

**NC DPI**  
**Alternative Schools Accountability Model Webinar\_092914**

**Gattis: Ken Gattis**  
**Howard: Tammy Howard**  
**Sonneman: Curtis Sonneman**

Gattis: Ken Gattis with the Department of Public Instruction. And we're here to talk about the Alternative School Accountability Model. We will be recording the webinar today so that if somebody misses it they can go back and catch it. We'll post that online later on. Joining us are Dr. Tammy Howard, the director of accountability services. And we'll also have Faye Brown and Curtis Sonneman from accountability will also be on the webinar. And we'll start with Tammy.

Howard: Good afternoon and thank you for joining us. To begin with we would like to note that of course in recent years we've using a local options model for alternative school accountability. This model has been in place for many years, but with the elimination of the ABCs accountability model and with the creation of the school performance grades, it has been thought that this is opportune time to reconsider the accountability model for alternative schools.

According to the general statute for alternative schools with respect to school performance grades, the State Board of Education has the option that they can determine an alternative model rather than the A through F school performance grade model for alternative schools. So if appropriate, the board may modify the system to adapt to the specific characteristics of the alternative schools.

With that in mind, in August of this year we had a discussion with the State Board of Education and explained to them the current status of the local option accountability model for alternative schools, and the impact of eliminating the ABCs, as well as the potential impact of having the A through F school performance grades. We gathered feedback from the State Board of Education about their intent for evaluating alternative schools. And in general the state board agreed that these schools should have a different evaluation other than the A through F letter grades. It was acknowledged that another model should be designed for the alternative schools. And in that discussion, just to share very briefly, the point was made of the transient population of these schools, the small population for most of these schools, and those two factors present difficulty in applying the general A through F school performance grade model or any other accountability model for that matter to the alternative schools.

One of the things that the state board very clearly said to us was they wanted to make sure that we spent time getting input on what an optimal accountability model would be for alternative schools. So in the past couple of months we have spent our time doing that. And we've had some formal gathering and we've had some gathering. We in accountability have worked very closely with Dr. Ken Gattis, and we also have been sharing this information with different audiences across the state.

On September 23<sup>rd</sup> we shared this information with the accountability coordinators fall meeting. And on September 26<sup>th</sup> we presented this information to the North Carolina Association of Alternative Educators at their fall

conference. Today we're sharing this information with all of you during this webinar. We do want to emphasize that we are still in information gathering phase of this work and we want to make sure that we listen to and we gather all the potential information that all of you may have on your thoughts on what would work in this model and what would not work as well.

The plan at this point is to go to the state board at its November meeting and to share with them the proposal for a new accountability model for alternative schools. And one key to remind us all of is at that November we also anticipate having the state board action that would specify that alternative schools do not receive an A through F school performance grade for the school year 2013-14. I'm sure we're all familiar with the fact that schools were directed in 2013-14 to determine their local options and so we want that to remain in place for 2013-14. What we're really looking at is moving forward with 2014-15, the current school model.

So if the proposed model that we end with going to the board in November is approved by the board, then for this school year, for 2014-15, local options will not be collected. And the data collection processes will be reviewed and any changes that will be made will be provided to the field. We appreciate your patience as we work thorough this. The overall timeline was we really wanted the school performance grades to kind of settle down before we turned our attention to the Alternative School Accountability Model, so that is why we're at the juncture that we are today.

So with that I'm going to turn the over to Curtis Sonneman, who is going to walk us through the specifics of the model as it exists today. And of course this is not final and we of course are very much looking forward to having your input. And the end of the webinar when we'll have an opportunity for questions, and you make comments as well, as we go through on the feedback loop on the webinar. Both would be very helpful to us. So thank you. And Curtis.

Sonneman: Thank you very much. I've had an opportunity to present this a few times to—and some of you on the line may have seen this part of the presentation before. What I can say is let's start with talking about the new model in terms of it's really broken up into three individual components. And the first one is to determine how alternative schools want to participate in accountability reporting. The second one is how the data then is calculated for a current year within that—whatever model they choose. And the third one is then determining what that designation is for that alternative school.

So the first part is to determine how schools will participate in the accountability reporting. The first option that schools would have is to participate in A through F in the exact same way as all other schools. The next one would be to return all of the test results and other indicators back to attending schools and receive no designations. And the third is to participate in the alternative progress model.

So what that means in respect to the first one, participating in A through F. A school can elect to participate in the A through F system just as all of the other traditional schools are. All of the data that is in school performance grades would

be applied in the same way it had been in the past for A through F system. The school superintendent or local board would decide at the beginning of the school year as to whether they'd participate in this system.

