Washington State Charter School Commission
Academic Performance Framework Methodology – DRAFT
Revised 5/3/17

Introduction

The Academic Performance Framework (APF) includes measures that allow the Washington State Charter School Commission (the "Commission") to evaluate charter school academic performance to answer the question: Is the academic program a success? In schools that meet or exceed standards, student learning—the central purpose of every school—is taking place and the Commission can consider the academic program to be effective.

The Commission collaborated with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA), in partnership with Public Impact, to develop the APF. The starting point for the draft was NACSA's Core Academic Performance Framework, which is based on NACSA's Principles & Standards. Development of the APF included a review of publicly-available information related to Washington State charter laws, rules, and regulations.

RATING SCALE

As outlined in WAC 108-30-030, for each APF measure, a charter school receives one of four ratings: "Exceeds Standard", "Meets Standard", "Does Not Meet Standard", or "Falls Far Below Standard."

- ***Exceeds Standard*** – Schools that earn this rating exhibit exemplary performance. They are on track for charter renewal and could warrant consideration by the Commission for expansion or replication.
- ***Meets Standard*** – Schools in this rating category meet the minimum expectations for charter school performance. They are performing well and are on track for charter renewal.
- ***Does Not Meet Standard*** – Schools in this category fail to meet minimum expectations for academic performance. The Commission could consider closer monitoring, and their status for renewal could be in question.
- ***Falls Far Below Standard*** – Schools that fall into this rating category are on par with the lowest-performing schools in the state and may be subject to non-renewal or revocation.

The Commission will review charter school performance against the APF annually and at the time of renewal. The results will be used by the Commission to make decisions pertaining to renewal, revocation, and corrective action plans. In addition to the Commission's oversight of charter school performance, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) uses the state's Achievement Index to evaluate charter schools annually.

INDICATORS AND MEASURES

The Academic Performance Framework (APF) evaluates schools based on: state accountability, federal accountability, proficiency rates, student growth, career and college readiness, subgroup performance, comparisons to district schools and schools statewide serving similar students, and school-specific goals.

Indicator	Measure	K-8 Weight Measure	K-8 Indicator Weight	HS Weight Measure	HS Indicator Weight
State and Federal Accountability	3-Year Composite Index	15%		15%	
	Annual Composite Index	40%	55%	40%	55%
	Pending state ESSA Consolidated Plan	TBD		TBD	
Geographic Comparisons	Proficiency comparison to district	3%		3.75%	
	Subgroup proficiency comparison to district	3%		3.75%	
	Growth comparison to district (K-8 only)	4.5%		NA	
	Subgroup growth comparison to district (K-8 only)	4.5%	15%	NA	15%
	Grad rate comparison to district (HS)	NA		3.75%	
	Grad rate subgroup comparison to district (HS)	NA		3.75%	
Comparison to Schools Serving Similar Students (Regression)	Proficiency comparison to schools statewide serving similar students	15%		7.5%	
	Graduation rate comparison to schools statewide serving similar students	NA	15%	7.5%	15%
School-Specific	School-Specific Goals	15%	15%	15%	15%

Note: Weights across all indicators total to 100%. *Weights in the table have not been finalized by the Commission.*

Subgroups include race and ethnicity, current and former English Language Learners, students with disabilities, free and reduced price lunch, and "highly capable status."

Note on missing data: *If a school does not have at least one year of SBAC data or if more than one of the four indicators is missing, an overall tier rating will not be calculated.*

If any metrics within an indicator are missing, an indicator rating will not be calculated. The only exception will be made in the first two years that a school receives an Achievement Index annual rating. In these years, the 3-year composite Achievement Index will not be available and the Commission will calculate the State and Federal Accountability indicator rating and overall tier rating using only the annual Achievement Index rating.

Academic Performance Framework Indicators and Measures

This section provides background information, data requirements, and methodology steps for each of the measures in the APF.

INDICATOR 1: STATE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

The Washington State Board of Education (SBE) and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) developed the Washington State Achievement Index to evaluate and track the performance of all schools in the state.[1] In order to align charter school accountability expectations with the state accountability system, the state's Achievement Index serves as the foundation of the APF, supplemented by additional measures required by WAC 108-30-020(a).

