WASHINGTON STATE
Charter School Commission
STUDENTS • INNOVATION • TRANSPARENCY

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK METHODOLOGY

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. The APF was revised in April 2018 to reflect changes in the state accountability system.

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 about 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 School Improvement Framework 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 charter schools' students would otherwise attend and schools statewide serving similar students, and school-specific goals.

INDICATOR	MEASURE		Weight	
			K-8	HS
1. State and Federal Accountability—Washington School Improvement Framework	1a.1. All Students Framework Score		30%	30%
	1a.2. Subgroup Framework Scores		20%	20%
2. Geographic Comparisons (Assigned School Comparison)	2a.1. Proficiency	2a.2. Subgroup Proficiency	6%	5%
	2b.1. All students growth	2b.2. Subgroup growth	9%	NA
	2c.1. Graduation Rate	2c.2. Subgroup Graduation Rate	2.5%	2.5%
	2d. 1. EL. Progress	2d.2. Subgroup EL Progress	2.5%	2.5%
	2e.1. Regular Attendance	2e.2. Subgroup Regular Attendance	NA	2.5%
	2f.1. 9th Graders on Track	2f.2. 9th Graders on Track	NA	2.5%
	2g.1. Dual Credit	2g.2. Dual Credit	NA	5%
3. Comparison to Schools Serving Similar Students	3a. Proficiency		15%	7.5%
	3b. Graduation rate		NA	7.5%
4. School-specific goals	School-specific goal(s)		15%	15%

Note: 9th Graders on Track and Dual Credit are evaluated for all schools serving 9th grade.
Weights across all indicators total to 100%.

Note on missing data: ***If a school does not have at least one year of SBA 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.

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 School Improvement Framework as part of its ESSA Consolidated Plan to evaluate and track the performance of all schools in the state.[1] To align charter school accountability expectations with the state accountability system, the Washington School Improvement Framework serves as the foundation of the APF, supplemented by additional measures required by WAC 108-30-020(a).

The Washington School Improvement Framework evaluates all students and targeted subgroups[2] on proficiency, growth, graduation rate, English learner (EL) progress, attendance, ninth grade credit attainment, and dual credit. Each year, the state calculates up to 10 scores for each school that represents statewide ranking (deciles) for all students and each subgroup with a sufficient number of students to meet reporting requirements. The scores are based on up to three years of performance.

Additional Information/Considerations:

Because the state framework scores are based on up to three years of data, the Commission will need to consider the issue of "overweighting" data from some years during a renewal review. When four years of results are considered for a charter renewal review, performance from some years may count as many as three times. It is possible, as well, that data from years before the current charter contract term are included in the review.

Using a hypothetical example, (see 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—2020 through 2023. Using the Washington State Improvement Framework, based on three years of data, performance in the first year of the charter term (2020) "counts" for 50% of the evaluation because 2020 results are included in the Framework scores for 2020, 2021, and 2022. The most recent year counts only for 8% because 2023 results are only included in the 2023 3-year Framework score. Additionally, years before the charter term (2018 and 2019) are also included in the renewal review.

[1] More information is available at the OSPI website.
[2] Targeted subgroups in the state Washington School Improvement Framework include race and ethnicity, current ELL, students with disabilities, and free and reduced price lunch.

	Years included in the renewal review, based on state accountability Framework scores from 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023:					
Year of the 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 the current charter term
(2024 results not yet available for the final year of term)

Measure 1a.1. Washington School Improvement Framework Score – All Students

Necessary data

- Washington School Improvement Framework scores for the current year

Targets

1a.1. State Accountability: Washington School Improvement Framework Score – All Students Is the charter school meeting performance expectations based on state accountability results?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school receives an all student Framework Score of 8, 9 or 10.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school receives an all student Framework Score of 6 or 7.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school receives an all student Framework Score of 4 or 5.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school receives an all student Framework Score of 1, 2 or 3.**

Measure 1a.2. Washington School Improvement Framework Score – Subgroups

Necessary data

- Washington School Improvement Framework scores for each reported subgroup for the current year

Additional Information/Considerations:

OSPI includes the following subgroups in the Washington School Improvement Framework: American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, black/African American, Hispanic/LatinX, native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, two or more races, white, English learners, low income, students with disabilities. Results for fewer than 20 students are not released or included in Commission analyses.

