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Some progress in state policy...

Source: Momentum Strategy & Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Alt Accountability</th>
<th>Alternative Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools Only (11 states)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative accountability present</td>
<td>9 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different weighting of indicators and/or measures</td>
<td>4 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different measures than traditional framework</td>
<td>4 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different benchmarks/comparison groups</td>
<td>6 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on growth</td>
<td>3 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customizable at school level</td>
<td>2 states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not currently implemented, recently passed legislation will put this component into place in 2015-2016.
State highlights

- NV: SB must develop new AEC Frameworks
- OH: New Cutpoints *(effective 4/2015)*; state committee to define “quality” in AECs *(SB 148, pending)*
- AR: AECs exempt from A-F grades
- CT: AEC policies, charter oversight intersect
Ohio: New Cutpoints

Graduation rates:
• 4-year cohort:
  – >36% = "exceeds standards"; 8-35% = "meets standards"; <7.9 = "does not meet standards"
• 5,6,7,8-year cohorts:
  – >40% = "exceeds standards"; 12-39% = “meets”; <12% = "does not meet"

Schoolwide passage rates on high school achievement assessments:
• 68% or higher = “Exceeds standards”
• 32 – 67% = “Meets standards”
• <32% = “Does not meet standards”

Annual measurable objectives:
• 36% or higher = "exceeds standards"
• 1-35.9% = "meets standards"
• <1% = "does not meet standards"
Connecticut’s story

- Advocates pushed 2013 bill due to AEC disarray
- State produced taxonomy in early 2014
- Oversight stakes heightened by FUSE scandal
- NACSA/Momentum proposed new AEC frameworks (6/2015)
- Next, a comprehensive review...
Alternative Charter Accountability in Louisiana
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The Challenge

While letter grade accountability systems have many advantages – simplicity, consistency, relevance, – they are by nature reductive.
Key Question #1

What is a fair, accurate, and consistent way to assess performance and provide accountability consequences for alternative schools?
Key Questions #2

How do we balance the desire to differentiate assessments, labels, and consequences with the desire to maintain high standards and expectations for all schools and students?
Key Questions #3

In a system of letter grades premised on giving parents accurate information, what does it mean to give accurate information about alternative schools?
Key Questions #4

Is an “F” for an alternative school the same as an “F” for a traditional school? Should parents be expected to know the difference?
Accountability

• We decided that it was important to maintain the consistency of the state accountability across all types of schools

• No variation in how letter grades are calculated, who receives them, or how they are disseminated

Portfolio Management

• We decided that portfolio management – especially deciding which schools stay open – did require differentiation across types of schools
The Louisiana Compromise (2 of 2)

Working in partnership with the charter school community, we developed an additional framework for evaluation of alternative charter schools.

These schools still receive letter grades but portfolio management decisions are made instead based on this framework.

### Alternative Charter School Extension and Renewal Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Potential Points</th>
<th>Performance Metric</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOC Performance(^1)</td>
<td>Full Credit – 20 Points</td>
<td>≥ 75% of Students Receive Score Eligible for Graduation</td>
<td>X / 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Credit - 10 Points</td>
<td>61 – 74% of Students Receive Score Eligible for Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Credit – 0 Points</td>
<td>≤ 60% of Student Receive Score Eligible for Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Credit Accumulation\(^2\) | Full Credit – 20 Points | ≥ 75% of Students Earn 6 or More Credits or Full Completion | X / 20 |
| Partial Credit – 10 Points | 61 – 74% of Students Earn 6 or More Credits or Full Completion |
| No Credit – 0 Points | ≤ 60% of Students Earn 6 or More Credits or Full Completion |

| Student Stability Rate\(^3\) | Full Credit – 20 Points | ≥ 85% of Students Stay Enrolled in School | X / 20 |
| Partial Credit – 10 Points | 61 – 84% of Students Stay Enrolled in School |
| No Credit – 0 Points | ≤ 60% Students Stay Enrolled in School |

| School Selected Indicators | Department Sets Standard of Performance | X / 20 |
| • Schools propose two additional criteria related to their mission. | |
| • Schools must propose criteria that are objective and quantifiable. |

### Framework Extension Eligibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Points Accumulated</th>
<th>Eligible for Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81 – 100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 49</td>
<td>Ineligible for Extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SIATech Mission:
Recover disadvantaged opportunity youth

SIATech provides a premier high school dropout recovery program engaging students through relationship-focused, high-tech, and rigorous learning experiences resulting in Real Learning for Real Life™.

