



# High Stakes Rubric for Assessing Alternative Education Campus for Charter Renewal

A-GAME (Advancing Great Authorizing and Modeling Excellence) is a group of nationally recognized public charter school authorizers committed to improving the way we measure the effectiveness of alternative education campuses. By focusing on these schools, often described as “dropout prevention” or “credit recovery” schools, this group of thought leaders is tackling the most pressing question facing authorizers today: How do you measure the academic quality of schools designed to attract and engage students who, by definition, are disengaged and significantly behind in their learning?

The rubric below provides an example of how authorizers can assess an application to renew an alternative charter, and is consistent with the guidance and recommendations put forth in the A-GAME’s [Measuring Quality: A Resource Guide for Authorizers and Alternative Schools](https://charterinstitute.org/a-game-grant/documents-deliverables) ([charterinstitute.org/a-game-grant/documents-deliverables](https://charterinstitute.org/a-game-grant/documents-deliverables)).

For the majority of a high stakes charter review, evaluation standards should be no different for an alternative charter school than they are for a non-alternative charter school. For example, criteria for assessing governance, compliance with applicable laws, and finances are no different for alternative schools. Thus, the rubric below is provided only for renewal elements that require special consideration, especially since alternative public charter schools are generally expected to meet ESSA accountability framework targets (e.g., a four-year graduation rate of 67% or higher). The omission of other elements should not be taken to mean that they should be omitted in considering an alternative charter school’s renewal.

For a variety of reasons, ranging from mobility rates among high-risk students to serving students in grade levels not assessed by the state, the typical alternative school tends to have reliable data on a far smaller proportion of students than traditional (or non-alternative) schools. The example standards and ratings provided below anticipate lower statewide participation rates AND expect the school to be able to provide additional data that addresses student outcomes in both the academic and non-academic performance and growth of students.

<b>Sufficient Data</b>			
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>MEETS</b>	<b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>	<b>DOES NOT MEET</b>
<p><b>Sufficient Outcome Data</b></p> <p>This standard is applied for each of the goals below.</p> <p>Only meeting “sufficient data” standard can a goal be met,</p>	<p>School provides student outcome data for the measure specified in its contract goals and/or accountability framework for all eligible students for all years of the review period.</p>	<p>School provides student outcome data for the measure specified in its contract goals and/or accountability framework for more than 2/3rds of the eligible students and for more than 2/3rds of the review period.</p>	<p>School provides student outcome data for the measure specified in its contract goals and/or accountability framework for fewer than 2/3rds of the eligible students or for fewer than 2/3rds of the review period.</p>

<b>Student Motivation and Engagement</b>			
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>MEETS</b>	<b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>	<b>DOES NOT MEET</b>
<p>Student Motivation and Engagement</p> <p>(e.g. Attendance, persistence, re-enrollment, withdrawal rates, credits earned)</p>	<p>All of the agreed-upon motivation and/or engagement targets are met each year of the review period.</p>	<p>Targets are met for the majority of the charter term.</p> <p>Or, the school demonstrates consistent improvement with engagement over the course of the charter term.</p>	<p>Targets are not met for the majority of the charter term.</p> <p>And, there is no evidence of improvement.</p>



Academic Quality			
ITEM	MEETS	PARTIALLY MEETS	DOES NOT MEET
Academic Achievement	All eligible students <sup>1</sup> achievement rates meet the approved target on mandated state and supplemental, authorizer approved assessments. <sup>2</sup>	All eligible students <sup>2</sup> achievement rates for the majority of the years in the charter term meet the approved targets. <sup>2</sup>  Or, there is consistent improvement over the review period, with results in the final year(s) within reasonable range <sup>3</sup> of the target.	Student achievement rates for the majority of years in the charter term are below approved targets.  And, there is no evidence of improvement over the review period. OR not all eligible students are included in accountability measure
Student Growth	For all years of the review period, the average (or median) growth rates among eligible students <sup>2</sup> meet approved growth targets on the state mandated assessments and supplemental, authorizer approved assessments. <sup>4</sup>	For most years of the review period, the average (or median) growth rates among eligible students <sup>2</sup> meet approved growth targets on the state mandated and/or authorizer approved assessments.  Or, the average (or median) growth of eligible students shows improvement over the years of the review period, ending within reasonable range of the expected target.	The average (or median) growth rates among eligible students <sup>2</sup> do not meet approved growth targets for the majority of the charter term.  And, there is no improvement .

<sup>1</sup> Students determined as eligible to take the respective assessments, based on approved school assessment policies.