Targets

1a.2. State Accountability: Washington School Improvement Framework Score – Subgroups Are students in reported subgroups in the charter school meeting performance expectations based on state accountability results?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup receives a Framework Score of 8, 9 or 10.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup receives a Framework Score of 6 or 7.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup receives a Framework Score of 4 or 5.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup receives a Framework Score of 1, 2 or 3.**

Indicator 2: Geographic Comparisons (Assigned School Comparison)

Charter schools are compared to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend through the use of an Assigned School Comparison (ASC). Charter schools are rated based on the difference between the charter school and ASC average performance.

Methodology for identifying ASC schools

Each of the measures within Indicator 2 relies on the identification of the district schools that charter schools are "assigned" to, based on students' addresses of residence.

Necessary data

- Grade and street address for all students enrolled in the charter school during the month of the spring state assessment administration.

Methodology

Step 1: For each unique student street address, enter the address into the resident district's online boundary map tool.[3]
Step 2: Record the school name and corresponding district school id for each address submitted by the charter school.
Step 3: Tally the total number of students by grade that is "assigned" to each district school identified in Steps 1 and 2.

Sample: Table 1

"Assigned" School Name	Students Assigned by Grade Level, School Year 2017-18			Total Students
	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	
School 1	12	13	9	34
School 2	7	3	4	14
School 3	6	6	1	13
School 4	4	8	1	13
School 5	4	5	1	10
School 6	4	2	3	9
School 7	6	2	0	8
School 8	4	4	0	8
School 9	3	2	3	8
School 10	4	1	1	6
School 11	2	1	2	5
School 12	0	2	0	2
School 13	0	1	0	1
Total	56	50	25	131

[3] For an example of the Seattle Public Schools *SchoolSearch* tool, see: https://www.seattleschools.org/admissions/school_finder/address_lookup_tool

In the table above, the district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend are labeled "assigned" school. In each of the measures described below, charter school performance (grade-level proficiency, grade-level growth, sub-group proficiency, sub-group growth, etc.) is compared to the ASC, which is the weighted average of the performance of the assigned schools. For an example of the weighting calculation, see the Appendix.

Measure 2a.1. Proficiency—ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

Necessary data

For charter school and the district schools charter, school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students by grade "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- Percentage of students proficient in ELA by grade
- Percentage of students proficient in math by grade

Methodology (carried out separately for ELA and math)

Step 1: Multiply the proficiency rate for each grade in each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school in that grade. Sum the products for all assigned schools and grades, and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).

Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school percentage of proficient students and the ASG average percentage of proficient students in the grades served by the charter school.

Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

Targets (apply separately to all tested subjects)

2a.1 Proficiency comparison to district How are charter school students performing on state assessments compared to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **School proficiency rate is 10 or more percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **School proficiency rate is equal to or is up to 9 percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **School proficiency rate is up to 9 percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Falls Far Below Standard:

☐ **School proficiency rate is 10 or more percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**

Measure 2a.2. Subgroup Proficiency—ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

Necessary data

For charter school and district schools, charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students by grade "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- Percentage of students proficient in each eligible subgroup in ELA by grade.
- Percentage of students proficient in each eligible subgroup in math by grade.

Note: "Eligible" subgroups meet OSPI reporting standards for the number of students tested (20).

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

Step 1: Multiply the subgroup proficiency rate for each grade in each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school in that grade. Sum the products for all assigned schools and grades, and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).

Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school and ASC percentages of proficient students in the subgroup.

Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

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

2a.2. Subgroup proficiency - Comparison to district How are charter school students in subgroups performing on state assessments compared to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **School subgroup proficiency rate is 10 or more percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **School subgroup proficiency rate is equal to or is up to or equal to 9 points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **School subgroup proficiency rate is up to or equal to 9 percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **School subgroup proficiency rate is 10 or more percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**

Measure 2b.1. Student Growth - All Students – ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

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 charter school and district schools charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- Median growth percentile (MGP) – ELA
- Median growth percentile (MGP) - math

Methodology (carried out separately for ELA and math)

***Step 1*:** Multiply the MGP for each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school. Sum the products for all assigned schools and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).
Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school MGP and the ASC MGP.
Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

Targets (applied separately to both ELA and math)

2b.1. Student Growth- All Students - Comparison to the district How are charter school students meeting growth expectations compared to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school? (based on subgroup median growth percentiles (MGPs))
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **School MGP is 5 or more points above the Assigned School Comparison median.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **School MGP is equal to or up to 4 percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison median.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **School MGP is up to 4 points below the Assigned School Comparison median.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **School MGP is 5 or more points below the Assigned School Comparison median.**

Measure 2b.2. Student Growth—Subgroups—ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

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 charter school and district schools charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- School median growth percentile (MGP) for all eligible subgroups – ELA
- School median growth percentile (MGP) for all eligible subgroups - math

Note: "Eligible" subgroups meet OSPI reporting standards for the number of students tested.

Methodology (carried out separately for ELA and math for all eligible subgroups)

Step 1: Multiply the subgroup MGP for each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school. Sum the products for all assigned schools and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).

Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school subgroup MGP and the ASC subgroup MGP.

Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

Targets (applied separately to both ELA and math for each eligible subgroup)

2b2. Student Growth—Subgroups—Comparison to the district in which the school is located How are charter school student subgroups meeting growth expectations compared to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school? (based on subgroup median growth percentiles (MGPs))
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **School subgroup MGP is 5 or more points above the Assigned School Comparison median.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **School subgroup MGP is equal to or up to 4 points above the Assigned School Comparison median.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **School subgroup MGP is up to or equal to 4 points below the Assigned School Comparison median.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **School subgroup MGP is 5 or more points below the Assigned School Comparison median.**

Measure 2c.1. Graduation rate—All students—ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

Necessary data

For charter school and district schools charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- Adjusted cohort graduation rate reported in the Washington School Improvement Framework

Methodology

Step 1: Multiply the adjusted cohort graduation rate for each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school. Sum the products for all assigned schools and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).

Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school adjusted cohort graduation rate and the ASC adjusted cohort graduation rate.

Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

Targets

2c.1. Graduation rate - All students - Comparison to district How are charter school student graduation rates compared to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school graduation rate is 10 or more percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school graduation rate is equal to or up to 9 percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school graduation rate is up to 9 percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school graduation rate is 10 or more percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**

Measure 2c.2. Graduation rate – Subgroup – ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

Necessary data

For charter school and district schools charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- Subgroup graduation rates for all eligible subgroups reported in the Washington School Improvement Framework

Note: "Eligible" subgroups meet OSPI reporting standards for the number of students tested.

Methodology (carried out separately for each eligible subgroup)

Step 1: Multiply the subgroup graduation rate for each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school. Sum the products for all assigned schools and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).

Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school subgroup adjusted cohort graduation rate and the ASC subgroup adjusted cohort graduation rate.

Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

Targets

2c.2. Graduation rate – Subgroup – Comparison to district How do charter school student subgroup graduation rates compare to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup graduation rate is 10 or more percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup graduation rate equals or is up to 9 percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup graduation rate is up to 9 percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup graduation rate is 10 or more percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**

Measure 2d.1. EL Progress - ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

Percentage of students who are making enough progress to transition out of the program within at most six years.

Necessary data

For charter school and district schools charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- English Learner (EL) progress rates

Methodology

Step 1: Multiply the EL progress rate for each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school. Sum the products for all assigned schools and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).

Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school EL progress rate and the ASC EL progress rate.

Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

Targets

2d.1. EL Progress comparison to district How does charter school student EL progress compare to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance is 10 or more percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance equals or is up to 9 percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance is up to 9 percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance is 10 or more percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**

Measure 2d.2. EL Progress—Subgroup—ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

Percentage of students who are making enough progress to transition out of the program within at most six years.

