

Darrell Lynn Hines College Preparatory Academy of Excellence

Programmatic Profile and Educational Performance

2014–15 School Year

Report Date: September 2015

Prepared by:
Susan Gramling
Janice Ereth, PhD
Sarah Covington




TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | i |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. PROGRAMMATIC PROFILE | 2 |
| A. Description and Philosophy of Educational Methodology..... | 2 |
| 1. Mission and Philosophy | 2 |
| 2. Description of Educational Programs and Curriculum | 3 |
| B. Student Population | 5 |
| C. School Structure | 7 |
| 1. Board of Directors | 7 |
| 2. Areas of Instruction..... | 7 |
| 3. Classrooms..... | 7 |
| 4. Teacher Information..... | 8 |
| 5. Hours of Instruction/School Calendar | 11 |
| 6. Parent and Family Involvement | 12 |
| 7. Waiting List..... | 13 |
| 8. Disciplinary Policy | 13 |
| 9. Graduation and High School Information..... | 13 |
| D. Activities for Continuous School Improvement..... | 14 |
| III. EDUCATIONAL PERFORMANCE | 16 |
| A. Attendance | 17 |
| B. Parent Participation..... | 17 |
| C. Special Education Needs | 18 |
| D. Local Measures of Educational Performance | 18 |
| 1. Reading | 21 |
| a. PALS for K4, K5, and First-Grade Students..... | 21 |
| i. PALS-PreK | 21 |
| ii. PALS K5 and PALS for First Graders | 21 |
| b. Reading Progress for Second Through Eighth Graders Using MAP Normative Mean Scores | 22 |
| i. Students at or Above the National Average (Normative Mean) for Their Current Grade Level on the Fall MAP Reading Test... .. | 24 |
| ii. Students Below the National Average (Normative Mean) for Their Current Grade Level on the Fall MAP Reading Test | 24 |
| 2. Math | 26 |
| a. Math in Focus for K5 and First Graders | 26 |
| b. Math Progress for Second Through Eighth Graders Using MAP Normative Mean Scores | 26 |
| i. Students at or Above the National Average (Normative Mean) on the Fall MAP Math Test..... | 28 |
| ii. Students Below the National Average (Normative Mean) on the Fall MAP Math Test..... | 29 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 3. | Writing Progress | 30 |
| a. | Writing for K5 Through Sixth Grades..... | 30 |
| b. | Writing for Seventh and Eighth Grades..... | 32 |
| 4. | IEP Progress for Special Education Students..... | 33 |
| E. | External Standardized Measures of Educational Performance | 34 |
| 1. | PALS | 34 |
| a. | PALS–PreK..... | 36 |
| b. | PALS–K and PALS 1–3 | 36 |
| 2. | Badger Exam for Third Through Eighth Graders..... | 39 |
| 3. | WKCE Science and Social Studies Assessments for Fourth and Eighth Graders..... | 41 |
| F. | Multiple-Year Student Progress..... | 42 |
| 1. | Second-Grade Progress Based on PALS..... | 42 |
| 2. | Fourth- Through Eighth-Grade Badger Exam..... | 43 |
| G. | CSRC School Scorecard | 43 |
| H. | DPI School Report Card..... | 45 |
| IV. | SUMMARY/RECOMMENDATIONS | 46 |

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Contract Compliance Chart
 Appendix B: Student Learning Memorandum
 Appendix C: Trend Information
 Appendix D: CSRC 2014–15 School Scorecard
 Appendix E: 2014–15 Badger Exam Results
 Appendix F: CSRC PILOT School Scorecard

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
for
Darrell Lynn Hines College Preparatory Academy of Excellence
2014–15

This 13th annual report on the operation of Darrell Lynn Hines College Preparatory Academy of Excellence (DLH Academy) is a result of intensive work undertaken by the City of Milwaukee Charter School Review Committee (CSRC), DLH Academy staff, and the NCCD Children's Research Center (CRC). Based on the information gathered and discussed in the attached report, CRC has determined the following.

I. CONTRACT COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

DLH Academy met all provisions of its contract with CSRC.

II. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

A. Local Measures

1. Primary Measures of Academic Progress

CSRC requires the school to track student progress in reading, writing, math, and special education goals throughout the year to identify students in need of additional help and to assist teachers in developing strategies to improve the academic performance of all students.

a. Reading

K4 through first-grade reading skills were assessed using the Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS).

- A total of 25 K4 students completed the fall and spring PALS assessments; 20 (80.0%) students reached the developmental range for at least five of seven tasks at the spring assessment; the school's goal was 85.0%.
- Out of 56 K5 through first-grade students, 50 (89.3%) met the spring summed score benchmark; the school's goal was 85.0%.

Second- through eighth-grade student reading skills were tested using Measures of Academic Progress (MAP).

- Overall, 39 (70.9%) of 55 second- through eighth-grade students who were at or above the national average (i.e., normative mean) for their grade level at the time of the fall MAP reading test remained at or above the national average at the time of the spring test, falling short of the school's goal of 75.0%.

- Of 120 second- through eighth-grade students below the national average (i.e., normative mean) for their grade level on the fall MAP reading test, 95 (79.2%) reached the average for their current grade level or at least met the national averages for the functional grade level at which they tested in the fall, exceeding the school's goal of 65.0%.

b. Math

K5 and first-grade students were tested using the Math in Focus curriculum. Of 56 students, 44 (78.6%) scored proficient or higher on 75.0% of math skills; the school's goal was 100.0%.

Second- through eighth-grade student math skills were tested using MAP.

- Of the 37 students at or above the national average (i.e., normative mean) for their grade level at the time of the fall MAP math test, 26 (70.3%) remained at or above the national average on the spring test, not meeting the school's goal of 75.0%.
- Of the 138 students below the national average (i.e., normative mean) for their grade level on the fall MAP math test, 98 (71.0%) reached the average for their current grade level or at least met the national averages for the functional grade level at which they tested in the fall, exceeding the school's goal of 65.0%.

c. Writing

K5 through eighth-grade student writing skills were assessed using the Six Traits of Writing rubric.

- Out of 177 K5 through sixth-grade students, 139 (78.5%) had an overall score of at least three of four points on grade-level writing skills, exceeding the school's goal of 65.0%.
- Out of 54 seventh- and eighth-grade students, 19 (35.2%) had an overall score of at least four out of five points on grade-level writing skills, failing to meet the goal of 65.0%.

d. Special Education

Of 28 special education students with active individualized education programs (IEPs), 22 (78.6%) demonstrated progress on at least 70.0% of their subgoals. The school's goal was that all students with active IEPs would show that amount of progress.

2. Secondary Measures of Academic Progress

To meet City of Milwaukee requirements, DLH Academy identified measureable education-related outcomes in attendance, parental involvement, and special education student records. The school met its goals in all but one of these outcomes.

DLH Academy met its goal that 100.0% of parents of students enrolled all year attend both parent-teacher conferences.

B. Year-to-Year Academic Achievement on Standardized Tests

DLH Academy administered all required standardized tests noted in their contract with the City of Milwaukee. However, data regarding year-to-year academic achievement on Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction standardized tests are not available this year due to the discontinuance of the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination and the first year of application of the PALS to second graders and the Badger Exam to third through eighth graders.

C. Scorecard

The school's multiple measure score card score for the 2014–15 school year was 83.9% (B), placing the school in the High Performing/Exemplary category.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

The school addressed all of the recommendations in its 2013–14 programmatic profile and education performance report. Based on results in this report and in consultation with school staff, CRC recommends that the school continue a focused school improvement plan by engaging in the following activities.

- Continue to implement the recommendations resulting from the partnership with Cambium Learning to improve all of the local measure results with particular attention to improving writing outcomes.
- Continue and reinforce the practices of differentiation and monitoring the growth of all students, both those who struggle and those performing at or above their grade level.
- Provide teachers with more professional development and support in the area of differentiation.
- Work with the Cambium Learning consultants to improve parent involvement. Continue to develop and implement strategies to improve the number of returning students from year to year and the number who stay the entire year.

IV. CRC RECOMMENDATION FOR ONGOING MONITORING

Because the school has met all of its contract requirements, addressed all of the school improvement recommendations from the previous year, and continues to improve its score on the CSRC multiple measure scorecard, CRC recommends that DLH Academy continue regular, annual academic monitoring and reporting.

I. INTRODUCTION

This is the 13th annual program monitoring report to address educational outcomes for the Darrell Lynn Hines College Preparatory Academy of Excellence (DLH Academy), one of 10 schools chartered by the City of Milwaukee during the 2014–15 school year. This report focuses on the educational component of the monitoring program undertaken by the City of Milwaukee Charter School Review Committee (CSRC) and was prepared as a result of a contract between CSRC and the NCCD Children’s Research Center (CRC).¹

The following process was used to gather the information in this report.

1. CRC staff assisted the school in developing its student learning memorandum.
2. CRC staff visited the school, conducted a structured interview with the executive director and principal, and reviewed pertinent documents.
3. CRC staff and the CSRC chair attended a meeting of the board of directors of this school to improve communications regarding the roles of CSRC and CRC as the educational monitor and the expectations regarding board member involvement.
4. CRC made additional site visits to observe classroom activities, student-teacher interactions, parent-staff exchanges, and overall school operations.
5. CRC conducted a structured interview at the end of the academic year with the executive director and the assistant principal to review the year and develop recommendations for school improvement.
6. CRC read case files for selected special education students to ensure that individualized education programs (IEPs) were up to date.
7. CRC staff verified the license or permit information for all instructional staff using the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) teacher license website.
8. DLH Academy provided electronic and paper data to CRC, which were compiled and analyzed at CRC in order to produce the monitoring report.

¹ CRC is a nonprofit social science research organization and a center of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD).

II. PROGRAMMATIC PROFILE

Darrell Lynn Hines College Preparatory Academy of Excellence

Address: 7151 N. 86th St.
Milwaukee, WI 53224

Telephone: (414) 358-3542

Director of Schools
and Leadership: Precious Washington
Principal: Lois Fletcher

DLH Academy is on the Northwest side of Milwaukee. It was founded in 1998 as a private school affiliated with the Christian Faith Fellowship Church. In 2002, the school became an independent charter (public) school, chartered by the City of Milwaukee. DLH Academy provides educational programming for children in kindergarten (K4 and K5) through eighth grade.

A. Description and Philosophy of Educational Methodology²

1. Mission and Philosophy

The mission of DLH Academy is to prepare students academically, socially, physically, and emotionally. Students who graduate from DLH will be prepared to promote open-mindedness and social responsibility in both their communities and the world around them. Students who leave the DLH program will be equipped with the skills necessary to become well-balanced, caring, and knowledgeable individuals who understand that the many diverse voices in the world have a right to be heard and respected. The school's goals include the following.

- Deliver a quality education enriched with multiple opportunities to develop internationally minded students.
- Provide broad access to an exemplary K4 through eighth-grade college preparatory education that is internationally benchmarked through the International Baccalaureate (IB) Programme framework.

² 2014–15 *Family Handbook*.

- Be a school community that values and recognizes scholarship, high levels of student effort, academic achievement, and creativity.
- Provide an environment in which each student is known, respected, and valued as an individual of great potential and promise.
- Prepare students to become active, ethical, and responsible citizens who develop an understanding of their role in a multicultural world.
- Create a professional setting for teachers and staff in which they are free to model and demonstrate best practices and engage in innovative pedagogical methods that promote international mindedness.
- Actualize partnerships with parents, families, and community-based organizations and develop global partnerships to build a holistic support system for students.

2. Description of Educational Programs and Curriculum³

DLH Academy offers a transdisciplinary curriculum through the IB Primary Years Programme (PYP). Through the PYP curriculum, students learn to profile all of the characteristics of educated international persons.

In addition to reading/literacy, language arts (including writing), and math, DLH Academy offers instruction in science, Spanish,⁴ music,⁵ physical education, health, and research methods. Students in K4 through fifth grade were included in the balanced literacy approach.

The school continued to focus on reading and math development and improved use of Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) data to identify gaps in student academic progress. All new students in second through eighth grades are tested with the MAP to determine their level of functioning in reading and math.

³ Based on DLH Academy's 2014–15 *Family Handbook* and interviews with school administration.

⁴ Spanish was provided for students in second through fifth grades under a contract with Berlitz.

⁵ Music was provided through an agreement with the Wisconsin Conservatory of Music. General music was offered to K4 through fifth-grade students; violin was offered to students in first through third grades; and fourth and fifth graders were offered orchestra.

In addition to academic subjects, DLH Academy provides other community-based opportunities for students.

This was the third year of the Carrera Program, a teen pregnancy prevention program. The Carrera Program is designed to create a healthy environment where young people can identify their gifts and talents and begin the progress toward healthy growth and development. When teens believe they have value and a real chance for success, they start to see a future in which teen pregnancy has no part. The Carrera Program's debut in Wisconsin was made possible through a partnership with Community Advocates and the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families, funded by the US Department of Health and Human Services. Implementation and operation of the program was awarded to Boys and Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee. Club staff work with DLH Academy administration to deliver the Carrera Program curriculum to sixth- through eighth-grade students.⁶

The school provided an extended-care program from 7:00 to 7:30 a.m. at no additional charge. Parents were responsible for transportation for the extended-care program. The school contracts bus services with a local company. Bus transportation is provided on a first-come services basis.