The Achievement Index evaluates all students and targeted subgroups[2] on three components: proficiency, growth, and career and college readiness. Each year, the state calculates two index scores for each school. The *annual AI* is based on the current year's data only, and the *composite AI* is based on the most recent three years of student performance results. Based on a school's index score, it receives a rating (tier label): *Exemplary*, *Very Good*, *Good*, *Fair*, *Underperforming*, and *Lowest 5 Percent*. Annual state accountability awards and designations are based on the 3-year composite AI results.

The APF includes both the 3-year composite and the annual AI results. In the first two years that a school receives an Achievement Index annual rating, the 3-year composite Achievement Index will not be available and the Commission will calculate the State and Federal Accountability indicator rating and overall tier rating using only the annual Achievement Index rating.

Measure 1a.1 State Accountability: Achievement Index *3-Year Composite Result*

Necessary data

- Achievement Index (AI) 3-year composite results

Additional Information/Considerations:

The 3-year composite AI is used for annual state accountability decisions, but it has at least two shortcomings when used for a charter school renewal review that considers four or more years of charter school performance.

Over-weighting data from some years. Because the 3-year AI composite is based on a three-year average, when four years of results are considered for a charter renewal review, performance from some years is counted as many as three times, while data from other years are counted only once, and others are counted twice. It is possible, as well, that data from years before the current charter contract term are included in the review.

Using a hypothetical example, in the table below, in 2024 a charter school is in the fifth year of the charter term, and the Commission is reviewing academic performance from the first four years of the charter contract term –

---

[1] More information is available at the <u>Washington State Achievement Index Site</u>.
[2] Targeted subgroups in the state Achievement Index include race and ethnicity, current and former ELL, students with disabilities, and free and reduced price lunch.

2020 through 2023. Using the 3-year AI composite, performance in the first year of the charter term (2020) "counts" for 50% of the evaluation because 2020 results are included in the 3-year AI composite for 2020, 2021, and 2022. The most recent year counts only for 8% because 2023 results are only included in the 2023 3-year AI composite. Additionally, years prior to the charter term (2018 and 2019) are also included in the renewal review.

	Years included in the renewal review, based on 3-year composite AI results from 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023:					
Year of charter term:	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
1 (2020)	included	included	included			
2 (2021)		included	included	included		
3 (2022)			included	included	included	
4 (2023)				included	included	included
Percentage each year is "weighted" in the review	8%	17%	25%	25%	17%	8%

Years included in current charter term
(2024 results not yet available for final year of term)

State versus federal accountability. *{UPDATE PENDING ESSA CONSOLIDATED PLAN}* The 3-year composite AI rating combines state and federal accountability results through a two-step process. Schools receive a state accountability AI index score based on proficiency, growth, and career and college readiness results. Separately, schools are assigned federal Focus or Priority status if they meet at least one trigger, based on index score, proficiency, or graduation rate[3]. Schools with Focus or Priority status are automatically assigned to the "Lowest 5 Percent" or "Underperforming" AI 3-year composite ratings.

The APF considers the federal accountability results separately in Measure 2a, but for schools with Focus or Priority status, Measures 1a.1 and 2a both reflect only the performance measure that triggered the Focus or Priority status. For example, a high school with a graduation rate lower than 60 percent automatically triggers a Focus or Priority status and, as a result, cannot receive an AI index rating higher than "Underperforming." While the Commission should consider the low graduation rate, it should also be able to consider other results, such as proficiency rates for all students and subgroups.

To address these concerns, the framework includes both the AI 3-year composite (Measure 1a.1) and the AI annual result (Measure 1a.2). The AI annual result is based only on the index score and allows the Commission to see performance for each year of the charter contract term separately.

---

[3] For more information, see OPSI *Overview of Methodology Used to Identify Priority and Focus Schools*.

1a.1 State Accountability: Achievement Index *3-Year Composite Result*
Is the charter school meeting performance expectations based on the Washington State Achievement Index?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ Charter school receives a performance designation of "Exemplary" or "Very Good."
Meets Standard: ☐ Charter school receives a performance designation of "Good."
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ Charter school receives a performance designation of "Fair."
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ Charter school receives a performance designation of "Underperforming" or "Lowest 5 Percent."

