps, and postsecondary readiness. The four index scores are considered collectively to determine the school and school district ratings.

### *Utah*

<http://www.schools.utah.gov/data/Educational-Data/Accountability-School-Performance.aspx>

In the area of potential for academic growth, 200 points are possible in all students, and 100 points are possible for below proficient student growth. In achievement, schools are awarded up to 150 points for the percentage of students who are at or above proficient and 150 points for readiness, or the graduation rate calculation.

### *Washington*

<http://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/summary.aspx?year=2012-13>

Washington's new accountability system revolves around Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs).

### *Wisconsin*

<http://reportcards.dpi.wi.gov/>

Wisconsin schools receive one of five accountability ratings based on an overall score that result from performance in the following indicators: student achievement; student growth; closing gaps in performance between specific student groups; and post-secondary readiness.

## **Other Variables**

### *State Rating*

Based on a full-time virtual school's performance on AYP or new state accountability system created through NCLB waivers, a full-time virtual school is assigned one of three possible rankings: Academically Acceptable (the highest possible ranking), Academically

<http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/virtual-schools-annual-2014>

Unacceptable (the lowest possible ranking); in rare instances, the category Not Rated is used.

### *Graduation rate*

Individual school graduation rates are obtained from state education agencies and key state contacts. This report adopts the most widely-used measure of school grade point for the high school graduation rate, namely, “On Time Graduation Rate.” This measure is based on a count of students who enter the system, and then follows the students’ progress in school. Thus, “on-time graduates” are graduates who earn diplomas within four years of entering the 9th grade. The total possible points that can be awarded for the graduation rate component is 100 points.

### *Enrollment*

The enrollment figures are collected according to grade, gender, and racial/ethnic group. This variable provides a measure of school size (i.e. the number of students enrolled), the school’s grade organization, and its racial/ethnic composition.