The school's leadership team consisted of the director of schools and leadership, a principal, an executive manager of finance and reporting, a special education coordinator, an executive assistant, and an administrative assistant. Other staff include a building operations specialist and a food services coordinator.

The director of schools and leadership oversees the school's operations, including all administrative functions and administrative staff supervision. The principal directs and supervises the school on a day-to-day basis. The principal is responsible for curriculum development, academic

⁶ *Wisconsin Community Journal*. (2012, October 19). Nationally recognized teen pregnancy prevention program launches in Milwaukee. Retrieved from <http://communityjournal.net/nationally-recognized-teen-pregnancy-prevention-program-launches-in-milwaukee/> and the DLH website: <http://www.dlhacademy.org>

programming, and accountability for academic achievement. The PYP coordinator provides oversight of the IB program.⁷

B. Student Population

At the beginning of the year, 288 students in K4 through eighth grade were enrolled in DLH Academy.⁸ A total of three students enrolled after the school year started, and 28 students withdrew from the school prior to the end of the year.⁹ Numbers of students and their reasons for withdrawing included the following: Nine students moved out of state, nine were dissatisfied with the school/program, eight left due to transportation issues, and two left for unknown reasons.¹⁰ Four (14.3%) of the students who withdrew had special education needs. Of the 288 students who started the year at the school, 260 remained enrolled at the end of the year, resulting in a 90.3% retention rate.

At the end of the year, 263 students were enrolled at DLH Academy.

- Most (233, or 88.6%) of the students were African American, 14 (5.3%) were Hispanic, and 16 (6.1%) students were Asian.
- There were 139 (52.9%) girls and 124 (47.1%) boys.
- A total of 30 (11.4%) students had special education needs: nine with speech and language impairments (SL), eight with other health impairments (OHI), four with emotional/behavioral disorders, four with specific learning disabilities (SLD), two with SLD with SL, one with OHI and SL, one with cognitive disability, and one with visual impairment and OHI.

⁷ From the 2014–15 *Family Handbook*.


⁸ As of September 19, 2014.

⁹ Three students withdrew from K4 and two students withdrew from K5. Four withdrew from first, three from second, three from third, two from fourth, one from fifth, three from sixth, seven from seventh, and zero from eighth grade.

¹⁰ The school provided withdrawal reasons for three additional students. Two students withdrew before the third Friday in September—one was going to be homeschooled and the other withdrew because of transportation problems. One student withdrew after one day of school because of transportation problems. These three students were excluded from the analysis.

- Most (243, or 92.4%) students were eligible for free or reduced lunch prices. The remaining 20 (7.6%) were not eligible.

The largest grade level was eighth, with 31 students. The rest of the grade levels had between 21 and 30 students, with an average grade-level size of 26 students (Figure 1).



Of the 240 students attending on the last day of the 2013-14 academic year who were eligible for continued enrollment at the school for 2014-15 (i.e., who did not graduate from eighth grade), 187 were enrolled on the third Friday in September 2014, representing a return rate of 77.9%.

C. School Structure

1. Board of Directors

DLH Academy is governed by a volunteer board of directors. The board currently consists of 10 members, including a president, an executive vice president, a secretary, a treasurer, a teacher representative, a parent representative, and two other members, along with the director of schools and leadership and the principal.¹¹

2. Areas of Instruction¹²

In addition to reading/literacy, language arts, and math, DLH Academy offered instruction in science, Spanish, music, physical education, health, and research methods. Special education programming was provided to students identified as needing an IEP. At the end of each quarter (every nine weeks), report cards were distributed to parents. Midway through each quarter, progress reports were sent home to update parents on student progress. Parents also were encouraged to use PowerSchool, a web-based student information system that facilitates student information management and communication among school administrators, teachers, parents, and students. The parent portal gives parents and students access to real-time information, including attendance, grades, detailed assignment descriptions, school bulletins, lunch menus, and personal messages from teachers.

3. Classrooms

DLH Academy had 11 classrooms, ranging in size from 21 to 31 students throughout the year. There was one classroom each for K4 through fifth grade. Sixth, seventh, and eighth graders moved

¹¹ The director of schools and the principal are ex officio members.

¹² 2014–15 *Family Handbook*.

among four classrooms, one each for English, social studies, science, and math. The school also had a gym, a resource room (for special education services outside of the classrooms), a library, a health room, and a cafeteria. Each classroom from K4 through fifth grade had a teacher and an educational assistant. Students in fifth, sixth, and seventh grades were supported by paraprofessionals and tutors through the Carrera Program.¹³

4. Teacher Information

During the 2014–15 school year, DLH Academy employed a total of 18 instructional staff members plus a director of schools, a principal, and a curriculum specialist. There were 11 classroom teachers and seven other instructional staff. Classroom teachers consisted of seven elementary (one each for K4 through fifth grade) and four middle school classroom teachers (one each for math, English, science, and social studies). The seven other instructional staff included one special education coordinator/teacher, one special education paraprofessional, one speech language pathologist, two health/physical education teachers,¹⁴ one curriculum coordinator, and one librarian/media specialist. A school psychologist was contracted through the Cooperative Educational Service Agency #1.

Of the 11 teachers who started the school year in the fall, 10 remained for the entire school year for a classroom teacher retention rate of 91.0%. Five (83.3%) of the six other instructional staff who started in the fall completed the entire school year. Overall, a total of 15 of the 17 instructional staff who began in the fall of 2014 completed the entire year for an overall retention rate of 88.2%. The middle school science teacher left the school in November 2014. The school attempted to fill this position without success, so the curriculum coordinator stepped in as the science teacher. The physical education teacher left the school in October and was replaced in February 2015.

¹³ As mentioned previously in this report, these staff were employees of the Boys and Girls Club.

¹⁴ One physical education teacher resigned and was subsequently replaced.

All of the 10 classroom teachers employed at the end of the 2013–14 school year were eligible to return. Eight of the 10 came back to the school in the fall of 2014 for a return rate of 80.0%. All seven of the other instructional staff employed at the end of the 2013–14 school year were eligible to return; five (71.4%) of the seven returned. Overall, 13 of the 17 instructional staff who were eligible returned to the school, for an overall return rate of 76.5%

All of the instructional staff employed at the end of the year held DPI licenses or permits. The school engaged in many staff development activities prior to and during the 2014–15 school year. A list of trainings hosted by and held each month at the school is shown below.

| Staff Training 2014–15 | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| August | Professional Development and Standards-Based Planning for the 2014–2015 School Year, 8/18–8/29. Topics covered included educator effectiveness, goals/beliefs vs. school vision/mission, scope and sequence (vertical alignment), behavior management, and providing students with learning expectations and self-management strategies |
| September | Curriculum Meeting; Extended Learning Time |
| | AIMS Web Training |
| | Extended Learning Time, 9/8 |
| | Saturday Planning Session, 9/20 |
| | Mimio Training at Learning Exchange, 9/26 |
| October | All-School Meeting: Beliefs and Student Management, 10/1 |
| | Teacher Data Review, 10/15 |
| | Saturday Planning Session, 10/18 |
| | Middle School (MS) Differentiation, 10/20 |
| | MS Response to Intervention (Rtl) Practices, 10/23 |
| | Instructional Learning Team (ILT) Testing Sessions Update |
| | Curriculum Meeting, 10/27 |
| November | All-School Meeting: Authentic Reporting, 11/5 |
| | Classroom Management, Learning A-Z Training, Formative Assessment, Differentiation, 11/4 |
| | Curriculum Meeting, 11/10 |
| | Saturday Planning Session, 11/15 |
| | Teacher Data Review, 11/19 |
| | DPI Review Meeting, 11/20 |
| | Curriculum Meeting, 11/24 |

| Staff Training 2014–15 | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| December | All-School Meeting: Progress Reports, Maximizing Learning Time, 12/3 |
| | ILT Meeting, 12/4 |
| | Curriculum Meeting, Re-Teaching, 12/8 |
| January | ILT Meeting: Reports Update, 1/6 |
| | All-School Meeting: RtI Standardized Grading Procedures |
| | Saturday Planning Session, 1/10—Indistar Update Training |
| | Curriculum Meeting |
| | Mimio Training, Standards-Based Training, Educator Effectiveness Training, 1/23 |
| February | All-School Meeting: Students in Fear of Failure, 2/4 |
| | Saturday Planning Session, 2/7 |
| | Curriculum Meeting: Differentiation, Smarter Balanced, 2/17 |
| | DPI Review Meeting, 2/20 |
| | MS Structures, Routines, and RtI, 2/25 |
| March | All-School Meeting: Teacher Reports, Student Progress and Goals, Parent Communication, Data Review, 3/4 |
| | Curriculum Meeting: Classroom Management for Late Winter, 3/16 |
| | Teacher Data Review Meetings, 3/18 and 3/19 |
| | Mimio Training, 3/19 |
| | Saturday Planning Session, 3/21 |
| | ILT Meeting, 3/26 |
| April | All-School Meeting: Smarter Balanced Assessment, 4/1 |
| | ILT Meeting: Instructing Teachers Regarding Data Review, 4/13 |
| | Teacher Data Review, 4/15 |
| | Saturday Planning Session, 4/18 |
| | Curriculum Meeting, 4/27 |
| May | Saturday Planning Session, 5/2 |
| | All School Meeting: Final Goals/Reports and Closing Procedures, 5/6 |
| | Curriculum Meeting: Student Promotion, 5/11 |
| | Teacher Data Review, 5/21 |
| June | All-School Meeting: Student Goals For Fall, Using Alternative Curriculum and Novelty in Instruction, 6/3 |
| | Year-End Data Review, 5/15 |

In addition to staff training at the school, the appropriate staff members attended the following workshops hosted by other agencies outside of the school.

- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) Conference on Educational Leadership
- ASCD Conference on Teaching Excellence
- IB Conference
- Kindergarten Conference
- Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA) 9 Disproportionality Summit
- Wisconsin Rtl Summit
- Difficult Student Seminar
- CESA 1 Dynamic Learning Maps Training

At least one administrative staff member attended the following workshops.

- CESA District Assessment Coordinators Meetings
- The Employment Law Seminar
- ASCD Conference-Texas
- Federal Funding Conference
- Oasys User Group Conference

Performance of first-year employees was formally evaluated twice during the school year. Each returning staff member received one formal evaluation during the year.

5. Hours of Instruction/School Calendar

The regular school day for all students began at 7:55 a.m. and ended at 3:30 p.m.¹⁵ The first day of school was September 2, 2014, and the last day of school was June 11, 2015. The school provided a school calendar for the 2014–15 school year.¹⁶

¹⁵ Breakfast was served daily.

¹⁶ The school also offered a summer school program during the summer of 2014.

6. Parent and Family Involvement

DLH Academy's 2014–15 *Family Handbook* was provided to every family prior to the start of the school year. In this handbook, DLH Academy invites parents to become active members of the family involvement team, which is composed of all parents and guardians of DLH Academy students. Its purpose is to provide positive communication between parents/guardians/family members and the school administration, facilitate parental involvement in school governance and educational issues, organize volunteers, review and discuss school performance issues, and assist in fundraising and family education training.

DLH Academy expects parents/guardians/family members to review and sign its family agreement called the School-Parent Compact. This agreement is a contract that describes the school's and family's partnership roles to achieve academic and school goals for students.

Parents of all new students were required to attend a mandatory orientation session with their children prior to the start of school. Parents of returning students who had not consistently adhered to school policies and guidelines were invited to individual meetings to determine strategies to ensure each child's future success. Parent-teacher conferences were scheduled twice during the year, in October 2014 and March 2015. Telephone conferences were substituted for in-person conferences when parents were unable to attend. Families also were invited to attend special programs and events scheduled throughout the year.

Parents also were invited to join the Family Involvement Team (FIT), which is composed of all parents and guardians of DLH Academy students. The purpose of FIT is to provide positive communication between parents/guardians/family members and the school administration, facilitate parental involvement in school governance and education issues, and help with various school functions.

7. Waiting List

As of September 10, 2014, the school had a waiting list of approximately 10 students across all grades. On May 28, 2015, the school's leader reported no students waiting to enroll in the fall of 2015.

8. Disciplinary Policy

DLH Academy clearly explains its discipline policy and plan to parents and students in the current *Family Handbook*. The student management section of the handbook includes a statement of student expectations, parent and guardian expectations, and an explanation of the School-Parent Compact. In addition, an explanation of the school's discipline plan and disciplinary actions is provided. The types of disciplinary referrals include conferences with the student, the teacher, and the parent; referral to administration for Saturday detention; in-house suspension; out-of-school suspension; and expulsion recommendation. Each disciplinary referral is explained in the handbook, along with appeal rights and procedures. The school also has an explicit weapons and criminal offense policy that prohibits guns and other weapons, alcohol or drugs, and bodily harm to any member of the school community. These offenses can result in expulsion. The discipline plan states an action for each type of infraction.