Necessary data

For charter school and district schools charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- Subgroup EL progress rates for all eligible subgroups reported in the Washington School Improvement Framework

Note: "Eligible" subgroups meet OSPI reporting standards for the number of students tested.

Methodology (carried out separately for each eligible subgroup)

Step 1: Multiply the subgroup EL progress rate for each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school. Sum the products for all assigned schools and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).

Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school subgroup EL progress rate and the ASC subgroup EL progress rate.

Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

Targets

2d.2. Subgroup EL Progress comparison to district How does charter school student subgroup EL progress compare to the district schools that students would attend if they did not attend the charter school?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance is 10 or more percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance equals or is up to 9 percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance is up to 9 percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance is 10 or more percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**

Measure 2e.1. Regular Attendance—ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

Percentage of students attending 90% or more school days.

Necessary data

For charter school and district schools charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- Regular attendance rate

Methodology

Step 1: Multiply the regular attendance rate for each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school. Sum the products for all assigned schools and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).

Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school regular attendance rate and the ASC regular attendance rate.

Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

Targets

2e.1. Regular Attendance comparison to district How does charter school student regular attendance compare to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance is 10 or more percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance equals or is up to 9 percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance is up to 9 percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance is 10 or more percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**

Measure 2e.2. Regular Attendance—Subgroup—ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

Percentage of students attending 90% or more school days.

Necessary data

For charter school and district schools charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- Subgroup regular attendance rates for all eligible subgroups reported in the Washington School Improvement Framework

Note: "Eligible" subgroups meet OSPI reporting standards for the number of students tested.

Methodology (carried out separately for each eligible subgroup)

Step 1: Multiply the subgroup regular attendance rate for each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school. Sum the products for all assigned schools and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).
Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school subgroup regular attendance rate and the ASC subgroup regular attendance rate.
Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

Targets

2e.2. Subgroup Regular Attendance comparison to district How does charter school student subgroup regular attendance compare to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance is 10 or more percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance equals or is up to 9 percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance is up to 9 percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance is 10 or more percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**

Measure 2f.1. 9th Grade on Track—ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

Percentage of first time 9th graders who earned all credits attempted.

Necessary data

For charter school and district schools charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- 9th grade on track rates

Methodology

Step 1: Multiply the 9th grade on track rate for each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school. Sum the products for all assigned schools and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).

Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school 9th grade on track rate and the ASC 9th grade on track rate.

Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

Note: Applies to all schools serving students in 9th grade.

Targets

2f.1. 9th Grade on Track (HS) comparison to district How do charter school students 9th grade on track (HS) rates compare to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance is 10 or more percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance equals or is up to 9 percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance is up to 9 percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance is 10 or more percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**

Measure 2f.2. 9th Grade on Track—Subgroup—ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

Percentage of first time 9th graders who earned all credits attempted.

Necessary data

For charter school and district schools charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- Subgroup 9th grade on track rates for all eligible subgroups reported in the Washington School Improvement Framework

Note: "Eligible" subgroups meet OSPI reporting standards for the number of students tested.

Methodology (carried out separately for each eligible subgroup)

Step 1: Multiply the subgroup 9th grade on track rate for each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school. Sum the products for all assigned schools and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).

Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school subgroup 9th grade on track rate and the ASC subgroup 9th grade on track rate.

Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

Note: Applies to all schools serving students in 9th grade.

Targets

2f.2. Subgroup 9th Grade on Track (HS) comparison to district How do charter school student subgroup 9th grade on track (HS) rates compare to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance is 10 or more percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance equals or is up to 9 percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance is up to 9 percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance is 10 or more percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**

Measure 2g.1. Dual Credit—ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

Percentage of students in grades 9–12 who completed a dual credit course or program.

Necessary data

For charter school and district schools charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students assigned to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- Dual credit rates

Methodology

Step 1: Multiply the dual credit rate for each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school. Sum the products for all assigned schools and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).

Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school dual credit rate and the ASC dual credit rate.

Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.

Note: Applies to all schools serving students in 9th grade.

Targets

2g.1. Dual Credit (HS) comparison to district How do charter school student dual credit (HS) rates compare to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance is 10 or more percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance equals or is up to 9 percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance is up to 9 percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school performance is 10 or more percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**

Measure 2g.2. Dual Credit—Subgroup—ASC Comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend

Percentage of students in grades 9-12 who completed a dual credit course or program.

Necessary data

For charter school and district schools charter school students would otherwise attend:

- Number of students "assigned" to each ASC district school (see Table 1 for example)
- Subgroup dual credit rates for all eligible subgroups reported in the Washington School Improvement Framework

Note: "Eligible" subgroups meet OSPI reporting standards for the number of students tested.

Methodology (carried out separately for each eligible subgroup)

Step 1: Multiply the subgroup dual credit rate for each assigned school by the number of students who would otherwise attend the school. Sum the products for all assigned schools and divide by the total number of students in the charter school. The result is the Assigned School Composite (ASC).
Step 2: Calculate the difference between the charter school subgroup dual credit rate and the ASC subgroup dual credit rate.
Step 3: Apply targets from the table below to assign performance category.
Note: Applies to all schools serving students in 9th grade.

Targets

2g.2. Subgroup Dual Credit (HS) comparison to district How do charter school student subgroup dual credit (HS) rates compare to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?
Exceeds Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance is 10 or more percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Meets Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance equals or is up to 9 percentage points above the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Does Not Meet Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance is up to 9 percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**
Falls Far Below Standard: ☐ **Charter school subgroup performance is 10 or more percentage points below the Assigned School Comparison average.**

INDICATOR 3: 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 3a. 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

3a. 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 the rationale for effect size thresholds, see *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, Cohen (1988).

Measure 3b. 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:

- Cohort graduation rate reported in the Washington School Improvement Framework.

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

3b. 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 the rationale for effect size thresholds, see *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, Cohen (1988).

INDICATOR 4: SCHOOL-SPECIFIC GOALS

Measure 4a. 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

4a. 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 2a1 evaluates both ELA *and* math proficiency, and Measure 2a2 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 Schools that Charter School Students Would Otherwise Attend

Subgroup	Subject	School Proficiency Rate	District Proficiency Rate	Sub-measure rating	Points Earned
American Indian/Alaskan Native	ELA	**21%**	**32%**	**F**	25
	Math	**13%**	**20%**	**D**	50
Black/African American	ELA	**29%**	**34%**	**D**	50
	Math	**18%**	**16%**	**M**	75
Hispanic/LatinX	ELA	**32%**	**34%**	**D**	50
	Math	**23%**	**21%**	**M**	75
Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander	ELA	**22%**	**12%**	**E**	100
	Math	**19%**	**8%**	**E**	100
EL	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
				Average Score:	**58**
				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

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 table below.

INDICATOR	MEASURE		Weight	
			K–8	HS
1. State and Federal Accountability – Washington School Improvement Framework	1a.1. All Students Framework Score		30%	30%
	1a.2. Subgroup Framework Scores		20%	20%
2. Geographic Comparisons (Assigned School Comparison)	2a.1. Proficiency	2a.2. Subgroup Proficiency	6%	5%
	2b.1. All students growth	2b.2. Subgroup growth	9%	NA
	2c.1. Graduation Rate	2c.2. Subgroup Graduation Rate	2.5%	2.5%
	2d.1. EL Progress	2d.2. Subgroup EL Progress	2.5%	2.5%
	2e.1. Regular Attendance	2e.2. Subgroup Regular Attendance	NA	2.5%
	2f.1. 9th Graders on Track	2f.2. 9th Graders on Track	NA	2.5%
	2g.1 .Dual Credit	2g.2. Dual Credit	NA	5%
3. Comparison to Schools Serving Similar Students	3a. Proficiency		15%	7.5%
	3b. Graduation rate		NA	7.5%
4. School-specific goals	School-specific goal(s)		15%	15%

Note: 9th Graders on Track and Dual Credit are evaluated for all schools serving 9th grade.