<sup>2</sup> Examples of student engagement and other non-academic measures and targets can be found in the A-GAME's [Measuring Quality](#) guidance document, beginning on page 20.

<sup>3</sup> "Reasonable range" to be determined by authorizer and based on local or national standards.)

<sup>4</sup> Examples of student engagement and other non-academic measures and targets can be found in the A-GAME's [Measuring Quality](#) guidance document, beginning on page 23.



Academic Quality			
ITEM	MEETS	PARTIALLY MEETS	DOES NOT MEET
High School Completion (e.g. graduation rates)	For all years of the review period, the school meets or exceeds the high school completion targets as set forth in their charter contract, and consistent with federal and/or statewide policies. <sup>5,6</sup>	For most years of the review period, the school meets or exceeds the high school completion targets as set forth in their charter contract, and consistent with federal and/or statewide policies. <sup>6</sup>  Or, the school demonstrates improvement in their approved high school completion rate over the review period, ending within reasonable range of the approved target.	The school's high school completion rates did not meet the approved targets, not was there any improvement over the duration of the review period.
College and Career Readiness	For all years of the review period each of the agreed-upon college and career readiness targets are met. <sup>7</sup>	For most of the years in the review period, targets are met for the majority of the charter term.  Or, the school demonstrates consistent improvement in College and Career Readiness in overall the review period.	Targets are not met for the majority of the charter term.  And, the school does not demonstrate improvement in overall performance.

<sup>5</sup> Depending on state law, authorizers may be required to utilize the high school completion rate set out in their states approved ESSA plan, but may also be able to supplement their accountability framework with additional high school completion measures. Therefore, authorizers should refer to their state's charter laws to determine what their options are..

<sup>6</sup> For examples of alternative high school completion rate measures, metrics, and targets see the A-GAME's Measuring Quality guidance document, beginning on page 24.

<sup>7</sup> For examples of alternative high school completion rate measures, metrics, and targets see the A-GAME's Measuring Quality guidance document, beginning on page 23.



Equity and Inclusion			
ITEM	MEETS	PARTIALLY MEETS	DOES NOT MEET
Enrollment	<p>For all years of the review period, the school's enrollment is within reasonable range of projections (e.g., 95%).</p> <p>And, School abides by the enrollment policies set forth in its charter.</p>	<p>For most years of the review period, the school's enrollment is slightly out of the range of projections (e.g., 85-95%).</p> <p>And, School abides by the enrollment policies set forth in its charter.</p>	<p>Across all years of the review period, the school's enrollment is not within reasonable range of projections (e.g., lower than 80%).</p> <p>Or, School does not follow the enrollment policies set forth in its charter.</p>

Alternative schools tend to rely heavily on partnerships with community-based organizations and/or outside providers of wraparound supports. The authorizer, therefore, may want to know that the school is evaluating the effectiveness of these partnerships. Below is an example rubric for evaluating the evidence an alternative school provides on the evaluation and improvement of their support programs.

Program Evaluation & Improvement			
ITEM	MEETS	PARTIALLY MEETS	DOES NOT MEET
Evaluation of student service and support partnerships	<p>For each year of the review period, the school provides its evaluation of the effectiveness of each significant partnership that includes multiple measures (e.g. utilization, satisfaction surveys, change in relevant student behavior) from all eligible students/families using the partner services indicating strong approval.</p> <p>Or, if strong approval is not shown, the school demonstrates that it has enforced plans for improvement or removed the partner.</p>	<p>For the majority of the review period, the school provides its evaluation of the effectiveness of each partnership but it includes only one or two measures; or responses from the majority, but not all, eligible students.</p> <p>Or, it provides plans for improvement without evidence of enforcement.</p>	<p>The school does not provide its evaluation of the effectiveness of the partnership.</p> <p>Or, the school's assessment is based on anecdotes without evidence, or with evidence from fewer than half of the eligible students.</p> <p>Or, the assessment shows that the partner is not performing well but the school has neither enforced a plan of action nor removed the partner.</p>



Program Evaluation & Improvement			
ITEM	MEETS	PARTIALLY MEETS	DOES NOT MEET
Partner vetting process	School can document how each partnership was founded and how each partner organization was vetted (e.g., rubric used to evaluate the org, or questions that were asked) and that the chosen partner showed that it could perform the required duties.	n/a	School does not have complete documentation of how partner relationships were founded or how the organizations were vetted (e.g., rubric used to evaluate the org, or questions that were asked).  Or, the partner chosen was not the strongest applicant.