Students also are referred for awards. These include awards for attendance and the academic honor roll. An annual awards convocation honors students who have excelled in academic achievement and demonstrated positive behavior and character traits that exemplify a model student.

9. Graduation and High School Information

This year, the high school advisor spoke to eighth-grade students and hosted a meeting of eighth-grade parents regarding high school programs and admission procedures. The high school advisor kept a log for each student throughout the year to track high school applications and

admission. Carerra staff also provided information and assistance to students regarding their transition to high school.

This year, 31 students graduated from DLH Academy. At the time of this report, the following schools had each accepted one DLH Academy 2014–15 graduate: Milwaukee High School of the Arts, Brown Deer High School, Whitefish Bay High School, Heritage Christian Academy, Pius High School, Vincent High School, Destiny High School, Hope Christian School, Christo Rey, and Bay View High School. These schools each accepted two graduates: Wisconsin Lutheran, Riverside High School, Rufus King, and Carmen High School; Milwaukee Lutheran and Messmer each accepted four DLH Academy graduates. Three graduates received acceptances from two schools each: one from Milwaukee Lutheran and Wisconsin Lutheran; one from Marquette High School and Wisconsin Lutheran; and one from Carmen and Milwaukee Lutheran. One student applied to Carmen, but had not yet been accepted. One student moved out of state.

The school continues to use its DLH Academy alumni and friends Facebook page to identify former students who are enrolled in a university/college, a community college, in the military, are actively employed, etc.

D. Activities for Continuous School Improvement

The following is a description of DLH Academy's response to the activities during 2014–15 that were recommended in its programmatic profile and education performance report for the 2013–14 academic year.

- Recommendation: Continue to implement the recommendations resulting from the partnership with Cambium Learning to improve the local measure results.

Response: The school worked with consultants from Cambium Learning throughout the 2014–15 school year. The teachers initially analyzed their students' data in partnership with Cambium Learning staff. Ultimately the teachers grew to independently understand and interpret their students' data and were able to discuss

the results with Cambium Learning staff. This was demonstrated by the teachers' ability to use their student data to identify students who needed RtI, set goals, and monitor student progress.

- Recommendation: Continue and reinforce the practices related to data use and differentiation when programming for each student.

Response: The school focused on students who were struggling. The daily schedule was changed to provide re-teaching sessions mid-day, right before or after lunch. Teachers designed tiered instruction for each student and grouped students accordingly. In addition, the school implemented small-group instruction with the teacher while other students worked independently on online leveled materials such as Vmath and Raz-Kids. Progress for each student was tracked, with re-grouping occurring on a regular basis.

- Recommendation: Develop and implement a plan for monitoring licensure and keeping teachers for the entire year and from year to year.

Response: The school monitored the licensure of all instructional staff and teachers. Teachers were encouraged to call DPI and document all of their contacts. The school initiated and built a bonus and incentive system into its contracts with teaching staff. Bonuses were given if teachers signed a contract by a certain date and stayed throughout each semester. The administrative staff also offered specific appreciation and praise around teacher stability.

- Recommendation: Develop and implement a plan to improve the number of returning students from year to year.

Response: The school reported continuous work on culture and climate with more recognition of what students actually do. For example, to motivate students for testing (e.g., the MAP assessments and the Badger Exam), the school provided t-shirts and arm bands for students to wear during the testing periods. In addition, teachers found grant money related to units of study for field trips. Each grade took at least two field trips during the year to places such as the Milwaukee County Zoo, Betty Brinn Children's Museum, Pick 'n Save, and Junior Achievement. Families were contacted via phone calls, a regular newsletter, the website for communicating with teachers, mailings, texts, and emails for encouragement and to say "we need you as partners." The school also provided adult-sizes hoodies and sweatshirts, which were very popular with families. Family participation was encouraged for school-wide activities such as the open house.

The school addressed all of the recommendations in its 2013–14 programmatic profile and education performance report. Based on results in this report and in consultation with school staff,

CRC recommends that the school continue a focused school improvement plan by engaging in the following activities.

- Continue to implement the recommendations resulting from the partnership with Cambium Learning to improve all of the local measure results, with particular attention to improving writing outcomes.
- Continue and reinforce the practices of differentiation and monitoring the growth of all students, both those who struggle and those performing at or above their grade level.
- Provide teachers with more professional development and support in the area of differentiation.
- Work with the Cambium Learning consultants to improve parent involvement.
- Continue to develop and implement strategies to improve the number of returning students from year to year and the number who stay the entire year.

III. EDUCATIONAL PERFORMANCE

To monitor activities as described in the school's contract with the City of Milwaukee, a variety of qualitative and quantitative information was collected at specific intervals during the past several academic years. At the start of this year, the school established attendance and parent participation goals, as well as goals related to special education student records. The school also identified local and standardized measures of academic performance to monitor student progress.

This year, local assessment measures included student progress in reading, mathematics, writing skills, and, for special education students, IEP progress. The standardized assessment measures used were the Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS), the Badger Exam, and the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE) for science and social studies.¹⁷

¹⁷ The Badger Exam is a Smarter Balanced test aligned with Common Core State Standards. Students continued to take the WKCE science and social studies tests but not the reading, math, and language arts tests.

A. Attendance

CRC examined student attendance in two ways. The first reflected the average time students actually attended school, and the second included excused absences. Both rates include all students enrolled any time during the school year. The school considered a student present if he/she attended for at least half of the day. CRC also examined the time students spent, on average, suspended (in or out of school).

At the beginning of the academic year, the school established a goal of maintaining an average attendance rate of 90.0%. Attendance data were available for 291 students. Those students attended 93.3% of the time on average, exceeding the school's goal.¹⁸ When excused absences were included, the attendance rate rose to 96.3%.

This year, 72 (24.7%) students in K5 through eighth grade were suspended at least once. Those students spent 2.8 days, on average, out of school on suspension and an average of 1.4 days in school and on suspension.¹⁹

B. Parent Participation

At the beginning of the academic year, the school set a goal that parents of students enrolled for the entire school year would attend both scheduled parent-teacher conferences. Parents of all (260, or 100.0%) children enrolled for the entire year attended both parent-teacher conferences, achieving the school's goal of 100.0% attendance.

¹⁸ Individual student attendance rates were calculated by dividing the total number of days present by the total number of days that the student was enrolled. Individual rates were then averaged across all students.

¹⁹ Of students with out-of-school suspensions, a small number also were given an in-school-suspension; however, the number is too small to report. A total of 72 students spent, on average, 2.8 days in both in-school and out-of-school suspension.

C. Special Education Needs

This year, the school set a goal to develop and maintain records for all special education students. The school provided some special education service to 34 students during the year. Four of those students withdrew before the end of the school year, and one student was dismissed from special education services as a result of his/her three-year reevaluation. All 28 continuing special education students had IEP reviews this year; those students, plus one newly assessed student, had new IEPs completed during the school year. Parent(s) of all 29 students participated in IEP development for their students.

In addition, CRC conducted a review of a representative number of files during the year. This review showed that students had current IEPs indicating their eligibility for special education services, the IEPs were reviewed in a timely manner, and parents were invited to develop and be involved in their children's IEPs. Therefore, the school met its goal to develop and maintain records.

D. Local Measures of Educational Performance

Charter schools, by their definition and nature, are autonomous schools with curricula that reflect each school's individual philosophy, mission, and goals. In addition to administering standardized tests, each charter school is responsible for describing goals and expectations for its students in the context of that school's unique approach to education. These goals and expectations are established by each City of Milwaukee-chartered school at the beginning of the academic year to measure the educational performance of its students. These local measures are useful for monitoring and reporting progress, guiding and improving instruction, clearly expressing the expected quality of student work, and providing evidence that students are meeting local benchmarks. CSRC's expectation is that at a minimum, schools establish local measures in reading, writing, math, and special education.

Reading progress was measured using PALS and the MAP assessment. Math progress was measured using the Math in Focus Curriculum and the MAP assessment. Writing progress was examined using the Common Core State Standards for Writing, and special education progress was determined by looking at progress on IEP goals.

A full description of the PALS assessment can be found in the External Standardized Measures of Educational Performance section of this report. The MAP assessments, which were used to measure second through eighth graders' progress in both reading and math, are administered once in the fall and again in the spring of the same academic year. Schools can choose to administer the MAP mid-year as well. Results provide educators with information necessary to build curriculum to meet their students' needs.

Student progress can be measured by comparing each student's performance to nationally normed scores for his/her grade level. In 2008 and 2011, the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) conducted a norming study using data from school districts all over the country.²⁰ The association calculated a normative mean, or national average, score for the fall, winter, and spring administrations of each MAP test for each grade level. For example, on a national level, fifth-grade students scored, on average, 207 Rasch Unit points on the fall MAP reading test and 212 points on the spring MAP reading test, for an overall improvement of five points. On the math test, fifth graders scored, on average, 213 points on the fall test and 221 points on the spring test, for an overall improvement of eight points.²¹ Using these national averages, teachers and parents can determine whether students are above, at, or below the national average score for all students in the same grade level at each test administration. For example, if a third grader scored 175 points at the beginning of the year, he/she was functioning

²⁰ DLH Academy used the Common Core-aligned version of MAP. Because the 2011 norms are carefully constructed to be independent of any specific test, the 2011 norms apply to NWEA Common Core-aligned MAP tests.

²¹ Scores are rounded to the nearest whole number for analysis.

below the national average for his/her grade level; the student was functioning within the range of a first or second grader. National average scores for each grade level are presented in Table 1.²²

| Table 1 2011 NWEA Measures of Academic Progress National Average (Normative Mean) Scores Fall and Spring | | | | |
|---|------------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| Grade Level | Reading | | Math | |
| | Beginning-of-Year Mean | End-of-Year Mean | Beginning-of-Year Mean | End-of-Year Mean |
| K5 | 142.5 | 157.7 | 143.7 | 159.1 |
| 1st | 160.3 | 176.9 | 162.8 | 179.0 |
| 2nd | 175.9 | 189.6 | 178.2 | 191.3 |
| 3rd | 189.9 | 199.2 | 192.1 | 203.1 |
| 4th | 199.8 | 206.7 | 203.8 | 212.5 |
| 5th | 207.1 | 212.3 | 212.9 | 221.0 |
| 6th | 212.3 | 216.4 | 219.6 | 225.6 |
| 7th | 216.3 | 219.7 | 225.6 | 230.5 |
| 8th | 219.3 | 222.4 | 230.2 | 234.5 |
| 9th | 221.4 | 222.9 | 233.8 | 236.0 |
| 10th | 223.2 | 223.8 | 234.2 | 236.6 |
| 11th | 223.4 | 223.7 | 236.0 | 238.3 |

CRC examined progress for students who were at or above the national average as well as students who were below the national average for their current grade level at the time of the fall test.

Progress for students at or above grade-level national average in the fall of 2014 was measured by determining whether the student was able to again score at or above the grade-level national average at the time of the spring test (basically, this examination indicates if students who are functioning at or above grade level improved, on average, the same as their national counterparts).

²² <http://www.nwea.org/support/article/normative-data-2011>

For students below grade-level average, CRC examined how many reached the national grade-level average for their current grade by the spring test. For students who were still below the grade-level average on the spring test, progress was measured by determining if the student was able to achieve the national average score in the spring for the functional grade level at which he or she tested in the fall.

The following sections describe results of the local measures goals in reading and math for students at DLH Academy.

1. Reading

a. *PALS for K4, K5, and First-Grade Students*

The PALS assessment and benchmarks are described in detail in the standardized test section of this report (Section E, External Standardized Measures of Educational Performance). In addition to administering the assessment as required by DPI and CSRC, DLH Academy also elected to use the PALS as their local measure for students in K4, K5, and first grade.

i. *PALS-PreK*

The school's goal was that at least 85.0% of students who completed both the fall and spring PALS-PreK assessments would be at or above the developmental range for at least five of seven tasks at the time of the spring assessment. A total of 25 K4 students completed the fall and spring PALS-PreK; 20 (80.0%) of those students were at or above the range for at least five of seven tasks at the time of the spring assessment, falling short of the school's goal of 85.0%.

ii. *PALS K5 and PALS for First Graders*

The school's goal was that at least 85.0% of students in K5 and first grade who completed the fall and spring PALS would achieve the summed score spring benchmark. A total of 56 K5 and

first-grade students completed the fall and spring PALS assessment for their respective grade level; most (50, or 89.3%) of those students were at or above the spring summed score benchmark (Table 2).

| Table 2 DLH Academy PALS for K5 and 1st-Grade Students 2014–15 | | | |
|---|-----------|---|--------------|
| Grade | N | Students Who Were at or Above the Spring Benchmark Spring 2015 | |
| | | N | % |
| K5 | 30 | 27 | 90.0% |
| 1st | 26 | 23 | 88.5% |
| Total | 56 | 50 | 89.3% |

b. Reading Progress for Second Through Eighth Graders Using MAP Normative Mean Scores

The school's goal for MAP reading results was that at least 75.0% of the students who scored at or above the national average for their current grade level on the fall reading test would remain at or above the national average at the time of the spring test. The reading goal for students below their grade level in the fall was that at least 65.0% would either reach the national average for their current grade level or reach the national average for their functional grade level at which they tested in the fall.

