1. **How have the rating category points and weighting percentages been validated against other measures of school impact? How were the weights for the status and growth components derived? What other stakeholders have evaluated this framework for public school implementation?**
   - First, we are not sure what “other measures of school impact” is referring to.
   - Category points: there are 4 measures separated into quartiles, which are not arbitrary—please see page 23 of the methodology document: http://www.doe.k12.de.us/infosuites/schools/charterschools/files/DCPFAcadFmwrkMethGuid120313.pdf
     
     | Rating Category            | Points |
     |-----------------------------|--------|
     | Exceeds Standard            | 100    |
     | Meets Standard              | 75     |
     | Does Not Meet Standard      | 50     |
     | Falls Far Below Standard    | 25     |
   - The weighting was decided upon during the development of the framework between 2011-2012, stakeholders involved included: DSEA, Governor’s Office, National Governors Association, Delaware Legislators, Innovative Schools, Delaware Charter School Network, State Board of Education, DOE and Chief State School Officer representative.
   - When the framework was developed from August 2011 through September 2012, it was run against 2 years of data. They were tested by Public Impact to ensure fairness and accuracy. Psychometricians at AIR were involved in setting the growth targets for measures 1a and 1b.

2. **Since lowest-performing (1b) are included in all (1a), are these students are doubly counted towards a school’s score?**
   - Since graduation rates and proficiency (2a, 2b) are part of AYP aren't these measures doubly counted or more if you count sub-groups (part of 2a, 2b)?
     - No one student is counted multiple times in a single measure (with the exception of AYP)
     - Students will be counted in multiple measures throughout the entire framework index because this honors the complexity of school performance better than a single measure accountability system.

3. **How were targets for Exceeds Standard, Meets Standard, etc., set?**
   - The targets for individual measures as well as the overall ratings and measures were developed through the same stakeholder engagement as described above.
   - Additionally the measures in 1a and 1b were aligned in part to the goals established in the DPAS II – for Administrators, measure 1c was finalized after data testing by Public Impact and discussion with stakeholders, measures 2 a, b, c, d are comparative measures to state average performance, Measures 2a and b also incorporate comparison to the state average along with the lowest 20th and highest 10th percentiles of school performance. It is important to note that these comparisons are based upon a weighted average of the grades served by the school, the number of students within each of those grade levels, and the state averages of the same population.
   - SAT was established based upon performance expectations and the College Career Ready cut score as well as performance measures established in state education goals. The graduation rates were set based on initial RTTT goals.

4. **On the AYP part, there are two categories (meet/does not meet)....what are the values?**
   - 100 points for Meets Standard. *It was important to ensure that schools received the maximum number of points for “meets standard”.*
   - 50 points for Does Not Meet Standard.
5. The bottom quartile of performers in one school is very different from other schools? In a selective academic school, the bottom quartile may well be pretty high performers. In other schools, it may be very low performers. The bottom quartile, if anything, should be determined by the statewide distribution, not the school-specific distribution?
   - Every school has a lowest quartile and since this is not a comparative measure against others’ performance it is an appropriate measure of how each and every school is meeting the growth needs of their lowest quartile of students, no matter where that lowest quartile is situated on the continuum.

6. Will we be discussing the timelines for implementation of this Framework?
   - Yes, this is outlined in the ESEA Flexibility Amendment request here.
   - Pending approval from USED, the timeline for implementation will be for SY14/15.

7. When will the more detailed webinar be scheduled?
   - We plan to engage the Department’s Data Analysis Working Group (DAWG) on discussing some of the technical questions. There is a meeting on Wednesday March 12th. This may be a better venue to vet these questions.
   - This FAQ document will continue to evolve.

8. 1a Growth - Can a school have all teachers "satisfactory" (50% targets met) but the entire school still "fail" this metric that must be 60% or higher?
   - Yes, this framework metric is based upon school performance not individual classroom performance.
   - Even though teacher goals are set at 50% for meets in DPAS II, the measures for principal evaluation, states that an Administrator is rated Satisfactory for 60 – 79 and Exceeds for 80 – 100. This is school accountability not teacher accountability, thus comparison should not be made to the classroom level but to comparable measures which use school wide data.

9. How will a typical principal monitor this?
   - This is based on DCAS scores currently, which can be monitored via DCAS-OR and DSARA.
   - Principals as well as district leaders can monitor their school performance.
   - The only thing that they cannot monitor currently are state averages and state-wide data.
   - This is a summative measure of school performance, so principals (and districts) will still monitor leading indicators as they do currently and have previously.