The second option would be to return all of the test scores back to base schools. In this case the school would receive no designation and all of the reporting would go back to base schools.

And the third option would be to choose to participate in the alternative progress model which would measure performance based on a school with itself from the previous year and receive designations of progressing, maintaining, and declining.

The second part is how would the data be calculated for the current year. So if an alternative school chooses to participate in the A through F system, all of the current A through F model calculations as designated in law and accountability business rules would be applied. And all of the data would be collected through the current systems that we have. Nothing would change as far as collecting data for an A through F letter grade for alternative schools is that's why—where a school would choose to participate.

Returning all of the test results back to a sending school for accountability would mean that all of the scores would go back to those sending schools and no data would then be applied to that alternative school for the current year. All of those data pieces would go back to sending schools.

And then there is the alternative progress model. And under the alternative progress model there are certain components that we would apply for

alternative schools. And the first one that we have we call student persistence. That is where we will look to see if a student is still enrolled in school at the end of the school year after they have attended at any time an alternative school during that year. That's measured on the percent of students that are enrolled anywhere in the state of North Carolina at the end of the school year after appearing in a data collection at an alternative school.

The next component would be student achievement and that would be the percent of students that are considered proficient on the indicators that we have and those indicators would be the same as the school performance grade indicators which would be end of grade, end of course, ACT WorkKeys, ACT graduation rate if the school has one, and math course rigor. We would use a total of the students in the school for a three-year average. And the students must be assessed at the alternative school to be included in the calculations. And again, as I've stated, all of that data that's available for calculating school performance grades would be included in the student achievement component of the alternative progress model.

And the third section of the alternative progress model would be growth. And we would look to EVAAS to help us with a growth calculation. We are working with the EVAAS team to try to develop some form of alternative growth model where we would work to do things like remove the 140 day membership rule, to calculate growth use percentages of students that are—that take the assessments at alternative schools. Also use the percentages for students that attended an alternative school at some time during the school year that happened

to take an assessment in a different school, applying that percentage back to the alternative school.

So say for example a student comes to the alternative school and is there 30% of the school year, we would look to that student's results and apply 30% of that student's growth back to the alternative school. In this case at this time, we would not apply the remaining percentage to the other school as part of this model.

We would also look to use three years of growth or a three-year average of growth in measuring that index. We know that because we're starting this model at this time, we may or may not have three years of growth on a particular school. Our goal is to try to get a growth model that incorporates growth for all alternative schools. We know at this time not all alternative schools receive growth designations. So we also know that for this model to work as we start out, we would likely need to have the first year be based on year one results, the second year based on a two-year average, and the third year become the three-year average. And then going forward from that point it would be a three-year rolling average.

So when we calculate that into a reportable figure, we would take student persistence and multiply by 0.20 in this model, student achievement by 0.20, and growth by 0.60. Now to be clear, we have not settled on the actual percentages for what we would apply in this model. This is an example and sort of a starting point for us as we analyze the data. We appreciate your input on considerations of how much these items should be valued and we'll take those into consideration

as we look at the model. This was sort of based on information we had heard from the field where growth was very important for alternative schools. And in this particular instance it is a significant percentage of the overall school for alternative school.

So the third component after calculating a yearly rate for the school is to determine what the rating is for alternative schools. And when a school participates in the A through F system they would be awarded an A through F letter grade just like other traditional schools that receive the A through F letter grade. They would be required to follow all of the reporting requirements for the A through F letter grade system.

If a school chooses to return all of their results back a sending school, they would receive no designation. All of that data would be absorbed by the sending schools and nothing would be applied to alternative schools that fall into this category.

And the final one is under the alternative progress model, we would designate schools as progressing, maintaining, and declining. So in order to assign a designation to an alternative school we would compare the current year score to the previous year's score and determine the amount of change.

So in this example, we would be looking at progressing as greater than a certain amount of point change, maintaining would be between that point change and a negative amount of point change, and declining would be greater than the negative amount of point change. We have considered and talked about options of anywhere between three and ten points where we've looked and begun looking

at three-point, five-point, ten-point changes. We will continue to do data analysis and take input from all of you and from others in the field as to how much change would be appropriate to ensure that alternative schools received an appropriate designation but are not negatively impacted when they have a measure that declines slightly, and also not overly positively impacted when they have something that changes very little.

So in this example, if we were to take the data that I had shown on the earlier slide and compared it to a previous year, and in this case we had a three-point change, this school would have changed 3.4 points and would have been designated improving.