Both the fall and spring MAP reading tests were completed by 175 second- through eighth-grade students. At the time of the fall MAP test, 55 (31.4%) students were at or above the national average for their respective grade levels, while 120 (68.6%) scored below the average (Table 3).

| Table 3 DLH Academy Local Measures of Academic Progress: MAP Reading Assessment Student Scores Relative to National Average (Normative Mean) in Fall 2014²³ | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|--------------|---|--------------|
| Grade Level | N | Students at or Above National Average Fall 2014 | | Students Below National Average Fall 2014 | |
| | | N | % | N | % |
| 2nd | 20 | 5 | 25.0% | 15 | 75.0% |
| 3rd | 28 | 10 | 35.7% | 18 | 64.3% |
| 4th | 29 | 3 | 10.3% | 26 | 89.7% |
| 5th | 22 | 7 | 31.8% | 15 | 68.2% |
| 6th | 23 | 6 | 26.1% | 17 | 73.9% |
| 7th | 23 | 11 | 47.8% | 12 | 52.2% |
| 8th | 30 | 13 | 43.3% | 17 | 56.7% |
| Total | 175 | 55 | 31.4% | 120 | 68.6% |

²³ For the student's current grade level.

i. *Students at or Above the National Average (Normative Mean) for Their Current Grade Level on the Fall MAP Reading Test*

Of the 55 second- through eighth-grade students at or above the national average for their grade level on the fall test, 39 (70.9%) scored the national average again on the spring test, falling short of the school's goal of 75.0% (Table 4).

| Table 4 DLH Academy Local Measures of Academic Progress: MAP Reading Assessment Progress for Students at or Above the National Average in Reading in Fall 2014 | | | |
|---|-----------|---|--------------|
| Grade | N | At or Above National Average in Spring 2015 | |
| | | N | % |
| 2nd | 5 | Cannot report due to <i>n</i> size | |
| 3rd | 10 | 6 | 60.0% |
| 4th | 3 | Cannot report due to <i>n</i> size | |
| 5th | 7 | Cannot report due to <i>n</i> size | |
| 6th | 6 | Cannot report due to <i>n</i> size | |
| 7th | 11 | 6 | 54.5% |
| 8th | 13 | 10 | 76.9% |
| Total | 55 | 39 | 70.9% |

ii. *Students Below the National Average (Normative Mean) for Their Current Grade Level on the Fall MAP Reading Test*

More than two thirds (120, or 68.6%) of the students scored less than the national average for their current grade levels on the fall test. By the time of the spring test, 29 (24.2%) had reached the national reading score for their current grade level, and 66 (55.0%) had reached the national average reading score for their functional grade level. Of the 120 students who scored less than the national average for their grade, 95 (79.2%) either reached their current grade-level or functional grade-level reading score by the end of the year (Table 5), exceeding the school's goal of 65.0%.

| Table 5 DLH Academy Local Measures of Academic Progress: MAP Reading Assessment Progress for Students Below the National Average (Normative Mean) in Fall 2014²⁴ Fall 2014 to Spring 2015 | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|---|--------------|---|--------------|
| Grade Level | Students Below National Average in Fall 2014 | Students Who Reached Grade-Level National Average Score in Spring 2015 | | Students Who Did Not Reach Grade-Level Average in Spring but Met the National Average for the Functional Grade Level Tested at in Fall 2014 | | Overall Progress of Students Below National Average on Fall 2014 MAP Reading Test | |
| | N | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| 2nd | 15 | 7 | 46.7% | 7 | 46.7% | 14 | 93.3% |
| 3rd | 18 | 3 | 16.7% | 9 | 50.0% | 12 | 66.7% |
| 4th | 26 | 5 | 19.2% | 15 | 57.7% | 20 | 76.9% |
| 5th | 15 | 0 | 0.0% | 12 | 80.0% | 12 | 80.0% |
| 6th | 17 | 4 | 23.5% | 10 | 58.8% | 14 | 82.4% |
| 7th | 12 | 4 | 33.3% | 6 | 50.0% | 10 | 83.3% |
| 8th | 17 | 6 | 35.3% | 7 | 41.2% | 13 | 76.5% |
| Total | 120 | 29 | 24.2% | 66 | 55.0% | 95 | 79.2% |

The school did not meet their internal local measure goals in reading for K4 students or for students in second through eighth grades who were at or above the national average for their current grade in the fall of 2014. The school exceeded the local measure goals for K5 and first-grade students as well as second- through eighth-grade students who were below the national average for their current grade level in the fall of 2014. Overall, the school met local measures for reading progress for 204 (79.7%) of 256 students.²⁵

²⁴ For the student's current grade level.

²⁵ Calculation is based on the total number of K4, K5, and first-grade students who met their respective local measure goals using the PALS assessment as well as the total number of second- through eighth-grade students who met one of the MAP goals.

2. Math

a. *Math in Focus for K5 and First Graders*

Math skills for students in K5 and first grades are assessed on a four-point rubric in which 4 is advanced, 3 is proficient, 2 is basic, and 1 indicates a minimal skill level. The local measure goal for math was that by the end of the year, all students enrolled in K5 and first grade since the beginning of the year would reach proficient or advanced levels of mastery on at least 75.0% of the skills on the Math in Focus curriculum. K5 students were taught 30 concepts, and first graders were taught 28 concepts.

This year, 23 (76.7%) of 30 K5 students and 21 (80.8%) of 26 first graders scored proficient or higher on 75.0% of math skills (Table 6). The school, therefore, fell short of its goal of 100.0% for both K5 and first-grade students scoring proficient or higher on 75.0% of math skills. Overall, 44 (78.6%) of 56 K5 and first-grade students scored proficient or higher on 75.0% of math skills.

| Table 6 | | | |
|---|-----------|------------|--------------|
| DLH Academy | | | |
| Students Who Scored Proficient or Higher on 75.0% of Math Concepts | | | |
| K5 and 1st Grade | | | |
| 2014–15 | | | |
| Grade | N | Met | |
| | | N | % |
| K5 | 30 | 23 | 76.7% |
| 1st | 26 | 21 | 80.8% |
| Total | 56 | 44 | 78.6% |

b. *Math Progress for Second Through Eighth Graders Using MAP Normative Mean Scores*

The school's goal for MAP math results was that at least 75.0% of the students who scored at or above the national average for their current grade in the fall would remain at or above in the spring. For students scoring below their grade level in the fall, at least 65.0% would either reach the national

average for their current grade or the national average for their functional grade at which they tested in the fall. The following sections describe results of the MAP tests for students at DLH Academy.

There were 175 second- through eighth-grade students who completed both the fall and spring MAP math tests. As illustrated in Table 7, at the time of the fall test, 37 (21.1%) students scored at or above the national average for their current grade level, while 138 (78.9%) scored below the national average.

| Table 7 DLH Academy Local Measures of Academic Progress: MAP Math Assessment Student Scores Relative to the National Average (Normative Mean) in Fall of 2014²⁶ | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|--------------|---|--------------|
| Grade Level | N | Students at or Above National Average Fall 2014 | | Students Below National Average Fall 2014 | |
| | | N | % | N | % |
| 2nd | 20 | 6 | 30.0% | 14 | 70.0% |
| 3rd | 28 | 10 | 35.7% | 18 | 64.3% |
| 4th | 29 | 6 | 20.7% | 23 | 79.3% |
| 5th | 22 | 3 | 13.6% | 19 | 86.4% |
| 6th | 23 | 4 | 17.4% | 19 | 82.6% |
| 7th | 23 | 4 | 17.4% | 19 | 82.6% |
| 8th | 30 | 4 | 13.3% | 26 | 86.7% |
| Total | 175 | 37 | 21.1% | 138 | 78.9% |

²⁶ For the student's current grade level.

i. *Students at or Above the National Average (Normative Mean) on the Fall MAP Math Test*

Of the 37 second- through eighth-grade students at or above the national average for their grade level on the fall test, 26 (70.3%) met the national average again on the spring test. In order to protect students' confidentiality, CRC does not report results for cohorts smaller than 10 students; therefore, most results are not broken down by grade (Table 8).

| Table 8 DLH Academy Local Measures of Academic Progress: MAP Math Assessment Progress for Students at or Above the National Average in Math Fall 2014 | | | |
|--|-----------|---|--------------|
| Grade | N | At or Above National Average in Spring 2015 | |
| | | N | % |
| 2nd | 6 | Cannot report due to <i>n</i> size | |
| 3rd | 10 | 8 | 80.0% |
| 4th | 6 | Cannot report due to <i>n</i> size | |
| 5th | 3 | Cannot report due to <i>n</i> size | |
| 6th | 4 | Cannot report due to <i>n</i> size | |
| 7th | 4 | Cannot report due to <i>n</i> size | |
| 8th | 4 | Cannot report due to <i>n</i> size | |
| Total | 37 | 26 | 70.3% |

ii. *Students Below the National Average (Normative Mean) on the Fall MAP Math Test*

There were 138 students who scored less than the national average for their current grade level on the fall test. By the time of the spring test, 16 (11.6%) of those students had reached the national average math score for their grade level, and 82 (59.4%) had reached the spring national average math score for their functional grade level. This represents a total growth rate of 71.0%, exceeding the school's goal of 65.0%. Results by grade level are in Table 9.

| Table 9 DLH Academy Local Measures of Academic Progress: MAP Math Assessment Progress for Students Below the National Average (Normative Mean) in Fall 2014²⁷ Fall 2014 to Spring 2015 | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|---|--------------|---|--------------|
| Grade Level | Students Below National Average in Fall 2014 | Students Who Reached Grade-Level National Average Score in Spring 2015 | | Students Who Did Not Reach Grade-Level Average in Spring but Met National Average for Functional Grade Level Tested at in Fall 2014 | | Overall Progress of Students Below National Average on Fall 2014 MAP Reading Test | |
| | N | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| 2nd | 14 | 7 | 50.0% | 6 | 42.9% | 13 | 92.9% |
| 3rd | 18 | 2 | 11.1% | 13 | 72.2% | 15 | 83.3% |
| 4th | 23 | 0 | 0.0% | 15 | 65.2% | 15 | 65.2% |
| 5th | 19 | 0 | 0.0% | 8 | 42.1% | 8 | 42.1% |
| 6th | 19 | 1 | 5.3% | 11 | 57.9% | 12 | 63.2% |
| 7th | 19 | 2 | 10.5% | 14 | 73.7% | 16 | 84.2% |
| 8th | 26 | 4 | 15.4% | 15 | 57.7% | 19 | 73.1% |
| Total | 138 | 16 | 11.6% | 82 | 59.4% | 98 | 71.0% |

The school did not meet its local measure goal in math for students in K5 through first grades or for students in second through eighth grades who were at or above the national average for their

²⁷ For the student's current grade level.

current grade in the fall of 2014. The school exceeded its goal for students who were below the national average for their current grade level in the fall of 2014.

Overall, the school met local measures for math progress for 168 (72.7%) of 231 students.²⁸

3. Writing Progress

To assess writing skills at the local level, the school had students in K5 through eighth grade complete and submit a writing sample by the end of October 2014 and again in May 2015. The school used the Six Traits of Writing rubric to assess students' ability to produce writing samples appropriate for their respective grade levels. The Six Traits of Writing is a framework for assessing the quality of student writing and offers a way to link assessments with revisions and editing. The prompts for both writing samples was the same and based on grade-level topics with the narrative genre.²⁹ The writing samples were assessed using the Common Core State Standards for writing, which include five focus areas: (1) language—conventions of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling; (2) language—conventions of grammar and usage; (3) narrative techniques; (4) organization/plot; and (5) focus/setting.

a. *Writing for K5 Through Sixth Grades*

Writing skills for K5 through sixth-grade students were rated using a 4-point rubric: 1 = below grade level, 2 = approaching grade level, 3 = at grade level, and 4 = above grade level. The average, overall score for all five focus areas was used to measure student progress. The school set a goal that

²⁸ Calculation is based on the total number of K5 and first-grade students who achieved 75.0% of math concepts and second-through eighth-grade students who met one of the MAP goals.

²⁹ The writing genres for K5 through sixth grade included opinion, informational, and narrative; and the writing genres for seventh and eighth grades included argument, information/explanatory, or narrative.

at least 65.0% of the students who completed the writing sample in October would achieve an overall score of 3 (at grade level) or higher on the second writing sample taken in May 2015.

