



MEMORANDUM

to: CSRC Members
from: Sue Gramling, Janice Ereth, and Theresa Healy
cc: Cindy Zautcke
subject: Performance Results Related to Academic Expectations Stated in the December 30, 2008, Letter From CSRC to Academy of Learning and Leadership
date: July 7, 2010

In December 2008, the Chair of the Charter School Review Committee (CSRC) issued a letter to the Academy of Learning and Leadership (ALL) regarding placing the school on probation. This letter specified four educational performance expectations that would be used by the CSRC to assess the school's efforts towards improvement. As requested by the CSRC, Children's Research Center (CRC) staff analyzed data submitted by ALL relative to each of the four academic expectations. Table 1 summarizes the school's progress toward meeting each expectation. Following Table 1 is a description of the CSRC expectations and results from analysis of select performance measures stipulated by the CSRC. These results will be incorporated into the school's annual performance report

Table 1: Overview of Probation Expectation Results. A table with 2 columns: Probation Expectation and Met/Not Met. It lists four expectations regarding student advancement in reading and math, and AYP expectations.

1. Current Second- and Third-grade Students With Comparison SDRT Scores From the Previous Spring

Expectation: It is expected that all students will advance, on average, at least one year using grade-level equivalencies (GLE) from spring test to spring test. All students below grade level on the previous year's Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (SDRT) will advance, on average, more than one year using GLEs from spring test to spring test.

The results for third-grade students with comparable first-grade SDRT test results will be reported as supplementary information.

Results: The standardized test used by the CSRC to track reading progress from first through third grade is the SDRT. Note that GLE scores from this test do not translate into proficiency levels; therefore, results are described in GLE. Progress for all students who took tests in the last two consecutive years was examined.

There were 17 students enrolled in ALL as first graders in 2008–09 who took the test in 2009–10 as second graders, and 18 students enrolled in 2008–09 as second graders who took the test in 2009–10 as third graders. The CSRC expects that these students will advance, on average, 1.0 GLE. As illustrated in Table 2, 25.7% (9 of 35) of students improved by 1.0 or more GLE. The average advancement from first to second grade was 0.9 GLE. Approximately 29% (5 of 17) of the second graders improved at least 1.0 GLE. Second to third graders advanced an average of 0.7 GLE. Approximately 22% (4 of 18) of the third graders improved at least 1.0 GLE. Overall, these students advanced, on average, 0.8 GLE from 2008–09 to 2009–10. These data indicate that students did not meet the CSRC expectation of 1.0 GLE average advancement.

Table 2				
Academy of Learning and Leadership				
Average GLE Advancement in Reading				
Based on SDRT Total				
Grade (2008–09 to 2009–10)	Average GLE 2008–09	Average GLE 2009–10	Average Advancement	% of Students Who Met Expectation
1st to 2nd (n = 17)	1.0	1.9	0.9	29.4%
2nd to 3rd (n = 18)	2.2	2.9	0.7	22.2%
Total (N = 35)	--	--	0.8	25.7%

There were 9 second and 10 third graders who tested below GLE in 2008–09 and were tested again in 2009–10. Results indicate that no (0.0%) students advanced more than one GLE. On average, students advanced 0.6 GLE, which does not meet the expectation of advancing more than one GLE (see Table 3).

Table 3				
Academy of Learning and Leadership				
Average GLE Advancement for 2nd and 3rd Graders Who Did Not Meet GLE in 2007–08				
Based on SDRT Total				
Grade (2008–09 to 2009–10)	Average GLE 2008–09	Average GLE 2009–10	Average Advancement	% of Students Who Met Expectation
1st to 2nd (n = 9) ¹	Cannot report due to n size			
2nd to 3rd (n = 10)	1.6	2.0	0.4	0.0%
Total (N = 19)	--	--	0.6	0.0%

As supplemental information, scores for the 12 students who were enrolled as first graders in 2007–08 and as third graders in 2009–10 were also analyzed. These results show that, over two consecutive years of instruction, these students advanced, on average, 1.5 GLE from first to third grade (not shown).²

2. Current Fourth Through Eighth Graders Meeting the Full Academic Year (FAY) Definition Who Were at the Proficient or Advanced Levels on Their Previous Year’s Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE) Reading and/or Math Subtests

Expectation: It is expected that 75.0% or more of these students will maintain their status of proficient or above. This expectation applies to students enrolled for an FAY.³

¹ The CSRC has adopted a policy to consider but not report data on cohorts of less than 10 students.

² The CSRC has clear expectations that, each year, students will improve at least 1.0 GLE for each year of instruction. It follows that students will advance, on average, at least 2.0 GLE with two consecutive years of instruction in reading.

³ Since September 19, 2008.

Results: This year there were 32 students in fourth through eighth grades who met proficiency level expectations in reading, i.e., who scored proficient or advanced in 2008–09, and who were tested again in 2009–10. Of these students, 65.6% were able to again reach proficient or advanced levels in reading, which does not meet the CSRC goal. Note that to protect student identity, the CSRC requires that group sizes include 10 or more students. See Table 4.