Gattis: Yeah, or progressing a bit on the—[OVERLAPPING]

Sonneman: I'm sorry. I have "improving" on my slide but it should be "progressing." So at this point we are happy to take any questions and feedback. I will begin to look at questions and read them out loud and try to provide as many answers as possible.

Howard: And please remember that if you have a comment that you're welcome to enter that in as well. We may or may not respond to the comment, but we will definitely be going back and looking at that feedback.

Sonneman: So the first question that we have is, will this PowerPoint be posted for attendees to access or email to us? It is our intent to email the PowerPoint presentation to the attendees on this webinar. And as we had noted earlier, we are recording this and we are going to work to get this posted out publicly hopefully as a recorded webinar, and at the very least get this presentation posted. So thank you.

So the first question is did I hear correctly that the student who has shared the data with another school, that the percentage that is left does not go back to the home school? At this time we're asking EVAAS to run some modeling to see what that would look like. We would think that for schools—students that do not meet the 140 day requirement for other schools, that they would receive a percentage at the alternative school, but at this time the other school would not. If we look to the future and determine that with confidence we can apply some of that growth to those other schools, we may consider that as we move forward and look at growth modeling through EVAAS.

Howard: How will decisions be made about which option to select? Will local boards decide?

Sonneman: I think as far as that goes, I think it will ultimately be the local board that will make the decision. But at this point we also believe that it will be a conversation that schools and the board will need to have to determine what model is best for those particular schools. And as it stands now we think that if a district would happen to have more than one alternative school, that it—they would be able to—a board would be able to select different models for different schools within their district. So ultimately it will be up to the schools to have those conversations superintendents and local boards to make the decisions and we would request and likely have documentation where the superintendent will have to fill out a form and sign it to be sent back designating which schools will be in what model.

Howard: One question is about students that are enrolled outside of North Carolina, you know, how they are incorporated into the model.

Gattis: Well, we did discuss that earlier. Curtis, I believe, understands and we—there are certain parts of the model that you can calculate directly with data that we have at our disposal. And this would be an example when a student goes out of state, is we would have to give you the opportunity to add in students that you become aware of that are in school somewhere because they won't automatically in the model. But our plans would be for you to be able to document that, just like you document a student is not a dropout because they transferred out of the state.

Howard: One question is, how can you provide feedback to us on this? Curtis's email is at the end of the PowerPoint and he'll be putting that up shortly and so you may email Curtis. Also feel free to email Dr. Gattis or myself but it might be best if everything went to Curtis and then he can collect it all together.

Will any consideration be given for alternative education schools' increasing attendance and decreasing discipline referrals? We've had lots of conversations about that. And attendance, we all recognize that it is typically correlated to students output of achievement. We really see attendance as—and attendance is also seen as more of an input and not an output, we could have schools that have excellent attendance and yet still not have high student achievement. Of course, you know, research typically shows that isn't the case, but that is a possibility. If you like, you know, again we're getting input and so we know that attendance is one of the things that is very much—folks are very much interested in.

One thing that we tried to do when we were working through this was we tried to look at A through F model and tried to see where we could mirror, if you

will, the same intent of the—and not just the A through F, but really the accountability model that was adopted by the State Board of Education, and where we could mirror the same intent. And of course there's not attendance in that model, so we kind of went away from that.

Sonneman: Another thing to note is that we did take into consideration the student persistence, which while isn't attendance, it does show that the students are staying in school, which is a positive impact and plays well into saying that students are staying in school. So that hopefully will be helpful.

Howard: One question is, how do we inform the district test coordinators of the changes in the model? If the state board takes action in November to approve a model, and again based on feedback that we're still getting, what we shared this afternoon may not be the exact model that is presented to the state board and ultimately that they could possibly approve or not approve. So once a model is approved for 2014-15, then we would go through our normal communication channels to share that information. And it may be helpful at that point to have another webinar to walk through that information to make sure that we all are on the same page.

Will schools be locked into a model for several years?

Howard: If we're interpreting that as meaning a district has a school and they decide for 2014-15 that they want to use the progress the model, then the answer is no. That decision could be revisited every year. So it's not locked in for any certain period of time other than one year. But every year—so one year a school could use the progress model. The next year it could decide it didn't really like the progress model, maybe the sending scores back to the sending school was more

advantageous, and the next year they could decide they wanted in the general A through F school performance grade model.

Sonneman: One thing to keep in mind about that is if, let's say for example in the other direction a school sent their data to a sending school and then the following year they wanted to be in the alterative progress model, we would go back and look at the data within that school from the previous year in order to determine three-year averages and help calculate data for growth.