Results were provided for 177 students in K5 through sixth grades who were tested at both times. Of those, 139 (78.5%) students scored at grade level or above on their May writing sample, thereby exceeding the school's local measure goal (Table 10).

| Table 10 DLH Academy Local Measures of Academic Progress: Writing for K5 Through Sixth-Grade Students Six Traits of Writing Assessment Proficiency Levels Results by Grade 2014-15 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| Grade | Results | | | | | | | | | |
| | Below Grade Level | | Approaching Grade Level | | At Grade Level | | Above Grade Level | | Total | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| K5 | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 23.3% | 23 | 76.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 30 | 100.0% |
| 1st | 1 | 3.8% | 4 | 15.4% | 14 | 53.8% | 7 | 26.9% | 26 | 100.0% |
| 2nd | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 15.0% | 12 | 60.0% | 5 | 25.0% | 20 | 100.0% |
| 3rd | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 25.0% | 17 | 60.7% | 4 | 14.3% | 28 | 100.0% |
| 4th | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 25.0% | 17 | 60.7% | 4 | 14.3% | 28 | 100.0% |
| 5th | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 4.5% | 9 | 40.9% | 12 | 54.5% | 22 | 100.0% |
| 6th | 1 | 4.3% | 7 | 30.4% | 13 | 56.5% | 2 | 8.7% | 23 | 100.0% |
| Total | 2 | 1.1% | 36 | 20.3% | 105 | 59.3% | 34 | 19.2% | 177 | 100.0% |

Note: Shaded cells indicate students who met the writing goal this year.

b. *Writing for Seventh and Eighth Grades*

Seventh- and eighth-grade students were assessed using a rubric of 1 through 5 (1 = far below basic, 2 = below basic, 3 = basic, 4 = proficient [at grade level], 5 = advanced [above grade level]); the average, overall score for all six focus areas was used to measure student progress. The school's goal was that at least 65.0% of the students who completed the October writing sample would achieve an overall score of 4 (proficient) or higher on the second writing sample taken in May 2015. A total of 54 students submitted both fall and spring writing samples; of those, 19 (35.2%) had an overall writing score of proficient (there were no advanced scores) on the spring writing sample, failing to meet the school's local measure goal for seventh and eighth grades (Table 11).

| Table 11 DLH Academy Local Measures of Academic Progress: Writing for Seventh and Eighth Graders Six Traits of Writing Assessment Proficiency Levels Results by Grade 2014–15 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------|-----------|---------------|
| Grade | Results | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Far Below Basic | | Below Basic | | Basic | | Proficient | | Advanced | | Total | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| 7th | 2 | 8.3% | 7 | 29.2% | 9 | 37.5% | 6 | 25.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 24 | 100.0% |
| 8th | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 6.7% | 15 | 50.0% | 13 | 43.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 30 | 100.0% |
| Total | 2 | 3.7% | 9 | 16.7% | 24 | 44.4% | 19 | 35.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 54 | 100.0% |

Note: Shaded cells indicate students who met the writing goal this year.

Overall, 158 out of 231 (68.4%) students in K4 through eighth grade who were assessed for writing in both the fall and the spring were at or above grade level (proficient or above) at the time of the spring writing assessment (Table 12).

| Table 12 | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------|
| DLH Academy | | | |
| Six Traits of Writing Assessment Spring Proficiency Levels Results by Grade | | | |
| Grade | Total Students With Fall and Spring Writing Samples | Students With an Overall Spring Writing Score at or Above Grade Level (Proficient or Higher) | |
| | | N | % |
| K5 | 30 | 23 | 76.7% |
| 1st | 26 | 21 | 80.8% |
| 2nd | 20 | 17 | 85.0% |
| 3rd | 28 | 21 | 75.0% |
| 4th | 28 | 21 | 75.0% |
| 5th | 22 | 21 | 95.5% |
| 6th | 23 | 15 | 65.2% |
| 7th | 24 | 6 | 25.0% |
| 8th | 30 | 13 | 43.3% |
| Total | 231 | 158 | 68.4% |

4. IEP Progress for Special Education Students

The school set a goal that all students with active IEPs would demonstrate progress toward meeting their IEP goals at the time of their annual review or reevaluation. Progress was to be determined by 70.0% achievement of the total number of subgoals reported for each student. The school did not use subgoals on their IEPs and reported the actual number of goals met.³⁰ Twenty-two (78.6%) of 28 special education students who were at the school for an entire IEP year met at least 70.0% of their goals. Of the 28 students who had IEP reviews this year, 27 will continue to receive special education services next year.

³⁰ The learning memo data addendum also referred to "goals met."

E. External Standardized Measures of Educational Performance

In 2014–15, DPI required all schools to administer PALS assessments to K4 through second graders, the Badger Exam to third through eighth graders, and the WKCE science and social studies tests to fourth and eighth graders.³¹ These tests and results are described in the following sections.

1. PALS

Beginning in 2014–15, DPI required that all students in K4 through second grade take the PALS assessment in the fall and spring of the school year. PALS aligns with both the Common Core English standards and the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards.

The PALS assessment is available in three versions: PALS-PreK for K4 students, PALS-K for K5 students, and PALS 1–3 for students in first through third grades.³² The PALS-PreK includes five required tasks (name writing, uppercase alphabet recognition, beginning sound awareness, print and word awareness, and rhyme awareness). Two additional tasks (lowercase alphabet recognition and letter sounds) are completed only by students who reach a high enough score on the uppercase alphabet task. Finally, there is one optional task (nursery rhyme awareness) that schools can choose to administer or not. Because this latter task is optional, CRC will not report data on nursery rhyme awareness.

The PALS-K includes six required tasks (rhyme awareness, beginning sound awareness, alphabet knowledge, letter sounds, spelling, and concept of word) and one optional task (word recognition in isolation). The PALS 1–3 comprises three required tasks (spelling, word recognition in

³¹ Per the contract with CSRC, the school will administer all tests required by DPI within the timeframe specified by DPI; this includes the PALS. The timeframe for the fall PALS assessment was October 13 to November 7, 2014, for K4 and K5 students and September 15 to October 10, 2014, for first graders. The spring testing window was April 27 to May 22, 2015, for all grade levels. The timeframe for the Badger Exam was April 13 to May 23, 2015. The timeframe for the WKCE science and social studies tests were October 27 to November 27, 2014.

³² Although the PALS 1–3 can be used for students in third grade, DPI only requires the test for K4 through second graders; third-grade students are tested using the Badger Exam.

isolation, and oral reading in context). The PALS 1–3 also includes one additional required task for first graders during the fall administration (letter sounds) and additional tasks for students who score below the summed score benchmark. These additional tasks are used to gather further diagnostic information about those students.

For the PALS-K and PALS 1–3, specific task scores are summed for an overall summed score. For the PALS 1–3, the fall and spring summed scores are calculated using different task combinations. The summed score is then compared to benchmarks set for each grade level and test administration. Reaching or surpassing the benchmark is not an indicator that the student is reading at grade level; the benchmark simply helps teachers identify which students may have difficulty learning to read. For example, if the student’s summed score is below the designated benchmark for his/her grade level and test administration, the student is identified as requiring additional instruction to master basic literacy skills.³³ Students who are at or above the benchmark have the basic skills required to, with targeted instruction, continue learning to read without intervention. Teachers may use PALS assessment results to help plan classroom reading and spelling instruction according to student needs.

The PALS-PreK does not have a similar summed score or set benchmarks. Because students enter K4 with different levels of exposure to books, letters, and sounds, the purpose of the PALS-PreK is to learn students’ abilities as they enter K4 in the fall. In the spring, developmental ranges for each PALS task indicate whether the student is at the expected developmental stage for a 4-year-old child.

³³ Information retrieved from <http://www.palswisconsin.info>

a. *PALS-PreK*

A total of 27 K4 students completed the PALS-PreK in the fall, and 26 students completed the spring assessment; 25 students completed both. Although the spring developmental ranges relate to expected age-level development by the time of the spring semester, CRC applied the ranges to both test administrations to see whether more students were at or above the range for each test by the spring administration. The number of students at or above the developmental range increased for each task from fall to spring (Table 13).

| Table 13 DLH Academy PALS-PreK for K4 Students Students at or Above the Spring Developmental Range 2014–15 (N = 25) | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Task | Fall | | Spring | |
| | N | % | N | % |
| Name writing | 8 | 32.0% | 20 | 80.0% |
| Uppercase alphabet recognition | 8 | 32.0% | 21 | 84.0% |
| Lowercase alphabet recognition | Cannot report due to <i>n</i> size* | | 19** | 100.0% |
| Letter sounds | Cannot report due to <i>n</i> size* | | 19** | 100.0% |
| Beginning sound awareness | 6 | 24.0% | 20 | 80.0% |
| Print and word awareness | 4 | 16.0% | 19 | 76.0% |
| Rhyme awareness | 8 | 32.0% | 18 | 72.0% |

*Out of five students who qualified to complete the lowercase and letter sound tasks in the fall.

**Out of 19 students who qualified to complete the lowercase and letter sound tasks in the spring.

b. *PALS-K and PALS 1–3*

As mentioned above, each of these tests has a summed score benchmark for the fall and spring (Table 14). The fall and spring summed score benchmarks are calculated using different task combinations. Therefore, the spring benchmark may be lower than the fall benchmark. Additionally, student benchmark status is only a measure of whether the student is where he/she should be

developmentally to continue becoming a successful reader; results from fall to spring should not be used as a measure of individual progress.


| Table 14 | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| PALS-K and PALS 1–3 Published Summed Score Benchmarks | | |
| PALS Assessment | Fall Benchmark | Spring Benchmark |
| PALS-K | 28 | 81 |
| PALS—1st Grade | 39 | 35 |
| PALS—2nd Grade | 35 | 54 |

CRC first examined reading readiness for any student who completed the fall or spring tests. For each grade level, a larger percentage of students who completed the spring test were at the spring benchmark compared to the percentage of students who completed the fall test (Table 15).

| Table 15 | | | |
|--|----|--------------------------------|-------|
| DLH Academy Reading Readiness for K5 and 1st Graders Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 | | | |
| Grade Level and Test Period | N | Students at or Above Benchmark | |
| | | N | % |
| K5 | | | |
| Fall | 32 | 26 | 81.3% |
| Spring | 30 | 27 | 90.0% |
| 1st Grade | | | |
| Fall | 29 | 25 | 86.2% |
| Spring | 26 | 23 | 88.5% |
| 2nd Grade | | | |
| Fall | 23 | 15 | 65.2% |
| Spring | 21 | 20 | 95.2% |

Next, CRC looked at spring benchmark status for students who had completed both the fall and spring assessments. At the time of the spring assessment, 90.0% of 30 K5 students, 88.5% of 26 first graders, and 100.0% of 20 second graders were at or above the spring summed score benchmark for their grade level (Figure 2).

Figure 2



2. Badger Exam for Third Through Eighth Graders³⁴

The Badger Exam is Wisconsin's Common Core State Standards (CCSS) assessment. The assessment was developed by the Smarter Balanced Consortium, one of two national, state-led consortia tasked with developing "next-generation" assessments aligned to CCSS for English/language arts and math. The consortium was awarded federal funding in 2010 to develop the new assessment by the 2014–15 school year. The Badger Exam replaces the English, reading, and language arts sections of the WKCE, which previously was used to measure student progress on Wisconsin model academic standards in those areas. The Badger Exam includes a summative assessment that measures student progress on Common Core content as well as progress toward college and career readiness. It includes sections for English/language arts and math.

The Badger Exam is administered on computers and is a computer-adaptive test, which means that, based on student responses, it adjusts the difficulty of questions as the student moves through the items. The benefit of these adaptive tests is that they give students, teachers, and parents better information about which skills the student has mastered.³⁵

Each student receives a four-digit scale score from 2000 to 3000 for each of the English/language arts and math assessments. The scale scores represent a continuous vertical scale that increases across grade levels. The scale score demonstrates current student achievement and can be used to track growth over time.³⁶ Based on initial field test results, the Smarter Balanced Consortium developed achievement levels. Based on each student's scale scores, he/she is placed into an achievement level ranging from one to four (1 = below basic; 2 = basic; 3 = proficient;

³⁴ Information taken from the Wisconsin DPI and Smarter Balanced websites. For more information, visit <http://oea.dpi.wi.gov> and <http://www.smarterbalanced.org>

³⁵ The adaptive components of the Badger Exam were not ready for the 2014–15 school year. All students completed the same set of questions for both the English/language arts and math tests.

³⁶ <http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Interpretation-and-Use-of-Scores.pdf>


4 = advanced) that describes the student's knowledge and skills in that area. Classification into such achievement levels is a federal requirement under the No Child Left Behind Act.

The Badger Exam was first administered in the spring during the last eight weeks of the 2014–15 school year. DPI has embargoed Badger Exam results until September or October 2015. This means that, although schools and districts may share individual student test results with parents, they are not allowed to release summary test results until the embargo is lifted. Due to the embargo, Badger Exam results will not be included in the 2014–15 monitoring reports until such time as the embargo is lifted. At that time, results will be shown in an appendix of this report or in a separate addendum. Additionally, it is important to note that even after Badger Exam results are made available to the public, they will not be used by the CSRC this year to evaluate school performance or progress.

