

Delaware Academic Framework Report

Positive Outcomes Charter School (Alternative), ID # 570

For each measure, a school receives one of four ratings:

<i>E = Exceeds Standard</i>
<i>M = Meets Standard</i>
<i>D = Does Not Meet Standard</i>
<i>F = Falls Far Below Standard</i>
*Grey shading indicates that the number of students tested was insufficient to include results in the overall ratings; results are presented but not included in overall school rating.

Rating targets for each measure may be referenced on the Academic Performance Framework Guidance Document.

Each measure is weighted to provide an overall cumulative rating for the school on Academic Performance. School performance on each measure is presented below.

1. STUDENT PROGRESS OVER TIME (GROWTH)

Measure 1a. Are students meeting their fall to spring instructional scale score growth targets?

No alternative framework methodology applied.

Percentage of Students Meeting Growth Targets

Subject	Math	School Rating: Math	ELA	School Rating: ELA
2010-11	45.3%	D	28.0%	F
2011-12	44.4%	D	50.0%	D
2012-13	58.2%	D	63.3%	M
2013-14	65.5%	M	61.0%	M

Measure 1b. Are lowest-performing students in the school meeting their fall to spring instructional scale score growth targets?

No alternative framework methodology applied.

Percentage of Students in the Lowest Quartile Meeting Growth Targets

Subject	Math	School Rating: Math	ELA	School Rating: ELA
2010-11	66.7%	M	36.4%	F
2011-12	66.7%	M	52.4%	D
2012-13	85.0%	E	52.4%	D
2013-14	90.5%	E	85.7%	E

Measure 1c. Are students making enough annual growth to maintain or achieve proficiency status within 3 years or by 10th grade?

Alternative framework targets applied.

Percentage of Students Making Sufficient Growth

Subject	Math	School Rating: Math	ELA	School Rating: ELA
2010-11	37.3%	D	22.7%	F
2011-12	43.2%	D	43.8%	D
2012-13	40.5%	D	60.8%	M
2013-14	52.4%	M	64.6%	M

2. STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT (STATUS)

Measure 2a. Are students achieving proficiency on state examinations in math and ELA?

Alternative framework methodology applied.¹

School Proficiency Scores, Special Population Averages and Percentiles

Subject and Year	School Proficiency Rate	School Rating	Special Population School Average	Special Population 90 th Percentile	Special Population 20 th Percentile
Math, 2010-11	22.4%	M	9.6%	24.6%	0.0%
Math, 2011-12	35.0%	M	13.3%	40.6%	0.0%
Math, 2012-13	26.6%	M	13.1%	29.3%	0.0%
Math, 2013-14	36.7%	M	32.2%	66.7%	4.9%
ELA, 2010-11	21.1%	M	9.8%	38.8%	0.0%
ELA, 2011-12	33.8%	M	17.9%	61.5%	0.0%
ELA, 2012-13	52.5%	M	19.8%	56.5%	0.2%
ELA, 2013-14	52.6%	M	30.2%	66.7%	1.1%

¹ Comparison schools included in the 2a. alternative analysis:

Brennan School [†]	John G. Leach [†]	Positive Change (Parkway Academy)
Camelot Non-Secure Detention [†]	Kent County Community School [†]	Providence Corporation [†]
Carver Center	Kent County Alternative School	Richardson Park Learning Center [†]
Central School	Kent County Secondary ILC Program [†]	Sarah Pyle Academy
Charlton School	Lake Forest ILC	School for the Deaf
Chris Sturfels Youth Center [†]	Laurel Secondary ILC [†]	Seaford House Treatment
Cleveland White School [†]	Lewes Day Treatment Center ^{**}	Silver Lake Treatment
Delaware Day Treatment Center [*]	Meadowood Program [†]	Smyrna Intensive Learning Center [†]
Douglass School	New Castle County Detention Center	Stevenson House
DSCYF	New Castle School	Sussex Consortium
Ferris School	Northeast Treatment	Terry Psychiatric
First State School	People's Place II – Townsend NSD [†]	The Wallin School [†]
Grace and Snowden School	People's Place Non-Secure Detention [†]	Western Sussex Academy ^{***}
Howard T. Ennis [†]		

* Delaware Day Treatment Center was not included in the 2010-11 2a analysis, because there was no available 2010-11 data for this school.