Break cycle of poverty by providing a pathway to middle class through employment / college.
SIATech by the Numbers

17 Years in Existence

SIATech, Inc. 1998

MYcroSchool. 2010

21 School Sites

All Students

$18,000

Low-income

18 months

On average, students have been out of school 18 months prior to enrollment with SIATech

15,000 Graduates

35% In College

35% in college within two years of graduation
SIATech High School Program

Student Focused
• Dropout Recovery
• Nonprofit

Blended Model
• Competency-based
• Personalized

ConTech curriculum
• Common core state standards-aligned

Fully accredited
• AdvancED, WASC, SACS

Graduates are Ready for College and Career
SIATech Schools in California

- Two charters, 15 campuses
- 1,500 students
- Partnered with workforce development
  - Job Corps: 7 sites
  - WIOA: 8 sites
- Classroom-based and independent study
- An independent reporting charter school for accountability
SIATech Little Rock

• Arkansas state-authorized charter school
• Serve multiple counties
• Classroom-based model
• 150 students
• Considered an alternative school for accountability
• 150 graduates in 3 years
SIATech / MYcroSchool in Florida

- Five charters, five campuses
- 1,400 students
- Not graded in Florida
- Accountable for growth to standard over time
Keys to Success: Keepin’ it REAL

Individualized Learning Plans
Personalized Education Experience

Flipped Delivery
Lessons provided so teachers can concentrate efforts on relationship and trust building

Relevant, Rigorous Curriculum

Results
Accelerated learning supported by high expectations

- High-Tech
- Tied to career training
Building and Nurturing Partnerships: Synergy and Sustainability

• Charter and traditional schools need to work together to solve problems in American Education
• Unique school, business, and collegiate partnerships to leverage resources

We can all unite around the quest for equitable access to public education that is the civil rights issue of our time.
Each time a man stands up for an idea, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring, those ripples build a current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance. – ROBERT F. KENNEDY
What’s YouthBuild

• 35 years of empowering 16-24 year old opportunity youth

• 10,000 Students completed over 3.5 million service hours in 2014

• Pathways to education, jobs, entrepreneurship, and community transformation

• Comprehensive youth development experience
Five Components of a YouthBuild Program

Vocational Experiences
- supervised training
- employer expectations
- job readiness skills
- vocational education
- pre-apprenticeship

Leadership Development
- decision making
- group facilitation
- program leadership roles
- public speaking
- negotiating
- community service
- advocacy

YCSC Education (ACE Model)
- essential questions
- literacy & numeracy skills
- project-based learning
- authentic assessment
- restorative justice
- culminating projects

Wrap-Around Services
- peer counseling
- individual counseling
- group counseling
- case management
- outside referrals
- life skills
- goals

Graduate Resources
- college counseling
- pre-employment training
- pre-apprenticeship training
- career counseling
- job development
- job placement
- follow-up

YCSC Education (ACE Model)
- essential questions
- literacy & numeracy skills
- project-based learning
- authentic assessment
- restorative justice
- culminating projects
Why ACE Assessments: Test v. Competency

**Test-Based**
- Low Level Thinking on Bloom’s Taxonomy (memorization and recall)
- One day snapshot of performance
- Only applicable on the test

**Competency-Based**
- Higher Level Thinking on Bloom’s Taxonomy (analyze and create)
- On-going performance assessment
- Can be applied in real-life
YCSC Competencies

Curriculum at YCSC arranged competencies into 3 indices that reflect our educational philosophy and goals:

- Higher Order Thinking Index
  25 Skills

- Post-Secondary Readiness Index
  23 Skills

- Social Responsibility Index
  14 Skills
## Higher Order Thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GATHERING INFORMATION</th>
<th>EVALUATING, ANALYZING, SYNTHESIZING, INFERRING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Note-taking</td>
<td>● Evaluating information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Research (Online, Participatory Action Research, Book, Library, Reading creative texts, Geography literacy)</td>
<td>● Using evidence to defend an argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Identifying reliable sources</td>
<td>● Compare and contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Understanding the purpose of a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Problem solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCING ORIGINAL WORK</th>
<th>EXTENDED THINKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Expository writing</td>
<td>● Revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Creative writing</td>
<td>● Meta-cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Narrative writing</td>
<td>● Connections to prior knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Creative/artistic projects</td>
<td>● Interdisciplinary connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Understanding plagiarism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Citing sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Personal style and originality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Grammar and syntax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Postsecondary Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNTABILITY</th>
<th>PUBLIC SPEAKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Team agreements</td>
<td>● Projecting your voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Self-evaluation</td>
<td>● Speaking clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Peer-evaluation</td>
<td>● Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Restorative justice</td>
<td>● Posture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Individual goal setting</td>
<td>● Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Follow-through</td>
<td>● Courtesy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Self-control</td>
<td>● Humor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLABORATING</th>
<th>STUDY SKILLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Team goal setting</td>
<td>● Note-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Meeting planning</td>
<td>● Exam study skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Solidarity</td>
<td>● Timed writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Volunteering for tasks</td>
<td>● Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Fulfilling commitments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Problem solving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Discussion and dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Using technology to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaborate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Social Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS</th>
<th>POLICY ADVOCACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Identifying and understanding injustice, oppression, and inequality</td>
<td>• Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mapping/geography</td>
<td>• Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Listening with empathy and understanding</td>
<td>• Petitioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitate workshops to raise awareness</td>
<td>• Filing a legal challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs assessment</td>
<td>• Protesting for reforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Political Analysis</td>
<td>• Campaigning for political office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Power Analysis</td>
<td>• Deliver public comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Story-based messaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Goal-setting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING AUTONOMY</th>
<th>GROWTH AND TRANSFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Community involvement</td>
<td>• Love for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resource development</td>
<td>• Positive disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Budgeting</td>
<td>• Intellectual humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grant writing</td>
<td>• Genuine relationship building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program development</td>
<td>• Evaluation and reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>