Howard: Okay. So we have a couple of questions about local options. One is, could we have a local options system similar to the one we have now? You know, it's really at the discretion of the state board. When we present this, we'll present all three and I think a fourth one would be to say that we could continue on with the local options, that's at the discretion of the state board.

And the other question about local options is—I lost it—Should we be collecting them? And I think we were asked this last week as well at the test coordinators meeting. And that's a local decision. We anticipate, you know, a decision in November. If you collect them just be mindful that the state board could take action where they would not be needed.

Gattis: Simulations. Have you run data yet? You haven't run it.

Sonneman: We are working on them right now as far as simulations are concerned.

Gattis: Read the question.

Sonneman: The question was what sort of simulations have you run for these options? We are in the process of running them now which will help us determine if our percentages for applying each of those three elements are appropriate. And we're

also still working with EVAAS to see if we can come up with a model where we can calculate some of that data. So we are working on those simulations and we're still getting information back from those.

If scores are sent back to a base school, how will alternative teachers be scored on Standard 6? We would not change what Standard 6 is doing in roster verification. Those teachers would still receive growth in the same way for Standard 6. We anticipate that we would still run a school growth composite in the same way for educators, for educator effectiveness as its being done currently. There would not be a three-year average alternative model at this time. So everything would run exactly the same when it comes to educator effectiveness for alternative teachers under Standard 6. We wouldn't change any of those elements. We would simply create a separate model outside of that to do school accountability for alternative schools where we would remove some of those options like 140-day rule and get—applying percentages of data. It also gives us an opportunity to look at that see if doing those types of things could help improve the educator effectiveness model for alternative educators.

Howard: The next question is clarification of the timeline. So the question is will the improving, maintaining, declining model be an alternative reporting option this year? The answer to that is yes, pending approval by the State Board of Education. But the timeline is to have these options available for 2014-15.

The next question is for student persistence, would students count in the percent if they transferred to a community college and enrolled in a GED

program? We have not discussed this but I'm looking around the table and we think no. So—

Gattis: It may depend though if—there is also a pending state board policy change regarding—and so if we did that for the adult high school students, I suspect we would—we might be able to do it here but probably not with a GED.

Howard: Right. So it would be transferred to a community for adults.

Gattis: For adult high school.

Howard: Possibly.

Gattis: Possibly.

Howard: Possibly depending on what else happens in that. Okay, thank you.

One question is, when comparing scores from one year to the next, are we comparing apples to apples meaning same kids scored from one year to the next or are we looking a different cohorts of students? And the answer to that is if would be different cohorts of students. That's one of the challenges with alternative schools, that population is very, very fluid. So we're taking that into consideration. I think particularly if you look at the percentages for achievement, it's 20% and the growth 60%, and it has the three-year running average. So we're trying to take that into consideration.

Sonneman: And it also—keep in mind, this also compares the school to itself in the previous year, so there's not a standard that we're asking you to meet except doing as well or better than you did in the previous year.

Howard: Does this also pertain to programs instead schools?

Gattis: No, it does not. Students and programs are part of a school and they would be subject to just the accountability for the school.

Howard: When will a local board have to make a decision about the model selected? What is the timeline? If we were to have a decision from the state board in November, we realize then that it would take some time for you to review the options and make a decision and take for recommendation to your local board. So I would think no earlier than January, we could possibly extend it into February. And we would also welcome feedback on that.

With school persistence in the alternative model, what if the school is designed for students to return to their base schools during the school year?

Sonneman: That's one of the nice elements of this model. The student persistence is looking at student enrollment across the state of North Carolina. So if that school is designed to send students back, we would capture those students in their school they sent them back to and determine that they had persisted and made it to the end of the school year. And that alternative school would then receive credit in the student persistence component as positive that the student was enrolled in North Carolina schools at the end of the school year.

Howard: Okay. I think we've answered this but we'll answer it again. After the first year will you—would a district be allowed to switch models? And that is correct, or options, they would be allowed to switch options.

And then we have another question as well about the local options, specifically this particular district takes the local options to their October board meeting. Should they proceed? And if I were going to proceed I would proceed

and inform the local board that the state board is considering new options for alternative schools at its November meeting. So I would just make sure that we inform them of that.