Measure 1a.2 State Accountability: Achievement Index *Annual Result*

Necessary data

- Achievement Index (AI) annual result

Additional Information/Considerations:

As discussed above (see *Measure 1a1. Additional Information/Considerations*), the AI annual result is included in the framework to provide detail about annual performance (especially in the most recent years) and performance trends over time. The AI annual score and designation provide an assessment of school performance in the most current year.

Targets

1a.2 State Accountability: Achievement Index *Annual Result*
Is the charter school meeting performance expectations based on the Washington State Achievement Index?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ Charter school receives a performance designation of "Exemplary" or "Very Good."
Meets Standard: ☐ Charter school receives a performance designation of "Good."
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ Charter school receives a performance designation of "Fair."
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ Charter school receives a performance designation of "Underperforming" or "Lowest 5 Percent."

INDICATOR 2: FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

{UPDATE PENDING ESSA CONSOLIDATED PLAN}

The Achievement Index (Indicator 1) includes an evaluation of proficiency rates for all students, as well as for student subgroups. In order to meet requirements for comparative analyses detailed in WAC 108-30-020(a), the APF includes additional performance measures that compare charter school proficiency rates to both the school district in which the charter school resides, and schools statewide serving similar student populations. These comparisons allow the Commission to look not only at school averages, but at additional indicators to ensure that all students are learning.

INDICATOR 3: GEOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS

Charter schools are compared to schools in the surrounding district *that serve the same grades.* The district comparison provides a comparison to the schools that charter school students might otherwise attend.

District comparison measures compare the charter school's percentile ranking to district schools serving the same grades as the charter school. Charter schools are rated based on the difference between the charter school and average district performance.

Measure 3a.1 Proficiency Comparison to District

Necessary data

For all schools in the district where the charter school is located:

- Grades served
- Percentage of students proficient in ELA by grade level (elementary, middle, high school)
- Percentage of students proficient in math by grade level (elementary, middle, high school)

Methodology (carried out separately for ELA and math for each grade level served)

Step 1: Calculate the difference between the charter school percentage of proficient students and the district average percentage of proficient students.
Step 2: Apply targets from table below to assign performance category.

Note: For schools that serve more than one grade level (elementary, middle, high school), complete steps separately for each grade level.

Targets (apply separately to all tested subjects)

3a.1 Proficiency comparison to district
How are charter school students performing on state assessments compared to the district in which the school is located?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ School proficiency rate is 10 or more percentage points above the district average.
Meets Standard: ☐ School proficiency rate is equal to or is up to 9 percentage points above the district average.
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ School proficiency rate is up to 9 percentage points below the district average.
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ School proficiency rate is 10 or more percentage points below the district average.

Measure 3a2. Subgroup proficiency - Comparison to district

Necessary data

For all schools in the district:

- Grades served
- Percentage of students proficient in each eligible subgroup in ELA by grade level.
- Percentage of students proficient in each eligible subgroup in math by grade level.

Note: "Eligible" subgroups meet OSPI reporting standards for number of students tested. Subgroups required by WAC 108-30-020(a) include race and ethnicity, current and former ELL, special education, low income, and highly-capable status.

Methodology (carried out separately for ELA and math for each eligible subgroup and grade level served)

Step 1: Calculate the difference between the charter percentage of proficient students in the subgroup and the district average percentage of proficient students in the subgroup.
Step 3: Apply targets from table below to assign performance category.

Note: For schools that serve more than one grade level (elementary, middle, high school), complete steps separately for each grade level.

Targets (applied separately to all tested subjects for all eligible subgroups)

3a2. Subgroup proficiency - Comparison to district How are charter school students in subgroups performing on state assessments compared to the district in which the charter is located?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ School subgroup proficiency rate is 10 or more percentage points above the district average.
Meets Standard: ☐ School subgroup proficiency rate is equal to or is up to or equal to 9 points above the district.
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ School subgroup proficiency rate is up to or equal to 9 percentage points below the district average.
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ School subgroup proficiency rate is 10 or more percentage points below the district average.