** There was only available Math data for Lewes Day Treatment Center in 2010-11; it is not included in the ELA analysis for 2010-11.

*** Western Sussex Academy was not included in the 2011-12 2a analysis, because there was no available 2011-12 data for this school.

[†] Comparison school added for 2012-13 analysis.

Measure 2b. Are students in demographic subgroups achieving proficiency on state examinations in math and ELA?

Alternative framework methodology applied.²

Low Socio-Economic Status

Subject and Year	School Proficiency Rate	School Rating	State Average Proficiency Rate	State Proficiency Rate at 90 th Percentile	State Proficiency Rate at 20 th Percentile
Math, 2010-11	18.4%	D	38.5%	74.2%	4.1%
Math, 2011-12	35.4%	D	50.2%	84.4%	14.1%
Math, 2012-13	23.3%	F	50.8%	87.1%	27.0%
Math, 2013-14	32.3%	F	55.6%	81.7%	39.6%
ELA, 2010-11	26.5%	D	39.0%	69.5%	6.5%
ELA, 2011-12	31.3%	D	51.3%	85.5%	23.0%
ELA, 2012-13	50.0%	D	53.5%	86.3%	38.9%
ELA, 2013-14	45.2%	D	60.6%	82.6%	45.2%

Students with Disabilities

Subject and Year	School Proficiency Rate	School Rating	State Average Proficiency Rate	State Proficiency Rate at 90 th Percentile	State Proficiency Rate at 20 th Percentile
Math, 2010-11	7.1%	D	26.9%	59.7%	1.4%
Math, 2011-12	18.4%	D	35.2%	75.3%	1.3%
Math, 2012-13	18.2%	D	38.4%	76.5%	7.9%
Math, 2013-14	33.3%	M	32.5%	68.7%	3.5%
ELA, 2010-11	9.5%	D	25.6%	58.8%	0.6%
ELA, 2011-12	20.4%	D	34.2%	73.4%	5.1%
ELA, 2012-13	36.4%	D	38.2%	78.1%	4.8%
ELA, 2013-14	48.0%	M	35.6%	70.8%	8.8%

² The alternative framework only evaluates Low Socio-Economic Status, Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners. Results for Students with Disabilities are weighted by disability level.

English Language Learners

Subject and Year	School Proficiency Rate	School Rating	State Average Proficiency Rate	State Proficiency Rate at 90 th Percentile	State Proficiency Rate at 20 th Percentile
Math, 2010-11	***	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math, 2011-12	***	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math, 2012-13	**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math, 2013-14	**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA, 2010-11	***	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA, 2011-12	***	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA, 2012-13	**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA, 2013-14	**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Subgroup Summary

Year	Low-SES		SWD		ELL		OVERALL RATING	
	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA
10-11	D	D	D	D	N/A	N/A	D	D
11-12	D	D	D	D	N/A	N/A	D	D
12-13	F	D	D	D	N/A	N/A	F	D
13-14	F	D	M	M	N/A	N/A	D	D

Measure 2c. Are students performing well on state examinations in math and ELA in comparison to selected schools?

*Alternative framework methodology applied.*³

School Proficiency Compared to Selected School Proficiency

Subject and Year	School Proficiency Rate	School Rating	Selected School Comparison
Math, 2010-11	22.4%	D	25.3%
Math, 2011-12	35.0%	E	5.9%
Math, 2012-13	26.6%	E	6.5%
Math, 2013-14	36.7%	E	14.8%
ELA, 2010-11	21.1%	D	24.7%
ELA, 2011-12	33.8%	E	5.7%
ELA, 2012-13	52.5%	E	11.5%
ELA, 2013-14	52.6%	E	11.7%

Measure 2d. Are students performing well on state examinations in math and ELA in comparison to similar schools in the state?