Sonneman: As far as does the student—does a school progress model count dropouts twice against the alternative school? It appears that students who drop out count against our graduation rate as well as in the student persistence part of option three. If that student was in the cohort in the same year that they left school, then I suppose in this model it would count twice. But if this student were to say leave in one year but be in a cohort that comes up two years later, it would count against the school in the year that they didn't show up in student persistence and then they would—if that school has a graduation rate, it would count against them in the graduation in the year that that student was a cohort. So it is possible that a student in their final year of being in a particular cohort who leaves could count against student persistence and as a part of student achievement with the graduation rate.

Sonneman: One more question about the new model impacting Standard 6 for alternative Ed teachers. At this time it has no impact on the Standard 6 for alternative Ed teachers. I think this model affords us an opportunity to look at that, to see if we can assist in making a more robust system for the alternative Ed teachers, because at this time the number of students included are very limited, and often times the actual Standard 6 is limited for alternative education teachers. And hopefully looking at these other options may allow us to look at that more deeply as we move forward.

Howard: There's a question asking us, have we considered omitting from district-level results the alternative schools? And I would say, no, that we have not considered doing that. We realize it's a transient population and often times has negative impact, but, of course, we all want it to ultimately have a positive impact.

Gattis: And I think that's one reason why we're also kind of settling on one option for you to do something that's quite different from A through F in that you're really just saying whether or not you're maintaining, improving, or declining. And really we're just—you're really comparing that against yourself in doing that.

Howard: This is an excellent question. "What will our school report cards look like if a school were to elect to use the progress model?" That's an excellent question. And we have not had extensive conversations about programming the school report cards. So that would be on our list to do.

Sonneman: One question on here that I'll quickly address, "What is the minimum number of scores for teachers to get an educator effectiveness rating? And why wouldn't you consider an alternative educator effectiveness model now?" The first part of that question, it varies by assessment, but it ranges between seven and ten for the minimum number or scores that a teacher needs. And in the case of educator effectiveness that requires the 140-day participation rule. And it's difficult for us to make considerations for the alternative educator effectiveness model now because we would have to work with our partners at EVAAS to come up with a way to do that for the current year. And since we had not begun reporting that out with this coming up and the fact that roster verification actually starts in a couple of months from now we may not have—and likely don't have time to implement

something for educators with an alternative model for this particular school year.

So in all likelihood if anything were going to change it would begin with considerations for possibly 2015-16.

Howard: So one question, of course, is can we look at individual growth at the student level? And the concern there is the amount of standard error that is around an individual student's growth score, if you will. Of course, aggregating numbers of students for teaching reporting or for school reporting in that standard error is reduced or decreased, but doing it at the individual level for an accountability model, particularly when it's school accountability model is actually not desirable.

Sonneman: "So can you please explain the three-year rolling average again?" In essence, we kind of have two in there. So the first three-year rolling average would be for student achievement. So we would actually use three years of data to calculate the student achievement component and apply all of the students in those three years to give a percentage of student achievement as proficient. And we would do that because we know that there are a lot of fluctuations within in alternative school, and using three years of data allows for more students to be in the calculation into the model and allows for variance from one year to the next without seeing significant swings back and forth depending on the population. So if you have a three-year average it would assume that you would be able to have some sort of stability within three years of one another and not see significant swings from year to year. The other one would be a—considering a three-year average for growth, which again would allow more students to be included in the

growth calculation and also then allows for any variance and—fluctuation from year to year in growth designations and attempts to stabilize what designation a student—or a school—excuse me—a school receives over time.

One statement here is, “As of this morning our alternative school is still not showing a growth status in EVAAS or on the ready internal reports. Is that true for all alternative schools?” That would be true if your alternative school did not receive a growth designation. Only about 50%—in the current growth model only about 50% of the alternative schools received a growth designation this year. So some did not have enough data under the current model to receive a school growth designation, which is why we’re looking to do something different.

Howard: There is question about unintended consequences. I’m—from the questions—I’m thinking that the question is with an Alternative School Accountability Model and the output and the possible impact on teachers, the unintended consequences. We are always considering unintended consequences. We have those conversations and try to do everything we can to minimize them.

Sonneman: So, “Will you explain more the progress etcetera model again and how it’s calculated? How much time, days current enrollment, during testing will students have to be in alternative schools?” The student achievement component for the test results and other items will not change in terms of how we would calculate student achievement. We would still apply the same business rules that we have always applied as far as students being included in an alternative school in that if they’re in the school to take the assessment that assessment counts for the student achievement part of this. The growth component, we’re working with EVAAS to

determine if they can calculate percentages of enrollment. EVAAS collects on a regular basis; I believe almost daily, data, enrollment data from PowerSchool systems to tell them where—where folks are—where students are in a particular time of year. That’s what they’ve been able to do with roster verification in order to apply percentages early in the system for teachers so that claiming can be done a little bit easier across students and across schools. We would hopefully incorporate that same data that they are getting to be able to determine percentages of value that a student would have as they are enrolled in a—in a school, an alternative school, for a percentage of time. And then the student persistence component really is if we capture a student in a data collection that we are currently collecting is that student that showed up in the alternative school in one of our data collections throughout the school year still enrolled in the school, any school, in the state of North Carolina at the end of the year.