Measure 3b1. Student Growth- All Students - Comparison to the district

Median growth percentiles are calculated by OSPI using two years of state assessment data. Results are reported for grades 4 through 8 for all schools serving a range of grades from 3 through 8. (Growth is not reported for third grade, since two years of assessment data are needed and second grade is not a tested grade.)

Necessary data

For all schools in the district:

- Grades served
- School median growth percentile (MGP) – reading
- School median growth percentile (MGP) - math

Methodology (carried out separately for reading and math for each grade level served)

Step 1: Calculate the difference between the charter school MGP and the district MGP.
Step 2: Apply targets from table below to assign performance category.

Note: For schools that serve more than one grade level (elementary, middle, high school), complete steps separately for each grade level.

3b1. Student Growth- All Students - Comparison to the district
Are charter school students meeting growth expectations compared to the district in which the school is located? (based on subgroup median growth percentiles (MGPs)
Exceeds Standard: ☐ School MGP is 5 or more points above the district median.
Meets Standard: ☐ School MGP is equal to or up to 4 percentage points above the district median.
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ School MGP is up to 4 points below the district median.
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ School MGP is 5 or more points below the district median.

Measure 3b2. Student Growth- Subgroups - Comparison to district in which the school is located

Median growth percentiles are calculated by OSPI using two years of state assessment data. Results are reported for grades 4 through 8 for all schools serving a range of grades from 3 through 8. (Growth is not reported for third grade, since two years of assessment data are needed and second grade is not a tested grade.)

Necessary data

For all schools in the district:

- Grades served
- School median growth percentile (MGP) for all eligible subgroups – reading
- School median growth percentile (MGP) for all eligible subgroups - math

Note: "Eligible" subgroups meet OSPI reporting standards for number of students tested. Subgroups include race and ethnicity, current and former ELL, special education, low income, and highly-capable status.

Methodology (carried out separately for reading and math for all eligible subgroups for each grade level served)

Step 1: Calculate the difference between the charter school subgroup MGP and the district subgroup MGP.
Step 2: Apply targets from table below to assign performance category.

Note: For schools that serve more than one grade level (elementary, middle, high school), complete steps separately for each grade level.

Targets (applied separately to both reading and math <u>for each eligible subgroup)</u>

3b2. Student Growth- Subgroups - Comparison to district in which the school is located Are charter school student subgroups meeting growth expectations compared to the student subgroups in the district in which the charter is located? (based on subgroup median growth percentiles (MGPs)
Exceeds Standard: ☐ School subgroup MGP is 5 or more points above the district median.
Meets Standard: ☐ School subgroup MGP is equal to or up to 4 points above the district median.
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ School subgroup MGP is up to or equal to 4 points below the district median.
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ School subgroup MGP is 5 or more points below the district median.

Measure 3c1. Graduation rate - All students - Comparison to district

Necessary data

For all schools in the district with a graduating class:

- Five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

Methodology

Step 1: Calculate the difference between the charter school five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and the district five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
Step 2: Apply targets from table below to assign performance category.

Targets

3c.1 Graduation rate - All students - Comparison to district How are charter school student graduation rates compared to the district in which the charter is located?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ Charter school graduation rate is 10 or more percentage points above the district average.
Meets Standard: ☐ Charter school graduation rate is equal to or up to 9 percentage points above the district average.
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ Charter school graduation rate is up to 9 percentage points below the district average.
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ Charter school graduation rate is 10 or more percentage points below the district average.

Measure 3c2 Graduation rate – Subgroup – Comparison to district

Necessary data

For all schools in the district:

- Subgroup graduation rates for all eligible subgroups

Note: "Eligible" subgroups meet OSPI reporting standards for number of students tested. Subgroups include race and ethnicity, current and former ELL, special education, low income, and highly-capable status.

Methodology (carried out separately for each eligible subgroup)

Step 1: Calculate the difference between the charter school subgroup five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and the district subgroup five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
Step 2: Apply targets from table below to assign performance category.