3. WKCE Science and Social Studies Assessments for Fourth and Eighth Graders

Although the WKCE English, reading, and math tests were replaced by the Badger Exam, students in the fourth, eighth, and tenth grades are still required to take the WKCE science and social studies assessments to measure student progress in these subjects. The results for each of the assessments for the fourth and eighth grades are shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3



F. Multiple-Year Student Progress

Year-to-year progress is measured by comparing scores on standardized tests from one year to the next. Year-to-year progress/performance expectations apply to all students with scores in consecutive years. In the fall of 2013, students in K4 through second grade began taking the PALS reading assessment. The PALS summed score benchmark is intended to show teachers which students require additional reading assistance—not to indicate that the student is reading at grade level. Additionally, there are three versions of the test (PALS PreK, PALS, and PALS 1–3), which include different formats, sections, and scoring. For these reasons, an examination of PALS results from one test to another provides neither a valid nor a reliable measure of student progress. Therefore, CRC examined results for students who were in the first grade in 2014 and second grade in 2015 who had taken the PALS 1–3 during two consecutive years. The CSRC’s performance expectation is that at least 75.0% of students who were at or above the summed score benchmark in first grade will remain at or above the summed score benchmark as second graders in the subsequent school year.

Prior to this year, the WKCE was used to measure year-to-year progress for students in fourth through eighth grades. Because this is the first year the Badger Exam was administered, 2014–15 results will be used as baseline data to measure student progress from 2014–15 to 2015–16; results will be available at that time.

1. Second-Grade Progress Based on PALS

Based on PALS results from 2014, 11 students were at or above the spring 2014 summed score benchmark; all of those students remained at or above the summed score benchmark in the spring of 2015.

2. Fourth- Through Eighth-Grade Badger Exam

This is the first year that the Badger Exam was administered. Year-to-year results will not be available until the next school year.

G. CSRC School Scorecard

In the 2009–10 school year, CSRC piloted a scorecard for each school that it charts. The pilot ran for three years and in the fall of 2012, CSRC formally adopted the scorecard to help monitor school performance. The scorecard includes multiple measures of student academic progress, such as performance on standardized tests and local measures. It also includes point-in-time academic achievement and engagement elements, such as attendance and student and teacher retention and return. The score provides a summary indicator of school performance. The summary score is then translated into a school status rating.

In 2014, CSRC approved a new scoring system in order to make the scorecard percentages more meaningful and provide schools with greater opportunities to exhibit improvement. The new scoring system is based on the following scale.

| | | | |
|----|---------------|----|---------------|
| A | 93.4% – 100% | C | 73.3% – 76.5% |
| A– | 90.0% – 93.3% | C– | 70.0% – 73.2% |
| B+ | 86.6% – 89.9% | D+ | 66.6% – 69.9% |
| B | 83.3% – 86.5% | D | 63.3% – 66.5% |
| B– | 80.0% – 83.2% | D– | 60.0% – 63.2% |
| C+ | 76.6% – 79.9% | F | 0.0% – 59.9% |

The percentage score is still translated into a school status level as in previous years, with small changes to the status-level cut scores. The previous and newly adopted cut scores are shown in Table 16.

| Table 16 City of Milwaukee Educational Performance Rating Scale for Charter Schools | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| School Status | Scorecard Total % | |
| | Previous | Scale Adopted 8/12/14 |
| High Performing/Exemplary | 100% – 85% | 83.3% – 100.0% (B to A) |
| Promising/Good | 84% – 70% | 70.0% – 83.2% (C– to B–) |
| Problematic/Struggling | 69% – 55% | 60.0% – 69.9% (D– to D+) |
| Poor/Failing | 54% or less | 0.0% – 59.9% (F) |

CSRC uses the score and rating to guide decisions regarding whether to accept a school's annual education performance and continue monitoring as usual and whether to recommend a school for a five-year contract renewal at the end of its fourth year of operation under its current contract. CSRC's expectation is that schools will achieve a rating of 70.0% (Promising/Good) or more; if a school falls under 70.0%, CSRC will carefully review the school's performance and determine whether a probationary plan should be developed.

CSRC also approved a new pilot scorecard that will be tested this year. The pilot scorecard includes new measures that reflect changes to the standardized tests during the past couple of years (the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test [SDRT] to PALS and WKCE to the Badger Exam).³⁷ The pilot scorecard also includes changes to the maximum point values for some of the measures. For example, local measure results are each worth a maximum of 3.75 points on the 2014–15 scorecard but are

³⁷ The SDRT was administered to students in first through third grades up through the 2012–13 school year; it was discontinued in 2013–14 and replaced with the PALS reading assessment.

worth a maximum of 6.25 points on the pilot scorecard. Other point changes were made to some of the standardized test measures (full versions of both the 2014–15 and pilot scorecards are available in the appendices of this report). These changes were made primarily so that the same values would be awarded to a single standard test—the Badger Exam for elementary school and the ACT Aspire series for high school—for both scorecards. This revision resulted in additional weight being given to students’ annual academic progress as measured by a school’s local measures.

This year, CRC calculated the DLH scorecard using both the 2014–15 and the pilot scorecard versions. The score based on the 2014–15 scorecard will be used to determine the school’s rating for the 2014–15 school year. Because the pilot scorecard includes the results of the Badger Exam, CRC will not include pilot scorecard results until the DPI Badger Exam embargo is lifted. At that time, the pilot scorecard will be added to the appendix of this report or will be reproduced in a separate addendum. Pilot scorecard results will be used as baseline information for comparison with 2015–16 results, if applicable. DLH Academy scored 83.9% (B) this year, which places them at the High Performing/ Exemplary level. This compares with 72.6% on the 2013–14 scorecard and 73.8% on the 2012–13 scorecard.³⁸ See Appendix D for school scorecard information.

H. DPI School Report Card

DPI did not produce report cards for any schools for the 2014–15 school year.³⁹

³⁸ Note that the 2014–15 scorecard includes current year PALS results; this differs from previous years. Additionally, due to the shift in standardized tests, WKCE results were not available this year, so the scorecard percentage is based on the measures that were available at the time of this report.

³⁹ In May 2015, the Wisconsin legislature passed SB 67, which prohibits DPI from issuing school accountability reports for the 2014–15 school year.

IV. SUMMARY/RECOMMENDATIONS

This report covers the 13th year of DLH Academy's operation as a City of Milwaukee charter school. The school met all of the educational provisions in its contract with the City of Milwaukee and subsequent CSRC requirements. The school's multiple measure scorecard score for the 2014–15 school year was 83.9% (B), placing the school in the High Performing/Exemplary category. Based on current and past contract compliance, the school's efforts meeting all of the school improvement recommendations, and scorecard results, CRC recommends that DLH Academy continue regular, annual academic monitoring and reporting.

Appendix A

Contract Compliance Chart

| Table A DLH Academy Overview of Compliance for Education-Related Contract Provisions 2014–15 | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| Section of Contract | Education-Related Contract Provision | Report Page Number(s) | Contract Provisions Met or Not Met? |
| Section I, B | Description of educational program; student population served. | pp. 3–6 | Met |
| Section I, V | Charter school shall operate under the days and hours indicated in the calendar for the 2014–15 school year and provide CSRC with a school year calendar prior to the conclusion of the preceding school year. | p. 11 | Met |
| Section I, C | Educational methods. | pp. 2–5 | Met |
| Section I, D | Administration of required standardized tests. | pp. 34–41 | Met |
| Section I, D | Academic criterion #1: Maintain local measures showing pupil growth in demonstrating curricular goals in reading, writing, math, and special education goals. | pp. 18–33 | Met |
| Section I, D and subsequent memos from CSRC | Academic criterion #2: Year-to-year achievement measures. Year-to-year results were not available this year. | N/A | N/A |
| Section I, D | Academic criterion #3: Year-to-year achievement measures: Progress for students below grade level or proficiency level was not available this year. | N/A | N/A |
| Section I, E | Parental involvement. | p. 12 | Met |
| Section I, F | Instructional staff hold DPI licenses or permits to teach. | p. 9 | Met |
| Section I, I | Pupil database information. | pp. 5–6 | Met |
| Section I, K | Disciplinary procedures. | p. 13 | Met |

Appendix B

Student Learning Memorandum

Student Learning Memorandum for Darrell Lynn Hines Preparatory Academy of Excellence

To: NCCD Children's Research Center and Charter School Review Committee
From: Darrell Lynn Hines Preparatory Academy of Excellence
Re: Learning Memo for the 2014–15 Academic Year
Date: October 21, 2014

This memorandum of understanding includes the *minimum* measurable outcomes required by the City of Milwaukee Charter School Review Committee (CSRC) to monitor and report students' academic progress. These outcomes have been defined by the leadership and/or staff at the school in consultation with staff from the NCCD Children's Research Center (CRC) and CSRC. The school will record student data in Power School and/or MS Excel spreadsheets and provide the data to CRC, the educational monitoring agent contracted by CSRC. Additionally, paper test printouts or data directly from the test publisher will be provided to CRC for all standardized tests. All required elements related to the outcomes below are described in the "Learning Memo Data Requirements" section. CRC requests electronic submission of year-end data on the fifth working day following the last day of student attendance for the academic year, or June 18, 2015.

Enrollment

Darrell Lynn Hines Preparatory Academy of Excellence will record enrollment dates for every student. Upon admission, individual student information and actual enrollment date will be added to the school's database. Required data elements related to this outcome are described in the "Learning Memo Data Requirements" section.

Termination/Withdrawal

The exit date and reason for every student leaving the school will be determined and recorded in the school's database. Specific reasons for each expulsion are required for each student. Required data elements related to this outcome are described in the "Learning Memo Data Requirements" section.

Attendance

The school will maintain appropriate attendance records. The school will maintain an average daily attendance rate of 90%. A student is considered present for the day if he/she is present for a half day or more. Required data elements related to this outcome are described in the "Learning Memo Data Requirements" section.

Parent Participation

Parents (or other interested persons) of students enrolled for the entire school year will participate in both parent-teacher conferences. Face to face conferences are preferred, but phone conferences will be acceptable. Required data elements related to this outcome are described in the "Learning Memo Data Requirements" section.

Special Education Needs Students

The school will maintain updated records on all students who received special education services at the school, including students who were evaluated but not eligible for services. Required data elements related to the special education outcome are described in the "Learning Memo Data Requirements" section.

Academic Achievement: Local Measures⁴⁰

Reading

Reading for K4

At least 85% of K4 students who complete the fall and spring Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS)-PreK will be at or above the developmental range for at least five of seven tasks at the time of the spring assessment. Required data elements related to the reading local measure outcome are described in the “Learning Memo Data Requirements” section.

Reading for K5 and First Grades

At least 85% of the students in K5 and first grade who completed the fall and spring PALS will achieve the summed score spring benchmark. Required data elements related to the reading local measure outcome are described in the “Learning Memo Data Requirements” section.

Reading for Second Through Eighth Grades

Students in second through eighth grades will demonstrate progress in reading on the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) tests administered in the fall and spring. Specifically, students who complete both the fall and spring reading MAP tests will progress depending upon their fall Rasch unit (RIT) score.

- At least 75% of the students whose fall RIT score placed them at or above the normative mean for their current grade level in reading will again score at or above the normative mean for their current grade level on the spring MAP test.
- At least 65% of the students whose fall RIT score placed them below the normative mean for their current grade level in reading (their functional grade level) will reach at least the normative mean level for their functional grade level on the spring MAP test.⁴¹

Required data elements related to the reading local measure outcome are described in the “Learning Memo Data Requirements” section.

Mathematics

Mathematics for K5 and First Grades

By the end of the year, all K5 and first-grade students enrolled since the third Friday in September will reach either proficient or advanced levels of mastery on at least 75% of the grade-level skills on the Math in Focus curriculum.⁴²

⁴⁰ Local measures of academic achievement are classroom- or school-level measures that monitor student progress throughout the year (formative assessment) and can be summarized at the end of the year (summative assessment) to demonstrate academic growth. They are reflective of each school’s unique philosophy and curriculum. CSRC requires local measures of academic achievement in the areas of literacy, mathematics, writing, and IEP goals.

⁴¹ The student’s functional grade level represents the normative mean range at which the student tested in the fall.

⁴² There are 22 skills for K5 students and 21 skills for first-grade students.

4 = Advanced: Student demonstrates an advanced understanding of the concept or skill and is consistently working above grade-level expectations. Student repeatedly uses unique problem-solving tasks. Student communicates a sophisticated, well-articulated mathematical understanding of the concept.

3 = Proficient: Student solves problems independently, consistently, and efficiently (any errors that the student may make are infrequent and minor). Student may have some difficulty communicating his/her mathematical understanding of the concept.

2 = Student demonstrates a basic understanding of the concept or skill and is performing below grade-level expectations. Correct answers are not consistent/efficient, and/or reminders, suggestions, and learning aids may be necessary to complete the task.

1 = Student demonstrates a minimal understanding of the concept or skill and is performing noticeably below grade-level expectations. Student may require intensive assistance from the teacher to further develop his/her understanding

Required data elements related to the math local measure outcome are described in the “Learning Memo Data Requirements” section.

