

## School and District Accountability Design Team Quad Chair Decision Items

### I. PERSISTENTLY LOWEST PERFORMING SCHOOLS – TRADITIONAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS

---

*Design Team Consensus:* Based on a review of the meeting notes and the homework, the Design Team agreed that those schools which are *initially identified* as being among the persistently lowest performing in the state should be required to implement state-directed action.

---

#### A. Implementation of initial school-level identification

To carry out the Design Team recommendations, the state will conduct a **mandatory on-site diagnostic review** to identify the problem(s) at the school and district level. After participation in the state-conducted diagnostic review, the school must determine whether to implement one of two options:

- (1) **Contract with a state-approved independent expert and/or vendor to implement a turnaround model based on the recommendations of the diagnostic review.** The school will have three years to implement the state-driven actions and demonstrate improved performance. These recommended actions could include, but are not limited to:
  - a. Mandatory new scientific-research based curriculum in the school and/or the district, along with required screening, assessments, interventions, and necessary professional development;
  - b. Replacement of the school staff and/or school leadership;
  - c. Opening as a charter school, including through a contract with a charter management organization that has a proven track record of success in turning around low performing schools. The organization must be selected after a rigorous review process approved by DPI, and the State Superintendent must approve the selection of the charter operator.
- (2) **Close**

#### B. Implementation of subsequent school-level identification

*If a traditional public school is identified again after three years of targeted, state-directed intervention and has not demonstrated adequate improvement, the State Superintendent will utilize his or her intervention authority under Ch. 118.42 to appoint a special master to direct the activities of the school.* These activities could include, but are not limited to, directing that the school board reopen the school under a contract with a charter management organization that has a proven track record of success in turning around low performing schools, is selected after a rigorous review process approved by the state, and is approved by the State Superintendent; or closure of the school.

### *C. Implementation of district-level identification*

For persistently low performing districts, a DPI contracted expert will complete a diagnostic review at the LEA level to evaluate critical systems and structures within the district's central office that include human resources, curriculum and instruction, finance, leadership. Based on diagnostic review, the State Superintendent will direct reform at the LEA level in addition to reforms at the school level. The district would work closely with the turnaround expert in implementing the required reforms. Schools would continue to implement improvements based on DPI Corrective Action Requirements.

## **II. PERSISTENTLY LOWEST PERFORMING SCHOOLS – CHARTER SCHOOLS**

---

*Design Team Consensus:* For development of the state's next generation accountability system, the Design Team generally agreed that a charter school should be subject to having their charter contract removed if it is among the persistently lowest performing schools in the state. Further, some members of the Design Team raised concerns that it was not appropriate for the state to direct a charter school to implement a particular curriculum.

---

### *A. Implementation of Initial School-Level Identification*

***After the school has been in operation for at least three years, and the school is initially identified as being among the persistently lowest performing schools in the state, the charter school authorizer will implement one of three options:***

**Option 1:** The charter school (or its authorizer) must enter into a performance agreement with the Department of Public Instruction in which it agrees to meet annual state-approved performance targets that demonstrate substantial academic improvement within three years. If annual performance targets are not met, the charter is revoked. To meet these rigorous performance benchmarks, the charter school authorizer may contract with a charter management organization that has a demonstrated record of success to implement any necessary reforms, or the charter school board may seek a different authorizer to implement the reforms.

**Option 2:** The Department of Public Instruction will conduct a mandatory on-site diagnostic review to identify the problem(s) at the school and authorizer level. After participation in the state-conducted review, the charter school authorizer must implement one of two options with respect to the school consistent with the findings and recommendations of the diagnostic review:

- a.** Contract with a state-approved independent expert/vendor to implement a turnaround model based on the recommendations of the diagnostic review. These recommendations could include, but are not limited to, mandatory new scientific-research based curriculum in the school and/or the district, along with required screening, assessments, interventions and necessary professional development; replacement of the school staff and/or school leadership; or closing and restarting the school under a contract with a charter

management organization that has a demonstrated record of school improvement to manage the school's improvement activities.

- b. Revoke the charter

**Option 3:** In lieu of implementing either of these two options, the charter authorizer may instead elect to immediately revoke the charter.

### *B. Implementation of Subsequent School-Level Identification and Authorizer Requirements*

If the persistently low-performing charter school has not demonstrated adequate improvement after three years of either a turnaround model or a performance contract, the authorizer must revoke the charter. No authorizer may renew a charter if the school is persistently low performing. Relevant state law and new or, to the extent permissible, existing charter school contracts must be updated to reflect these requirements.