Targets

3c2. Graduation rate – Subgroup – Comparison to district How do charter school student subgroup graduation rates compared to the district graduation rates in which the charter is located?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ Charter school subgroup graduation rate is 10 or more percentage points above the district average.
Meets Standard: ☐ Charter school subgroup graduation rate equals or is up to 9 percentage points above the district average.
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ Charter school subgroup graduation rate is up to 9 percentage points below the district average.
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ Charter school subgroup graduation rate is 10 or more percentage points below the district average.

INDICATOR 4: COMPARISON TO SCHOOLS SERVING SIMILAR STUDENTS

Measures evaluating charter schools against schools statewide serving **similar student populations** use regression analysis, a method of statistical analysis that provides an estimate of expected performance based on different student and/or school characteristics. This approach allows the Commission to see whether charter schools are performing better, worse, or about the same as we would expect schools serving the same mix of students.

Measure 4a. Proficiency comparison to schools serving similar students
Regression analysis is used to compare each school's actual performance to its predicted performance, based on the enrollment of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch (FRL) and students with disabilities (SWD).

Necessary data

For all schools in the state:

- Percentage of students proficient in ELA by grade
- Percentage of students proficient in math by grade
- Enrollment (percentage) of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch (FRL)
- Enrollment (percentage) of students with disabilities (SWD)

Methodology (carried out separately for ELA and math)

For each tested grade served by the charter school:

Step 1: Using linear regression (dependent variable – proficiency rate, independent variables – percent FRL enrollment and percent SWD enrollment), calculate the expected proficiency rate for the charter school.

Step 2: Calculate the standard deviation statewide for the proficiency rate.

Step 3: Calculate the effect size *(the difference between the actual and predicted proficiency rate, divided by the standard deviation of proficiency rates statewide)*

After all grades are completed:

Step 4: Average the effect size for all grades, weighted by the number of students tested in each grade.

Step 5: Apply targets to assign performance category.

Targets

4a. Proficiency comparison to schools serving similar students How are charter school students performing on state assessments compared to schools serving similar students?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school proficiency rate exceeds expected performance (effect size >=.30)**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school proficiency rate meets or slightly exceeds expected performance (effect size 0 to .29)**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school proficiency rate is lower than expected performance (effect size -0.01 to -.29)**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school proficiency rate falls far below expected performance (effect size <=-.30)**
For information on rationale for effect size thresholds, see *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, Cohen (1988).

Measure 4b, Graduation rate – Comparison to schools serving similar students

Regression analysis is used to compare each school's actual performance to its predicted performance, based on the enrollment of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch (FRL) and students with disabilities (SWD).

Necessary data

For all schools with a graduating high school in the state:

- Five-year cohort graduation rate

Methodology

Step 1: Using linear regression (dependent variable – graduation rate, independent variables – percent FRL enrollment and percent SWD enrollment), calculate the expected graduation rate for the charter school.
Step 2: Calculate the standard deviation statewide for the graduation rate.
Step 3: Calculate the effect size (*the difference between the actual and predicted graduation rate, divided by the standard deviation of graduation rates statewide*).
Step 4: Apply targets to assign performance category.

Targets

4b. Graduation rate – Comparison to schools serving similar students How did the charter school graduation rate compare to schools serving similar students statewide?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ Charter school graduation rate exceeds expected performance (effect size >=.30)
Meets Standard: ☐ Charter school graduation rate meets or slightly exceeds expected performance (effect size 0 to .29)
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ Charter school graduation rate is lower than expected performance (effect size -0.01 to -.29)
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ Charter school graduation rate falls far below expected performance (effect size <=-.30)
For information on rationale for effect size thresholds, see *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, Cohen (1988).

INDICATOR 5: SCHOOL-SPECIFIC GOALS

Measure 5a. Did the charter school meet its school-specific academic goals?

Overview: School-specific goals must be measurable, based on valid and reliable sources, and should encompass performance outcomes. The Commission will consider the appropriateness and feasibility of assessing school-specific measures before including them in the academic performance framework.

Data source(s): Data sources and verification processes will be established as part of the approval of school-specific measures.