Howard: So, somewhat related to that we have a question. “When you look at three years of data, are you only looking at students who have been at that school for three years or more?” And the answer is no. We’re looking at three years’ worth of data. And that would have different students across time. And there was a comment as well that we’ll acknowledge. “Input on filling, again, like that is comparing apples to oranges. And of course with the alternative population starting over every year with a new population that comes with their own unique problems.” And, again, going back to what Dr. Gattis was saying, that is why although it’s one of the options is to use the A through F school performance grades we are trying to develop an alternative model for the alternative schools

that kind of gets at some of the challenges that are inherent in the design of those schools.

We do have one comment asking us to pause for secondary questions before moving to another question. You know, realizing, of course, you know, sometimes we say something and then we need to actually clarify it a little bit better. We apologize; it's a little bit difficult for us to do it on a webinar. And the questions, they're all coming in at one time, and we're scrolling down, so even though you just put your question in it may be further down and we can't see it on the screen yet. So we apologize that the format is not ideal.

Sonneman: One question is, "If part of the model requires a three year average how can a school have the option to change methods yearly?" We are still collecting this data. And we can still calculate data looking backwards. So if a school does choose to change its methods yearly we can still go back and calculate historical data. While it may not have been publicly reported it's still be—can be calculated to come up with an answer for the previous year so we can make comparisons when a school does move into the alternative progress model.

"On the three-year rolling average, will they go back three years to calculate growth for this year?" We are looking at that. And we're going to work with our partners at SAS to determine what can be done. It's entirely possible, based on some of the data we've collected from 2013–14, that we may be able to get something like a two-year average for this first year in 2014–15. But we may have to go with the idea that we begin in 2014–15 with a one-year designation, then the following year in 2015–16 it would be a two-year average. And then in

2016–17 it would be the first of three-year averages. And then going forward from that point we would just continue to have a three-year average. So it's entirely possible that we'll start this model using one and two years of data and move—with the intent to move to a three-year average.

Gattis: Okay, so Beth is asking about growth. And, Curtis, I want to get you to clarify again, to talk about the growth measure that when they get a total points for a year, how are the total points that they for one year—where is that growth coming from?

Sonneman: That to three-year—that—total points for that year is, in the model that I showed, is 60% would be growth—

Gattis: Mm-hmm.

Sonneman: —based on the calculation for that year which would ultimately, when we get to that point, would be a three-year average of growth.

Gattis: But those—but those growth—you said a three-year average. Each year that growth—that growth is actually individual growth.

Sonneman: Right. That's—

Howard: It's not—it's not compared to the previous year.

Sonneman: Right.

Gattis: I think that's a little bit misunderstand is that the growth—and Beth's comment appears that we're—that we're saying growth is one year to the next. There—you'll get a certain number of points each year; 60% of that is a growth measure, and that growth measure is actual growth of individual students. The thing that is a little bit different about this is that it—is the year-to-year comparison of these

total points that we're putting in the model. That is going to give you a designation of progressing school, a school that's above average in improvement, one that's maintaining, that's kind of doing the same thing as you did the previous based on our measures, or if you're declining. However, growth, actual real student growth is in the model. But there is also this comparison of your own performance—for total points from year to year. And so that may be a little bit—we may need to kind of talk through that several times before we all kind of come to understanding—

Howard Right.

Gattis: —how that works.

Howard: So let me try to repeat it—

Gattis: Okay.

Howard: —and see—because I was having the same thought there a minute ago, and I thought, “Oh, wow.” So to be very clear, the growth is for that year. Now, of course, EVAAS growth uses a student's history—

Gattis: Right.

Howard: —and previous scores—

Gattis: Mm-hmm

Howard: —to make that determination, but then the rolling average is looking that—those three years of independent growth—

Gattis: Mm-hmm.

Howard: —and getting an average from that.

Gattis: Yeah, and those three years we're the rolling average from, each year of those three years are also composed of individual growth measures.

Howard: Yeah.