*Alternative framework methodology applied.*⁴

School Proficiency Compared to Similar Schools Proficiency

Subject and Year	School Proficiency Rate	School Rating	Similar Schools Proficiency Rate
Math, 2010-11	22.4%	F	47.0%
Math, 2011-12	35.0%	F	55.1%
Math, 2012-13	26.6%	F	51.2%
Math, 2013-14	36.7%	D	47.1%
ELA, 2010-11	21.1%	F	47.2%
ELA, 2011-12	33.8%	F	54.8%
ELA, 2012-13	52.5%	M	52.6%
ELA, 2013-14	52.6%	M	52.6%

³**Schools included in the 2010-11 2c. analysis:** Charlton School, Kent County Alternative School, Lake Forest ILC, Stevenson House. DE DOE also requested Delaware Day Treatment Center, but there was no available 2010-11 data for this school.

Schools included in the 2011-12 2c. analysis: Charlton School, Delaware Day Treatment Center, Kent County Alternative School, Lake Forest ILC, Stevenson House.

Schools included in the 2012-13 and 2013-14 2c. analysis: Charlton School, Delaware Day Treatment Center, Kent County Alternative School, Kent County Community School, Kent County Secondary ILC Program, Lake Forest ILC, Milford ILC, People’s Place Non-Secure Detention, Providence Corporation, Smyrna Intensive Learning Center, Stevenson House.

⁴ Alternative framework methodology considers disability level in addition to Low Socio-Economic Status, English Language Learners, and Race when constructing the similar schools comparison.

3. STATE AND FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Measure 3a. Did the school make AYP?

No alternative framework methodology applied.

Year	AYP Status
2010-11	D
2011-12	M
2012-13	D
2013-14	D

4. POST-SECONDARY READINESS (Only for High Schools)

Measure 4a. Does students' performance on the SAT reflect college readiness?

No alternative framework methodology applied.

Percentage of Students receiving a 1550 or better on the SAT

Year	SAT High Score %	School Rating
2010-11	0.0%	F
2011-12	0.0%	F
2012-13	7.1%	F
2013-14	0.0%	F

Measure 4b. Are students graduating from high school?

No alternative framework methodology applied.

†Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate

Year	Graduation Rate	School Rating
2010-11	60.0%	F
2011-12	56.0%	F
2012-13	56.5%	F
2013-14	50.0%	F

†The Performance Framework uses the previous year's graduation rate.

5. MISSION-SPECIFIC ACADEMIC GOALS (OPTIONAL)

Measure 5a. Is the school meeting mission-specific academic goals?

No alternative framework methodology applied.

Year	Met Mission-Specific Academic Goals?
2010-11	N/A
2011-12	N/A
2012-13	N/A
2013-14	M

SUMMARY AND OVERALL RATING

Overall ratings are calculated based on the total point range below:

Exceeds Standard	89 to 100
Meets Standard	63 to 88
Below Standard	39 to 62
Far Below Standard	Below 39

Positive Outcomes Charter School (Alternative)

Year	1.a. Growth		1.b. Bottom 25%		1.c. Growth to Prof		2.a. Prof		2.b. Overall Subgroup		2.c. Selected Schools		2.d. Similar Schools		3.a. AYP	4.a. SAT	4.b. Grad Rate	5.a. Mission Specific	OVERALL RATING/SCORE	
	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA						
10-11	D	F	M	F	D	F	M	M	D	D	D	D	F	F	D	F	F	N/A	D	45.5%
11-12	D	D	M	D	D	D	M	M	D	D	E	E	F	F	M	F	F	N/A	D	55.9%
12-13	D	M	E	D	D	M	M	M	F	D	E	E	F	M	D	F	F	N/A	D	61.5%
13-14	M	M	E	E	M	M	M	M	D	D	E	E	D	M	D	F	F	M	M	71.9%