Targets

5a. Did the charter school meet its school-specific academic goals?
Note: Specific metric(s) and target(s) must be developed and agreed upon by the charter school and the authorizer.
Exceeds Standard: ☐ The charter school exceeds its school-specific academic goal(s).
Meets Standard: ☐ The charter school meets its school-specific academic goal(s).
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ The charter school does not meet its school-specific academic goal(s).
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ The charter school falls far below its school-specific academic goal(s).

Creating Measure Ratings, Indicator Ratings and an Overall Rating (Tier)

CALCULATING MEASURE RATINGS

Each measure in the academic framework receives one of four ratings: *Exceeds Standard*, *Meets Standard*, *Does Not Meet Standard*, or *Falls Far Below Standard*. Points are assigned to the school based on the rating category earned:

Rating Category	Points earned
Exceeds Standard	100 points
Meets Standard	75 points
Does Not Meet Standard	50 points
Falls Far Below Standard	25 points

For example, a school that "exceeds" the performance target for a measure would receive 100 points for that measure.

Calculating aggregate measure ratings

Many of the APF measures have one or more "sub-measure" ratings that must be aggregated or rolled up to a measure rating. For example, Measure 3a1 evaluates both ELA *and* math proficiency, and Measure 3a2 evaluates both ELA *and* math proficiency **for up to 10 subgroups**.

Points for sub-measure ratings are averaged and assigned a measure rating, using the following point ranges (the lowest score a school can receive is 25 points):

Category	Points Range
Exceeds Standard	88 to 100 points
Meets Standard	63 to 87.9 points
Does Not Meet Standard	38 to 62.9 points
Falls Far Below Standard	25 to 37.9 points

While a school receives an aggregated rating, annual reports will display disaggregated results and results for all subgroups and sub-measures will be reviewed by the Commission.

Example: Subgroup Comparison to District

Subgroup	Subject	School Proficiency Rate	District Proficiency Rate	Sub-measure rating	Points Earned
American Indian	ELA	21%	32%	F	25
	Math	13%	20%	D	50
Black	ELA	29%	34%	D	50
	Math	18%	16%	M	75
Hispanic	ELA	32%	34%	D	50
	Math	23%	21%	M	75
Pacific Islander	ELA	22%	12%	E	100
	Math	19%	8%	E	100
ELL	ELA	6%	10%	D	50
	Math	14%	20%	D	50
Low Income	ELA	35%	38%	D	50
	Math	38%	42%	D	50
SPED	ELA	11%	22%	F	25
	Math	6%	5%	M	75
Male	ELA	34%	39%	D	50
	Math	40%	37%	M	75
Female	ELA	41%	53%	F	25
	Math	42%	40%	M	75
Gifted	ELA	60%	63%	D	50
	Math	67%	66%	M	75
				Average Score:	**59**
				Measure Rating:	**D**

In the example above, the school has a range of sub-measure ratings, which result in an aggregated measure result of "Does Not Meet Standard."

CALCULATING INDICATOR AND OVERALL RATINGS

In order to aggregate scores from all the measures into indicator ratings and then into an overall rating (tier), the score for each measure is weighted according to the tables below.

Indicator	Measure	K-8 Weight Measure	K-8 Indicator Weight	HS Weight Measure	HS Indicator Weight
State and Federal Accountability	3-Year Composite Index	15%	55%	15%	55%
	Annual Composite Index	40%		40%	
	Pending state ESSA Consolidated Plan	TBD		TBD	
Geographic Comparisons	Proficiency comparison to district	3%	15%	3.75%	15%
	Subgroup proficiency comparison to district	3%		3.75%	
	Growth comparison to district (K-8 only)	4.5%		NA	
	Subgroup growth comparison to district (K-8 only)	4.5%		NA	
	Grad rate comparison to district (HS)	NA		3.75%	
	Grad rate subgroup comparison to district (HS)	NA		3.75%	
Comparison to Schools Serving Similar Students (Regression)	Proficiency comparison to schools statewide serving similar students	15%	15%	7.5%	15%
	Graduation rate comparison to schools statewide serving similar students	NA		7.5%	
School-Specific	School-Specific Goals	15%	15%	15%	15%

Note: Weights across all indicators total to 100%. *Weights in the table have not been finalized by the Commission.*

First, a weighted average of the points earned on measures within each indicator is calculated, and an indicator rating is assigned based on the table below. Next, a weighted average of the indicator rating points is calculated and each school is assigned to one of four tiers, according to the table below. The same point ranges are used to assign both indicator ratings and overall tiers.