Gattis: So it's all individual growth in there just kind of averaged out which is going to give you a certain number of points. And in our model it's going to give you the majority of the points, actually 60% the way that we have it right now.

Howard: Right.

Gattis: The place where it gets to be—going from year-to-year or the apples to oranges part of it really just has to do with our your students one year exactly like they were the previous year, and maybe there is—might be a little bit more potential to grow them in one year than another because they are different students, and we recognize that. And there's really nothing that really can be done about that. That is a little apples and oranges thing. But in terms of individual growth, individual growth really is in the model.

Howard: Mm-hmm.

Gattis: And—because we're tracking that student's performance over time. And which is how EVAAS determines growth from scores, standardized test scores.

[INAUDIBLE]

Gattis: It's kind of this—yeah. The—another question, very similar. “We have very different students each year. How can we be expected to improve over the previous year when we are often starting over with new students who need to be stabilized emotionally and psychologically before they can begin to make academic progress?” Well, you have—you have that same challenge each year.

And what the model does—what the model does is really compare you year to year. And when you said in there, “How can we be expected to improve over the previous year,” that may be difficult—this is—this is a model that’s going to show stability a lot. You will have to make a significant jump, probably, the way that we set the model, to show improvement. However, maintaining—the way we see it is the maintaining is still going to be a very positive designation for you because we’ll also have an opportunity to have a measurement that’s just to show whether or not you’re achieving growth as well. But in terms of the alternative model, the maintaining part I think will be looked at as a positive as well as improving. You won’t—you won’t have to—you won’t be expected to improve year over year.

Howard: One question is, how will the alternative growth model affect the selection of priority schools under ESEA waiver? Of course the priority schools are the lowest 5% performing schools in the state. And I’m wondering if part of this question is will the alternative schools still be included on those lists—or that list. And the answer is yes.

Sonneman: So long as that school has AMO targets, they would be included in—

Howard: Yeah.

Sonneman: —in these calculations.

Howard: Yeah.

Sonneman: One question is, just as a repeat, what are the three grading levels to the progress model again? And currently they are progressing, maintaining, and declining.

We haven’t settled officially on names, and if we get suggestions of names that

provide the public with a clear definition of what we're looking for as far as progressing, maintaining, and declining is concerned, we could consider changing a name. But at this point it's very difficult to find names that have good understandable meaning to the public with a lot—without a lot of explanation.

Howard: Okay. One question is, EVAAS is only helped with alternative schools have enough students in each grade level, in each subject, to get valid data? Are there very many schools that have enough students to do this? And there are. There are. We realize there may be some limited situations where there are not. And just as with the school performance grades A through F, per legislation if a school does not have an indicator then the indicator is not used. The other question or the next question, I should say, is, how will return scores impact proficiency and growth for the base schools? With—if a school elected to send their scores back to the sending school or the base school then that base school would use all of those scores in every aspect of accountability.

Will there be future consideration for counting or not counting data for alternative schools that receive students as late as on the day or week of testing? As I'm sure we all recall that for the proficiency model in—on the given test date any student in the school is tested, and that student's data is included in the accountability for proficiency or for achievement. Of course, it's with the growth model for the A through F—and we have for many years had the 140-day membership requirement. But that has not ever been the case for proficiency. So it would not be.

Gattis: I think we already the—this questions, but let's repeat it again. With regard to student persistence, if a student was enrolled in an alternative school at some point but is not enrolled in North Carolina at the end of the year will the model factor in documented moves out of state as we currently do when looking at cohort graduation rate? The answer is yes. We'll have to come up with some way for you to be able to document that.

Sonneman: The next question is, so this year would be the baseline year of the three-year average or last year? We're going to look at our modeling and determine what we can—are able to calculate in terms of how much data we have available to us to make some of those determinations. We think that this year we would like to make possibly a baseline year and determine how we would calculate it and—provide information on how we would do that calculation and make a baseline year so that we have somewhere to start for everyone. And make those designations accordingly after that.

Howard: Again, a question about counting students for performance/achievement when they've not been in membership in the school. As a reminder all of the schools across North Carolina have students that may walk in the door the day of a test and those students' scores are included in performance. So—and from that viewpoint it is consistent, if you will, across schools.

I have a—we have a question about would we be willing to post the answers to these questions in—on TNN. The webinar is being recorded and of course then we have to have a transcript. So that in effect will do that. That may take a little bit of time, but we will try to have that done as soon as possible. And

then we have some questions asking us to show the model again and show the calculation again. We're going to look at a few more questions and then we may switch back over and do that and come back.