## **III. PERSISTENTLY LOWEST PERFORMING SCHOOLS – CHOICE SCHOOLS**

---

*Design Team Consensus:* The Design Team agreed as a guiding principle that all schools – traditional public, choice, and charter – should be part of the new accountability system. They also agreed, in principle, that choice schools should participate in the diagnostic reviews process and that, if a choice school is persistently lowest performing, the school should be removed from the program.

---

### *A. Implementation of Initial School-Level Identification*

*After the choice school has been in operation for at least three years, and the school is initially identified as being among the persistently lowest performing schools in the state, the choice school will implement one of the following three options:*

**Option 1:** The choice school must enter into a performance agreement with the Department of Public Instruction in which it agrees to meet annual state-approved performance targets that demonstrate substantial academic improvement within three years. If annual performance targets are not met, the school shall no longer participate in the choice program.

**Option 2:** The Department of Public Instruction will conduct a mandatory on-site diagnostic review to identify the problem(s) at the school and authorizer level. The cost of the diagnostic review will be funded by the choice school. After participation in the state-conducted review, choice school must implement one of two options with respect to the school consistent with the findings and recommendations of the diagnostic review:

- a. Contract with a state-approved independent expert/vendor to implement a turnaround model based on the recommendations of the diagnostic review. These recommendations could include, but are not limited to, mandatory new scientific-research based curriculum

in the school and/or the district, along with required screening, assessments, interventions and necessary professional development; replacement of the school staff and/or school leadership; or closing and restarting the school under a contract with a charter management organization that has a demonstrated record of school improvement to manage the school's improvement activities.

- b. Discontinue participation in the choice program.

**Option 3:** In lieu of implementing either of these options, the choice school may elect to immediately discontinue participation in the program.

#### *B. Implementation of subsequent-school level identification*

If the persistently low-performing choice school has not demonstrated adequate improvement after three years of either a turnaround model or a performance contract, the state must discontinue the school's participation in the choice program.

### **IV. SCHOOL PERFORMANCE CATEGORIES**

---

*Design Team Consensus:* The design team agreed that the focus of the new system should be on placing schools in a continuum of levels, with continuous improvement expected for all students. A school's report card would be based on four priority areas (attainment; growth; CCR or "on track" measures; and closing achievement gaps), and final accountability determinations will be based on the aggregate score of the four priority areas. The Design Team agreed to place aggregate scores on an index (0-100) that results in both an accountability score and a corresponding rating that determines what level of support, intervention, or reward the school receives.

---

#### *A. Implementation of School Performance Categories*

Consistent with our Design Team discussions and relevant research on rating categories, **DPI will adopt six school performance categories that will allow differentiation of schools along a continuum.** The standards for each of these levels will be based on the accountability index proposed by the Design Team, and will be developed through the standards setting process run by DPI's Technical Advisory Committee. The performance categories will be as follows:

<i>Accountability Rating*</i>	<i>Includes a subset for Federal waiver purposes</i>
<b>Significantly Exceeding Expectations</b>	Reward Schools, Spotlight Schools
<b>Exceeding Expectations</b>	
<b>Meeting Expectations</b>	
<b>Not Meeting Expectations</b>	Focus Schools

<b>Significantly Below Expectations</b>	Focus Schools
<b>Persistently Failing to Meet Expectations</b>	Priority Schools

\*School cannot be in top three categories if the school missed its AMO. School cannot be exemplary if low in any of the four Priority Areas.

\*\*The Title I levels required by the ESEA waiver (reward, focus, priority) are *included* as a subset of these proposed categories, but will also include other schools.

#### V. ADDITIONAL ITEMS

- DPI will continue to use full academic year for all schools' accountability determinations
- DPI will provide a link to each school's website on the accountability report card
- DPI's accountability index and the associated standard setting process will expect growth along the spectrum of performance to the extent possible within the parameters of the assessment.
- DPI will require (or state law will be changed to require) schools to display their report cards prominently on their website's homepage.
- DPI will have a process for continuous review and improvement of the accountability system, including any necessary revisions to the standards applied to accountability ratings. There will be no "automatic trigger" to change standards in state law.
- DPI will produce the report card on an annual basis as soon as possible in alignment with applicable assessment and data collection timelines. Further discussion will be had about options available to students given the timing of the report card and whether any open enrollment changes are needed.