Note: Weights across all indicators total to 100%.

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 Washington School Improvement Framework will automatically be assigned to Tier 4, regardless of total points.

Note on missing data: ***If a school does not have at least one year of SBA 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.

Example: Elementary/Middle School

Indicator	*Measure*	*Charter School Rating*	*Points Earned*	*Weight*	*Weighted Points*	*Indicator Rating (Points)*
State and Federal Accountability	1a.1. All student Framework score	M	*75*	*15%*	*11.3*	*D (31.3 of 55 possible points)*
	1a.2. Subgroup Framework score	D	*50*	*40%*	*20*	
Geographic Comparisons (Assigned School Comparisons)	2a.1. Proficiency comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend	E	*100*	*3%*	*3*	*M (10.9 of 15 possible points)*
	2b.1. Subgroup proficiency comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend	M	*75*	*3%*	*2.25*	
	2a.2. Growth comparison to district (K–8) schools that charter school students would otherwise attend	D	*50*	*4.5%*	*2.25*	
	2b.2. Subgroup growth comparison to district (K–8) schools that charter school students would otherwise attend	M	*75*	*4.5%*	*3.38*	
	2a.3. Grad rate comparison to district (HS) schools that charter school students would otherwise attend	NA	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	
	2b.2. Grad rate subgroup comparison to district (HS) schools that charter school students would otherwise attend	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*	

**Four additional district comparison measures to be added in 2017-18.*

Tier 2
(65 of a possible 100 points)

School-Specific Goals	M	75	15%	11.3	M (11.3 of 15 possible 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. All student Framework score	D	50	15%	7.5	D (27.5 of a possible 55 points)
	1a.2. Subgroup Framework score	D	50	40%	20.0	
Geographic Comparisons (Assigned School Comparisons)	2a.1. Proficiency comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend	D	50	3.75%	1.9	D (7.5 of a possible 15 points)
	2b.1. Subgroup proficiency comparison to district schools that charter school students would otherwise attend	F	25	3.75%	0.9	
	2a.2. Growth comparison to district (K–8) schools that charter school students would otherwise attend	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	
	2b.2. Subgroup growth comparison to district (K–8) schools that charter school students would otherwise attend	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	
	2a.3. Grad rate comparison to district (HS) schools that charter school students would otherwise attend	D	50	3.75%	1.9	

Tier 3 (56 of a possible 100 points)

	2b.2. Grad rate subgroup comparison to district (HS) schools that charter school students would otherwise attend	**M**	***75***	***3.75%***	***2.8***	

**Four additional district comparison measures to be added in 2017-18.*

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)***

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

Appendix

Example - Assigned School Composite Measure 2a.1

The sample school below is a charter school with proficiency results for grades 6 through 8. The students at the charter school live in the school boundaries for three district schools. The percentage of charter school students assigned to each district school is presented in the table below.

School	Percentage of Charter School's Students "Assigned" to School		
	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
Assigned School A	1%	15%	16%
Assigned School B	-	18%	15%
Assigned School C	17%	18%	-

To calculate the Assigned School Composite for overall school proficiency, the grade level proficiency rates of each of the assigned schools are weighted by the number of charter school students assigned to each of the schools, by grade.

Assigned School	Grade	Number of students assigned to school and grade	Percentage of Students Proficient at School
School A	6	2	88.9%
School A	7	30	63.4%
School A	8	33	66.5%
School B	7	36	62.1%
School B	8	30	65.7%
School C	6	34	68.6%
School C	7	37	76.9%
Total		202	--

Assigned School Composite Average: 67.6%

$$\frac{(2 \times 88.9\%) + (30 \times 63.4\%) + (33 \times 66.5\%) + (36 \times 62.1\%) + (30 \times 65.7\%) + (34 \times 68.6\%) + (37 \times 76.9\%)}{202}$$