So the minimum-day requirement only applies to growth, and it's 140 days for a traditional school calendar, 70 school days for block. But what we're proposing here—and this is based on feedback from the alternative schools community—is to not have that minimum-days requirement for growth for alternative schools.

“Under the new model are there consequences for schools that are consistently labeled declining?” At this point there are not. As a reminder, that is consistent with the current status of school performance grades of which there are no defined consequences for the A through F grades either.

The question is it possible that the final model recommended to the board will be completely different? I think is the question of what we've discussed here today. I think part of depends on the feedback that we get from you and other discussions that we may have to have input. So that is to be determined.

Gattis: Question: if a student moves into alternative schools after roster verification has been completed, how will the alternative school notify EVAAS for the calculation of students? It won't be necessary for the schools to notify EVAAS in terms of the school calculation. Roster verification is really focused on the teacher at this time. It is not focused on the school. EVAAS would continue to receive the enrollment data throughout the entire roster verification, and they would then be able to calculate for a school when a student enrolls. And, again, we are still

talking with them, and they may review this data and be able to tell us with more definition exactly how they're going to do that or where—what the limitations are. And if we find that there are limitations and we have to do some additional data collection in some way we would try to consider figuring out how to do that or consider what the ramifications are in terms of including or not including those students if we can't determine when they've enrolled.

Howard: So at this time I'm going to ask Curtis if he would please, as requested, go back and review the slides on the calculation for the progress model. And, as a reminder, there are three options. One option is for alternative schools to participate in the school performance grade A through F as specified in legislation. The second option is for alternative schools to send their scores back to the base school or what we refer to as—sometimes as the sending school. And then a third option is this progress model which Curtis will go through again. And if you have questions after this we have some more time. We're willing to try to answer those.

Sonneman: So, again, we'll at the—as far as student persistence is concerned, again, this is where we would look to see if a student is enrolled at the end of the year to determine if that student is still enrolled in a school after receiving some sort of service at an alternative school where we have captured that that student was enrolled there.

Gattis: And, of course, on the slide here we—we just mention North Carolina, but I think we—in the questions we indicated that really is—we are only concerned that the

student is in school somewhere. And we will find a way that—for you to be able to document that.

Sonneman: Thank you. Student achievement, again, is the percent of proficient students on indicators that are in that school. And those would be the school—the indicators that are included in school performance grades. So in this example, if a school does in fact have a graduation rate those pieces would be added in to the overall student achievement component. That would be a three-year average, and it would be all of the students in meeting the standard over all of the students that we see data for for that over the course of three years, so a three-year average of data. And, again, they must be assessed at the alternative school to be included. The third component is the growth component, again, which we are working with EVAAS on to determine what type of modeling we can do. And I'm sure that they will come up with a couple of different scenarios for us in terms of if we do it with these rules here's the effect that you would get and other rules. And we would work to determine who we would incorporate that. But our intent is to incorporate the EVAAS growth model in some way into this because that is our current growth model.

Howard: Do you want to show—

Gattis: You want to show them the—

Howard: Yeah—

Gattis: —sample calculation?

Howard: —the calculation.

Sonneman: Okay. And just to show you the sample calculation again. In this case we would say that the student persistence we had 85.6% of students that were enrolled in the alternative school had persisted at the end of the year, and we would take that as 20% of the calculation. The student achievement, we had 14.7% of students meeting the proficiency standard. And, in this case, the growth calculation converted to a 64.8 points, and that growth calculation would be similar to the way that we're doing it for school performance grades, where the indexed value would be put on a scale similar to the A through F letter grades. And that would be multiplied by 60%. That would provide the school with a total point value for that particular year of 41.8. That would then be compared to the previous year total point value, and if that total point value is—is greater than whatever point change we determine to be the one that we're going to go with they would be considered progressing. If it is greater than a negative of that number it would be considered declining, and if it would be between those values it would be considered maintaining.

And as I stated earlier we will be sending the PowerPoint slide to the webinar participants shortly after we finish. We are also recording this and will work toward getting that posted as well. If there are no further questions.

Howard: So we'll—we'll wrap up by saying that we appreciate your participation. You've asked some very good questions, made some excellent comments that we need to consider. So we appreciate your participation this late in the day. We know how important of an issue this is, and we value our alternative schools and the successes that they have with our students, and so we want to do everything we

can to support that. So we thank you very much. The last slide, of course, does have Curtis's email address. Please feel free to email him any other comments or suggestions or questions. And I assume we don't have any other questions. I think that is it. So thank you. And I'm sure we'll be talking soon. Thank you.

[END RECORDING]