Mathematics for Second Through Eighth Grades

Students in second through eighth grades will demonstrate progress in mathematics on the MAP tests administered in the fall and spring. Specifically, students who complete both the fall and spring math MAP tests will progress depending upon their fall RIT score.

- At least 75% of the students whose fall RIT score placed them at or above the normative mean for their current grade level in math will again score at or above the normative mean for their current grade level on the spring MAP test.
- At least 65% of the students whose fall RIT score placed them below the normative mean for their current grade level in math will reach at least the normative mean level for their functional grade level on the spring MAP test.⁴³

Required data elements related to the math local measure outcome are described in the “Learning Memo Data Requirements” section.

Writing

Writing for K5 Through Sixth Grades

Students in K5 through sixth grades will complete grade-level writing samples no later than October 30, 2014, and again in May 2015. The prompt for both writing samples will be the same and will be based on grade-level topics with the narrative genre.⁴⁴ The writing samples will be assessed using the Common Core State Standards for writing, which include five focus areas: (1) Language—

⁴³ The student’s functional grade level represents the normative mean range at which the student tested in the fall.

⁴⁴ The writing genres for K5 through sixth grade include opinion, informational, and narrative.

Conventions of Capitalization, Punctuation, and Spelling; (2) Language—Conventions of Grammar and Usage; (3) Narrative Techniques; (4) Organization/Plot; and (5) Focus/Setting. Students receive a rubric score of 1 through 4 (1 = below grade level, 2 = approaching grade level, 3 = at grade level, 4 = above grade level) for each focus area; the average, overall score for all five focus areas will be used to measure student progress. At least 65% of the students who complete the writing sample in October will achieve an overall score of 3 or higher on the second writing sample taken in May 2015. Required data elements related to the special education outcome are described in the “Learning Memo Data Requirements” section.

Writing for Seventh and Eighth Grades

Students in seventh and eighth grades will complete grade level writing samples no later than October 30, 2014, and again in May 2015. The prompt for both writing samples will be the same and will be based on grade-level topics with the argument genre.⁴⁵ The writing sample will be assessed using the Common Core writing standards, which include six areas: focus/claim, organization, support/evidence, language conventions (grammar and usage, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling), narrative techniques, and analysis. Students receive a rubric score of 1 through 5 (1 = far below basic, 2 = below basic, 3 = basic, 4 = proficient [at grade level], 5 = advanced [above grade level]); the average, overall score for all six focus areas will be used to measure student progress. At least 65% of the students who complete the October writing sample will achieve an overall score of 4 or higher on the second writing sample taken in May 2015. Required data elements related to the writing outcome are described in the “Learning Memo Data Requirements” section.

Special Education Student Progress

All students with active individualized education programs (IEP) will demonstrate progress toward meeting their IEP goals at the time of their annual review or reevaluation. Progress will be determined by 70% achievement of the total number of subgoals reported for each student. Note that ongoing student progress toward IEP goals is monitored and reported throughout the academic year through the special education progress reports, attached to the regular report cards. Required data elements related to this outcome are described in the “Learning Memo Data Requirements” section.

Academic Achievement: Standardized Measures

The Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening for K4 Through Second-Grade Students⁴⁶

The Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS) will be administered to all K4 through second-grade students in the fall and spring of each school year within the timeframe required by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI). Required data elements related to this outcome are described in the “Learning Memo Data Requirements” section.

⁴⁵ The writing genres for seventh and eighth grades include argument, information/explanatory, or narrative.

⁴⁶ Students who meet the summed score benchmark have achieved a level of minimum competency and can be expected to show growth given regular classroom literacy instruction. It does not guarantee that the student is at grade level. Information from <http://www.palswisconsin.info>.

Smarter Balanced Assessment for Third- Through Eighth-Grade Students

The Smarter Balanced Assessment will be administered on an annual basis in the timeframe identified by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (i.e., spring of 2015). The English/language arts assessment will provide each student with a proficiency level via a scale score in reading, and the math assessment will provide each student with a proficiency level via a scale score in math. Required data elements related to this outcome are described in the “Learning Memo Data Requirements” section.

Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination for Fourth and Eighth Grade Students

Fourth and eighth graders will also complete the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE) science and social studies assessments in the fall timeframe identified by DPI. Specific data elements related to this outcome are described in the “Learning Memo Data Requirements” section.

Year-to-Year Achievement⁴⁷

1. CRC will report Smarter Balanced Assessment results starting in the 2014–15 annual school reports. The 2015 spring data will be baseline data and will be used by CSRC to set expectations for performance in subsequent years. If possible, beginning in the 2015–16 school year, CRC will also report year-to-year progress for students who completed the assessments in consecutive school years at the same school. When year-to-year data are available, CSRC will set its expectations for student progress and these expectations will be effective for all subsequent years.
2. CRC will report PALS results in the 2014–15 annual school reports. The 2014 spring data will be used as baseline data. CSRC’s expectation for students maintaining reading readiness is:

At least 75% of the first graders who met the summed score benchmark in the spring will remain at or above the second-grade summed score benchmark in the spring of the subsequent year.

⁴⁷ CSRC will not have year-to-year achievement measurements for students in K4 and K5.

Learning Memo Data Requirements

CRC developed the data requirements to clarify the data collection and submission process related to each of the outcomes stated in the school's learning memo for the 2014–15 academic year. Additionally, important principles applicable to all data collection must be followed.

1. CRC requires an enrollment document that **includes any student enrolled at any time during the school year**. This includes students who enroll after the first day of school and students who withdraw before the end of the school year.
2. Each student's unique Wisconsin student number (WSN) and name in each data file.
3. CRC requires individual student data for each measure. Aggregate data (e.g., 14 students scored 75.0%, or the attendance rate was 92.0%) will not be accepted as an alternative to individual student records.
4. Data formatting requirements are as follows.
 - Each item listed in the grid below represents a required data element and should be presented as a separate column in the data spreadsheet (e.g., Excel).
 - Each column in the spreadsheet must have a clear, understandable heading.
 - Shading and other formatting to denote benchmarks, proficiency levels, or other data-related elements cannot be used in place of actual data. CRC uses the provided data spreadsheets to calculate student performance on each measure. Shading and other similar formatting cannot be read into CRC's statistical program and should not be used.
 - If codes are entered into the data (e.g., F, R, and P for lunch status), the school must inform CRC of the codes' meanings even if they seem obvious.
5. Consider using an additional "comments" column in the spreadsheet to provide details or explanations about the data in that sheet or for specific students.

End-of-the-year data due date: No later than the fifth working day after the end of the second semester, or June 18, 2015.

Staff person(s) responsible for year-end data submission to CRC: Cathy Stampley (CS).

| Learning Memo Section/Outcome | Data Elements/Description | Location of Data | Person(s) Responsible for Collecting Data |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|
| Enrollment and Termination | <p>The following are required data elements for each student enrolled at any time during the year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSN • Local student ID • Student name • Grade • Gender • Race/ethnicity • Free/reduced lunch status (free, reduced, not eligible) • Enrollment date <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » If available, the first date the student ever attended the school (if student attended during a previous school year, then withdrew and reenrolled in a subsequent year, use the most recent enrollment date) » If first date ever is not available, first day student was enrolled for the current school year • Termination/withdrawal date, if applicable • Termination/withdrawal reason, if applicable (if the student was expelled, please provide reason). If a code is used for reasons, please provide the code to CRC. | Spreadsheet designed by school | CS |
| Attendance | <p>The following are required data elements for each student enrolled at any time during the year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSN • Student name • Number of days expected attendance • Number of days attended • Number of days excused absence • Number of days unexcused absence • Number of times out-of-school suspension • Number of days out-of-school suspension • Number of times in school on suspension • Number of days in school on suspension | | CS |
| Parent Participation | <p>The following are required data elements for each student enrolled at any time during the year.</p> | Spreadsheet designed by school | CS |

| Learning Memo Section/Outcome | Data Elements/Description | Location of Data | Person(s) Responsible for Collecting Data |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSN Student name Attend conference 1 (Yes, No, or N/E [not enrolled at the time of the conference]) Attend conference 2 (Yes, No, or N/E) | | |
| Special Education Needs Students | <p>The following are required data elements for each student enrolled at any time during the year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSN Student name Most recent eligibility assessment date (Date the team met to determine eligibility; may be at this school or a previous school. If at a previous school and date is unknown, enter unknown.) Special education need, If identified, e.g., ED, CD, LD, OHI, etc. Was student enrolled in special education services at the school during the previous school year (i.e., Has this school been responsible for special education services for the student for a full IEP year)? Yes or no. Next eligibility reevaluation date (three-year reevaluation date to determine whether student is still eligible for special education; may be during a subsequent school year) Date of last annual IEP review (should be blank if the first IEP was completed for the student this year) Beginning and end dates of the IEP that was reviewed; include the beginning and end dates Was the parent invited to participate in the review? Yes or no. At the time of that review, how many goals were reviewed? If there was no review, enter N/A (not applicable). At the time of that review, how many goals were met? If there was no review, enter N/A. Was a new IEP developed at the review? Yes or no. If a new IEP was not developed, provide a reason (e.g., parent refused services, student dismissed from special education services, etc.) Beginning and end dates of the new IEP | Spreadsheet designed by school | CS |

| Learning Memo Section/Outcome | Data Elements/Description | Location of Data | Person(s) Responsible for Collecting Data |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Academic Achievement: Local Measures <i>Reading for K4, K5, and 1st Grades</i> | K4, K5, and 1st-grade students have the same requirements as listed in the standardized measure section below. | Spreadsheet designed by school | CS |
| Academic Achievement: Local Measures <i>Reading for 2nd Through 8th Grades</i> | Required data elements for each student are as follows. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSN • Student name • Grade level • Fall MAP reading RIT score • MAP reading growth target • Spring MAP reading RIT score • Student met MAP reading growth target (Y/N) | Spreadsheet designed by school | CS |
| Academic Achievement: Local Measures <i>Math for K5 and 1st Grades</i> | Required data elements for each student are as follows. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSN • Student name • Grade level • Number of skills on which the student earned "3" • Number of skills on which the student earned "4" | Spreadsheet designed by school | CS |
| Academic Achievement: Local Measures <i>Math for 2nd Through 8th Grades</i> | Required data elements for each student are as follows. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSN • Student name • Grade level • Fall MAP math RIT score • MAP math growth target • Spring MAP math RIT score Student met MAP math growth target (Y/N) | Spreadsheet designed by school | CS |
| Academic Achievement: Local Measures <i>Writing</i> | Required data elements for each student are as follows. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSN • Student name • Overall writing score in fall • Overall writing score in spring | Spreadsheet designed by school | CS |

| Learning Memo Section/Outcome | Data Elements/Description | Location of Data | Person(s) Responsible for Collecting Data |
|---|---|---|---|
| Academic Achievement: Local Measures <i>IEP Goals</i> | See "Special Education Needs Students" section above. | Spreadsheet designed by school | CS |
| Academic Achievement: Standardized Measures <i>PALS-PreK</i> | For each K4 student, include the following. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSN • Student name • Fall score for each PALS PreK task (7 columns, 1 for each of the 5–7 tasks assessed) • Spring score for each PALS PreK task (7 columns, 1 for each of the 5–7 tasks assessed) • Provide the PALS test date(s) in an email or other document if the date is not included in the data sheet | Spreadsheet designed by school; provide paper copies of the test publisher's printout | CS |
| Academic Achievement: Standardized Measures <i>PALS-K and PALS 1–3</i> | For each K5, 1st-, and 2nd-grade student, include the following. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSN • Student name • Fall summed score • Spring summed score • Provide the PALS test date(s) in an email or other document if the date is not included in the data sheet | Spreadsheet designed by school; provide paper copies of the test publisher's printout | CS |
| Academic Achievement: Standardized Measures <i>Smarter Balanced Assessment</i> | <u>Note that these requirements may change during the year. If they do, CRC will alert schools to the updated requirements.</u> Required data elements for each student are as follows. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSN • Student name • Proficiency level, scale score, and state percentile for Smarter Balanced Assessment English/language arts assessment • Proficiency level, scale score, and state percentile for Smarter Balanced Assessment math assessment • Provide the Smarter Balanced Assessment test date(s) in an email or other document if the date is not included in the data sheet | Spreadsheet designed by school; provide DPI's electronic report | CS |

| Learning Memo Section/Outcome | Data Elements/Description | Location of Data | Person(s) Responsible for Collecting Data |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>Academic Achievement: Standardized Measures</p> <p><i>Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE)</i></p> | <p>Required data elements for 4th and 8th graders are as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSN • Student name • Social studies scale score • Social studies proficiency level • Science scale score • Science proficiency level • Provide the WKCE test date(s) in an email or other document if the date is not included in the data sheet | <p>Export results from the publisher's website to a spreadsheet.</p> <p>Also provide paper copies of all students' WKCE scores.</p> | <p>CS</p> |

Appendix C

Trend Information

| Table C1 | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| DLH Academy Student Enrollment and Retention | | | | | |
| Year | Number Enrolled at Start of School Year | Number Enrolled During Year | Number Withdraw | Number at End of School Year | Number and Rate Enrolled for Entire School Year |
| 2010–11 | 288 | 27 | 58 | 257 | 237 (82.3%) |
| 2011–12 | 303 | 10 | 33 | 280 | 272 (89.8%) |
| 2012–13 | 309 | 16 | 43 | 282 | 267 (86.4%) |
| 2013–14 | 272 | 18 | 26 | 264 | 264 (97.1%) |
| 2014–15 | 288 | 3 | 28 | 263 | 260 (90.3%) |

*2008–09 was the first year that CSRC required that retention rate be calculated.