Table 4			
Academy of Learning and Leadership			
Reading Progress for FAY Students Who Met Proficiency Level Expectations			
Based on WKCE			
Grade (2008–09 to 2009–10)	# of Students Proficient or Advanced 2008–09	# of Students Who Maintained Proficient or Advanced in 2009–10	
		N	%
3rd to 4th	7	Cannot report due to n size	
4th to 5th	3*	Cannot report due to n size	
5th to 6th	4	Cannot report due to n size	
6th to 7th	5	Cannot report due to n size	
7th to 8th	13	9	69.2%
Total	32	21	65.6%

*Does not include one student who withdrew and re-enrolled in 2009.

There were 20 students who were proficient or above in mathematics when tested in 2008–09 who were again tested in 2009–10. Of these students, 68.4% were able to maintain proficiency in math, short of the CSRC goal (see Table 5).

Table 5			
Academy of Learning and Leadership			
Math Progress for FAY Students Who Met Proficiency Level Expectations			
Based on WKCE			
Grade (2008–09 to 2009–10)	# of Students Proficient or Advanced 2008–09	# of Students Who Maintained Proficient or Advanced in 2009–10	
		N	%
3rd to 4th	3	Cannot report due to n size	
4th to 5th	5*	Cannot report due to n size	
5th to 6th	2	Cannot report due to n size	
6th to 7th	3	Cannot report due to n size	
7th to 8th	6	Cannot report due to n size	
Total	19	13	68.4%

*Does not include one student who withdrew and re-enrolled in 2009.

3. Current Fourth Through Eighth Graders Meeting the FAY Definition Who Were at the Minimal or Basic Levels or Proficiency on Their Previous Year's WKCE Reading and/or Math Subtests

Expectation: It is expected that, each year, the school will increase the percentage of students who show advancement in scale scores to the next highest quartile within the range of their previous year's proficiency level or advance to the next proficiency level.⁴ This expectation applies to FAY students.

Results: Reading progress in terms of proficiency level achievement for students who tested below proficiency expectations in 2008–09 is provided in Table 6. Approximately 46.1% of 89 students from fourth through eighth grades either advanced at least one level or showed improvement within their level by advancing at least one quartile in reading. This compares to 41.9% of 105 students who advanced in reading the previous year. Therefore, the school increased the percentage of students who advanced from year to year in reading.

Table 6					
Academy of Learning and Leadership					
Proficiency Level Advancement for FAY Students					
Who Tested Below Proficiency Level Expectations in Reading					
Based on WKCE Reading Subtest					
Grades 2008–09 to 2009–10	# of Students Minimal/Basic in 2008–09	# of Students Who Advanced One Proficiency Level	If Not Advanced, # Who Improved Quartile(s) Within the Proficiency Level	Total Proficiency Level Advancement	
				N	%
3rd to 4th	19	3	2	5	26.3%
4th to 5th	15	5	3	8	53.3%
5th to 6th	18	6	4	10	55.6%
6th to 7th	18	4	2	6	33.3%
7th to 8th	19	7	5	12	63.2%
Total	89	25	16	41	46.1%

⁴ CRC will divide the scale scores at each proficiency level into quartiles.

Math progress by grade level for fourth- through eighth-grade students who tested below proficiency expectations in 2008–09 is illustrated in Table 7. As a group, 39.2% of 102 students advanced at least one proficiency level or at least one quartile within their proficiency level in mathematics. This compares to 47.4% of 116 students who advanced in math in 2008–09. Therefore, the school did not increase the percentage of students who advanced from year to year in math.

Table 7					
Academy of Learning and Leadership					
Proficiency Level Advancement for FAY Students					
Who Tested Below Proficiency Level Expectations in Math					
Based on WKCE Math Subtest					
Grade 2008–09 to 2009–10	# of Students Minimal/Basic in 2008–09	# of Students Who Advanced One Proficiency Level	If Not Advanced, # Who Improved Quartile(s) Within the Proficiency Level	Total Proficiency Level Advancement	
				N	%
3rd to 4th	23	4	5	9	39.1%
4th to 5th	13	1	2	3	23.1%
5th to 6th	20	4	2	6	30.0%
6th to 7th	20	5	7	12	60.0%
7th to 8th	26	4	6	10	38.5%
Total	102	18	22	40	39.2%

4. Adequate Yearly Progress

Expectation: The Committee expects ALL to meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) expectations in reading and math as indicated by its AYP report for the 2009–10 academic year.

Results: According to the AYP Review Summary published by DPI for 2009–10, ALL reached AYP in test participation, attendance, and reading.⁵ The school’s improvement status for test participation and attendance is “satisfactory.” The school’s improvement status for reading is Level 2 Improved. For the fourth year in a row, the school did not meet AYP in mathematics, indicating a Level 3 status.

⁵ <http://www2.dpi.state.wi.us/sifi/default.asp>.