Overall Tier	Indicator Rating	Points Range
1	Exceeds Standard	88 to 100 points
2	Meets Standard	63 to 87.9 points
3	Does Not Meet Standard	38 to 62.9 points
4*	Falls Far Below Standard	25 to 37.9 points

*Consistent with RCW 28A.710.200 (2), charter schools in the bottom quartile of schools on the Achievement Index will automatically be in Tier 4, regardless of total points.

Note on missing data: *If a school does not have at least one year of SBAC data or if more than one of the four indicators is missing, an overall tier rating will not be calculated.*

If any metrics within an indicator are missing, an indicator rating will not be calculated. The only exception will be made In the first two years that a school receives an Achievement Index annual rating. In these years, the 3-year composite Achievement Index will not be available and the Commission will calculate the State and Federal Accountability indicator rating and overall tier rating using only the annual Achievement Index rating.

Example: Elementary/Middle School

Indicator	Measure	Charter School Rating	Points Earned	Weight	Weighted Points	Indicator Rating (Points)
State and Federal Accountability	1a.1. 3-Year Composite Index	M	75	15%	11.3	D (31.3 of 55 possible points)
	1a.2 Annual Composite Index	D	50	40%	20	
	2a. Pending state ESSA Consolidated Plan	NA	-	TBD	-	
Geographic Comparisons	3a.1 Proficiency comparison to district	E	100	3%	3	M (10.9 of 15 possible points)
	3b.1 Subgroup proficiency comparison to district	M	75	3%	2.25	
	4a. Growth comparison to district (K-8)	D	50	4.5%	2.25	
	4b. Subgroup growth comparison to district (K-8)	M	75	4.5%	3.38	
	3a.3 Grad rate comparison to district (HS)	NA	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	3b.2 Grad rate subgroup comparison to district (HS)	NA	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Comparison to Schools Serving Similar Students (Regression)	3a.2 Proficiency comparison to schools statewide serving similar students	M	75	15%	11.3	M (11.3 of 15 possible points)
	3a.4 Graduation rate comparison to schools statewide serving similar students	NA	N/A	N/A	N/A	
School-Specific Goals		M	75	15%	11.3	M (11.3 of 15 possible points)

Tier 2 (65 of a possible 100 points)

E	Exceeds Standards	M	Meets Standards	D	Does Not Meet Standard	F	Falls Far Below Standard

Example: High School

Indicator	Measure	Charter School Rating	Points Earned	Weight	Weighted Points	Indicator Rating
State and Federal Accountability	1a.1. 3-Year Composite Index	D	50	15%	7.5	D (27.5 of a possible 55 points)
	1a.2 Annual Composite Index	D	50	40%	20.0	
	2a. Pending state ESSA Consolidated Plan	NA	-	TBD	-	
Geographic Comparisons	3a.1 Proficiency comparison to district	D	50	3.75%	1.9	D (7.5 of a possible 15 points)
	3b.1 Subgroup proficiency comparison to district	F	25	3.75%	0.9	
	4a. Growth comparison to district (K-8)	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	
	4b. Subgroup growth comparison to district (K-8)	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	
	3a.3 Grad rate comparison to district (HS)	D	50	3.75%	1.9	
	3b.2 Grad rate subgroup comparison to district (HS)	M	75	3.75%	2.8	
Comparison to Schools Serving Similar Students (Regression)	3a.2 Proficiency comparison to schools statewide serving similar students	F	25	7.5%	1.9	D (9.4 of a possible 15 points)
	3a.4 Graduation rate comparison to schools statewide serving similar students	E	100	7.5%	7.5	
School-Specific Goals		M	75	15%	11.3	M (11.3 of a possible 15 points)

Tier 3 (56 of a possible 100 points)

E	Exceeds Standards	M	Meets Standards	D	Does Not Meet Standard	F	Falls Far Below Standard