Figure C1





Figure C2



| Table C2 | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| DLH Academy Teacher Retention Rates | | | | | |
| Teacher Type | Number at Beginning of School Year | Number Started After School Year Began | Number Terminated Employment During the Year | Number at End of School Year Who Began the Year | Retention Rate: Rate Employed at School for Entire School Year |
| 2010-11 | | | | | |
| Classroom Teachers Only | 13 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 84.6% |
| All Instructional Staff | 21 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 90.5% |
| 2011-12 | | | | | |
| Classroom Teachers Only | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 100% |
| All Instructional Staff | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 100% |
| 2012-13 | | | | | |
| Classroom Teachers Only | 12 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 83.3% |
| All Instructional Staff | 21 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 81.0% |
| 2013-14 | | | | | |
| Classroom Teachers Only | 12 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 83.3% |
| All Instructional Staff | 18 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 88.9% |
| 2014-15 | | | | | |
| Classroom Teachers Only | 11 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 91.0% |
| All Instructional Staff | 17 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 88.2% |

| Table C3 | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------|
| DLH Academy Teacher Return Rates* | | | |
| Teacher Type | Number at End of Prior School Year | Number Returned at Beginning of Current School Year | Return Rate |
| 2010–11 | | | |
| Classroom Teachers Only | 6 | 6 | 100.0% |
| All Instructional Staff | 13 | 13 | 100.0% |
| 2011–12 | | | |
| Classroom Teachers Only | 9 | 9 | 100.0% |
| All Instructional Staff | 17 | 17 | 100.0% |
| 2012–13 | | | |
| Classroom Teachers Only | 11 | 6 | 54.5% |
| All Instructional Staff | 19 | 14 | 73.7% |
| 2013–14 | | | |
| Classroom Teachers Only | 10 | 6 | 60.0% |
| All Instructional Staff | 16 | 11 | 68.8% |
| 2014–15 | | | |
| Classroom Teachers Only | 10 | 8 | 80.0% |
| All Instructional Staff | 17 | 13 | 76.5% |

*Includes only teachers who were eligible to return, i.e., were offered a position for fall.

| Table C4 | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|
| DLH Academy CSRC Scorecard Results | |
| School Year | Result |
| 2009–10 | 67.2% |
| 2010–11 | 71.2% |
| 2011–12 | 77.3% |
| 2012–13 | 73.8% |
| 2013–14 | 72.6% |
| 2014–15 | 83.8% |

Appendix D

CSRC 2014–15 School Scorecard

**City of Milwaukee Charter School Review Committee
School Scorecard**

r: 4/11

K5–8TH GRADE

STUDENT READING READINESS: GRADES 1–2

- PALS—% 1st graders at or above spring summed score benchmark this year (5.0)
- PALS—% 2nd graders who maintained spring summed score benchmark two consecutive years (5.0) **10%**

STUDENT ACADEMIC PROGRESS: GRADES 3–8

- WKCE reading—% maintained proficient and advanced (7.5)
- WKCE math—% maintained proficient and advanced (7.5)
- WKCE reading—% below proficient who progressed (10.0)
- WKCE math—% below proficient who progressed (10.0) **35%**

LOCAL MEASURES

- % met reading (3.75)
- % met math (3.75)
- % met writing (3.75)
- % met special education (3.75) **15%**

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT: GRADES 3–8

- WKCE reading—% proficient or advanced (7.5)
- WKCE math—% proficient or advanced (7.5) **15%**

ENGAGEMENT

- Student attendance (5.0)
- Student reenrollment (5.0)
- Student retention (5.0)
- Teacher retention (5.0)
- Teacher return* (5.0) **25%**

HIGH SCHOOL

STUDENT ACADEMIC PROGRESS: GRADES 9, 10, and 12

- EXPLORE to Aspire—composite score at or above benchmark on EXPLORE and at or above benchmark on the Aspire (5)
- EXPLORE to Aspire—below composite benchmark on EXPLORE by increase one or more on Aspire (10)
- Adequate credits to move from 9th to 10th grade (5)
- Adequate credits to move from 10th to 11th grade (5)
- DPI graduation rate (5) **30%**

POSTSECONDARY READINESS: GRADES 11 and 12

- Postsecondary acceptance for graduates (college, university, technical school, military) (10)
- % of 11th/12th graders tested (2.5)
- % of graduates with ACT composite score of 21.25 or more (2.5) **15%**

LOCAL MEASURES

- % met reading (3.75)
- % met math (3.75)
- % met writing (3.75)
- % met special education (3.75) **15%**

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT: GRADE 10

- WKCE reading—% proficient and advanced (7.5)
- WKCE math—% proficient and advanced (7.5) **15%**

ENGAGEMENT

- Student attendance (5.0)
- Student reenrollment (5.0)
- Student retention (5.0)
- Teacher retention (5.0)
- Teacher return* (5.0) **25%**

*Teachers not offered continuing contracts are excluded when calculating this rate.

Note: If a school has less than 10 students in any cell on this scorecard, CRC does not report these data. This practice was adopted to protect student identity. Therefore, these cells will be reported as not available (N/A) on the scorecard. The total score will be calculated to reflect each school's denominator.

Beginning with the 2014–15 scorecard, the PALS replaced the SDRT as the standardized measure for students in first and second grades. As noted in the body of the report, the CSRC approved a pilot scorecard, which will be tested this year. However, because the new scorecard is still in the pilot stage, expectations for school performance will be based on the 2014–15 scorecard included in Table D.

| Table D Charter School Review Committee Scorecard 2014–15 School Year | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Area | Measure | Max. Points | % Total Score | Performance | Points Earned |
| Student Reading Readiness : 1st – 2nd Grades ^{48,49} | % 1st graders at or above spring summed score benchmark this year | 5.0 | 10.0% | 88.5% | 4.4 |
| | % 2nd graders at or above spring summed score benchmark this year | 5.0 | | 100.0% | 5.0 |
| Student Academic Progress: 3rd – 8th Grades | WKCE reading: % maintained proficient/advanced | 7.5 | 35.0% | N/A | N/A |
| | WKCE math: % maintained proficient/advanced | 7.5 | | N/A | N/A |
| | WKCE reading: % below proficient who progressed | 10 | | N/A | N/A |
| | WKCE math: % below proficient who progressed | 10 | | N/A | N/A |
| Local Measures | % met reading | 3.75 | 15.0% | 79.7% | 3.0 |
| | % met math | 3.75 | | 72.7% | 2.7 |
| | % met writing | 3.75 | | 68.4% | 2.6 |
| | % met special education | 3.75 | | 78.6% | 2.9 |
| Student Achievement: 3rd – 8th Grades | WKCE reading: % proficient or advanced | 7.5 | 15.0% | N/A | N/A |
| | WKCE math: % proficient or advanced | 7.5 | | N/A | N/A |
| Engagement | Student attendance | 5.0 | 25.0% | 93.3% | 4.7 |
| | Student reenrollment | 5.0 | | 77.9% | 3.9 |
| | Student retention | 5.0 | | 90.3% | 4.5 |
| | Teacher retention rate | 5.0 | | 88.2% | 4.4 |
| | Teacher return rate | 5.0 | | 76.5% | 3.8 |
| Total | | 50⁵⁰ | | | 41.9 (83.8%) |

Note: Teacher retention and return rates reflect all instructional staff (classroom teachers plus other instructional staff).

⁴⁸ The PALS replaced the SDRT as the standardized measure for students in first and second grades.

⁴⁹ Includes students who completed both the fall and spring PALS.

⁵⁰ The WKCE reading and math tests were discontinued for the 2014–15 school year. Therefore, current and year-to-year results were not available. The maximum points possible for the WKCE scorecard measures were subtracted from the total possible points. The scorecard percent was calculated by dividing the number of points earned by the modified denominator.

Appendix E

2014–15 Badger Exam Results

Due to the DPI embargo of Badger Exam data, summary results cannot be reported at this time. As soon as the embargo is lifted later this year, results will be added to this appendix or to a separate addendum to this report.

Appendix F

CSRC PILOT School Scorecard

As described in the body of the report, CSRC approved a revised scorecard to be piloted over the next several years. The pilot scorecard includes new measures that reflect changes to the standardized tests during the past couple of years (SDRT to PALS and WKCE to Badger Exam).⁵¹ The pilot scorecard also includes changes to the maximum point values for some of the measures. For example, local measure results are each worth a maximum of 3.75 points on the 2014–15 scorecard, but are worth a maximum of 6.25 points on the pilot scorecard. Other point changes were made to some of the standardized test measures. These changes were made primarily so that the same values would be awarded to a single standard test—the Badger Exam for elementary school and the ACT Aspire series for high school—for both scorecards. This revision resulted in additional weight being given to students’ annual academic progress as measured by a school’s local measures. Score distribution for the elementary and high school pilot scorecards is shown below.

⁵¹ The SDRT was administered to students in first through third grades up through the 2012–13 school year; it was discontinued in 2013–14 and replaced with the PALS reading assessment.

**City of Milwaukee Charter School Review Committee
PILOT School Scorecard**

r: 6/15

K5–8TH GRADE

| STUDENT READING READINESS: GRADES 1–2 | | |
|---|-------|------------|
| • PALS—% 1st graders at or above spring summed score benchmark this year | (4.0) | 10% |
| • PALS—% 2nd graders who maintained spring summed score benchmark two consecutive years | (6.0) | |

| STUDENT ACADEMIC PROGRESS: GRADES 3–8 | | |
|---|--------|------------|
| • Badger Exam reading—% maintained proficient | (5.0) | 30% |
| • Badger Exam math—% maintained proficient | (5.0) | |
| • Badger Exam reading—% below proficient who progressed | (10.0) | |
| • Badger Exam math—% below proficient who progressed | (10.0) | |

| LOCAL MEASURES | | |
|---------------------------|--------|------------|
| • % met reading | (6.25) | 25% |
| • % met math | (6.25) | |
| • % met writing | (6.25) | |
| • % met special education | (6.25) | |

| STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT: GRADES 3–8 | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| • Badger Exam reading—% proficient or advanced | (5.0) | 10% |
| • Badger Exam math—% proficient or advanced | (5.0) | |

| ENGAGEMENT | | |
|------------------------|-------|------------|
| • Student attendance | (5.0) | 25% |
| • Student reenrollment | (5.0) | |
| • Student retention | (5.0) | |
| • Teacher retention | (5.0) | |
| • Teacher return* | (5.0) | |

HIGH SCHOOL

| STUDENT ACADEMIC PROGRESS: GRADES 9, 10, and 12 | | |
|---|------|------------|
| • ACT Aspire - % 10th graders who were at or above the composite benchmark score two consecutive years | (5) | 30% |
| • ACT Aspire - % 10th graders below the composite benchmark in 9th grade but progressed one point in 10th grade | (10) | |
| • Adequate credits to move from 9th to 10th grade | (5) | |
| • Adequate credits to move from 10th to 11th grade | (5) | |
| • DPI graduation rate | (5) | |

| POSTSECONDARY READINESS: GRADES 11 and 12 | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| • Postsecondary acceptance for graduates (college, university, technical school, military) | (10) | 15% |
| • % of 11th/12th graders tested | (2.5) | |
| • % of graduates with ACT composite score of 21.25 or more | (2.5) | |

| LOCAL MEASURES | | |
|---------------------------|-------|------------|
| • % met reading | (5.0) | 20% |
| • % met math | (5.0) | |
| • % met writing | (5.0) | |
| • % met special education | (5.0) | |

| STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT: Grades 9 and 10 | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| • ACT Aspire English—% students at or above spring benchmark | (5.0) | 10% |
| • ACT Aspire math—% students at or above spring benchmark | (5.0) | |

| ENGAGEMENT | | |
|------------------------|-------|------------|
| • Student attendance | (5.0) | 25% |
| • Student reenrollment | (5.0) | |
| • Student retention | (5.0) | |
| • Teacher retention | (5.0) | |
| • Teacher return* | (5.0) | |

*Teachers not offered continuing contracts are excluded when calculating this rate.

Note: If a school has less than 10 students in any cell on this scorecard, CRC does not report these data. This practice was adopted to protect student identity. Therefore, these cells will be reported as not available (N/A) on the scorecard. The total score will be calculated to reflect each school's denominator.