10. How will schools and districts track their progress? How will schools and districts ensure that any formative data collected and tracked by districts and schools during the school year will align with DOE’s framework
    - Schools and districts will track leading indicators the same way they do today. Changes as a result of the shift to the Smarter Assessments will be the only difference.
    - Any formative data geared towards improving student proficiency rates and improve student growth should align to the framework by default.
    - The methodology document provides details on how every measure is calculated. If a school or district wanted to recreate the measures, or see how they are calculated, they are able to do so – with the exception of state-average comparison data.

11. Next year, we will no longer be using DCAS, and with SBAC we will no longer have fall data, so no measure of fall-to-spring growth will be available. Therefore, the growth components of the new framework, as they are now specified, will no longer be possible
    - Correct: whatever accountability rules Delaware has in place will need to evolve to accommodate the shifts related to the Smarter Assessments.
    - SY14/15 is a transition year.
12. The new framework’s three separate growth calculations are completely based on DOE’s current Component V, Part A DCAS fall-to-spring growth model. Next year, we will no longer be using DCAS and with SBAC we will no longer have fall data, so no measure of fall-to-spring growth will even be available. Therefore, the growth components of the new framework, as they are now specified, will no longer be possible. What is being done with regard to these measures?

- Only measures 1a and 1b use the same instructional scale score growth tables which are used for DPAS II. Measure 1c uses the accountability score.
- These measures will be able to be used for the 2013-14 school year as well as comparison data reports for the 11-12, and 12-13 school years already completed using these same metrics, which was provided to all districts several months ago.

And, has the state considered a value-added growth methodology?

- The methodology to calculate growth in 2014-15 and beyond is currently being reviewed by the State Board of Education, and additional details on what changes will need to be made to the methodology will be communicated.
- The intent is that growth will be able to be calculated using a spring to spring assessment and enable a transition without a gap in analysis.
- The targets within the framework were designed to adapt to a new high stakes assessment. While cut scores and growth targets may change, the language of the framework should not need to change drastically since we are measuring student outcomes, i.e. % of students proficient in Math and ELA.

13. For the comparison "virtual school"- are that schools students removed from the comparison group?

- The students in the schools are not currently removed from the comparison. (updated 3.7.14)

14. Why was this accountability framework selected?

- This was developed from a national best practice model and customized for Delaware by Delaware education leaders. This is not a canned product developed or created by an outside entity.
- This framework has been in place for charter schools in Delaware since September 2012 and reports have been generated based upon the framework metrics back to the 2010-11 school year. This framework was first used with those schools and upon the multiple years of data has proved to be a more robust measure for evaluating school performance.
- The maturation of this framework model to be used as a model for all schools is an application of the intent of charter schools to be centers of innovation.
- Other states have similar accountability systems in place which are used for all schools – states that have an index as part of ESEA flex applications, include Colorado, Hawaii, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Maryland, Nevada. States that have an A-F grade based on an underlying index are Florida, Indiana, Arizona, Louisiana. California has an index based on a fewer number of indicators (no growth). (updated 3.7.14)

15. Has this methodology been applied to a regular school in Delaware to see how it compares to the ratings the school has received in the past?

- Yes, the methodology has been applied to all Delaware public schools for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Reports were provided to all superintendents in September outlining each schools’ performance against the framework.
- DOE has cross-referenced prior identification of schools with the overall ratings of the framework and found alignment and is in the process of running full impact data.

16. Is Full Academic Year still applied?
• Full Academic Year is applied for the status measures (Measures 2a through 2d) and AYP (Measure 3). It is not included for the other measures.

17. Growth to Proficiency: since this data point includes "average growth by grade" (based on historical data), how will this be calculated with no historical data related to the SBAC?
  • As stated above, SY14/15 is a transition year, and any accountability system in place would need to evolve to accommodate the Smarter assessments. The methodology to calculate growth in 2014-15 and beyond is currently being reviewed and additional details on what changes will need to be made to the methodology will be communicated. The intent is that growth will be able to be calculated using a spring to spring assessment and enable a transition without a gap in analysis.

18. Will mission-specific goals still be included? If so, can you provide some examples?
  • Mission Specific Goals will not be included in SY14/15, as it is a transition year.
  • Examples of Mission Specific goals are available in some charter school Performance Agreements.

19. How will growth be measured with SBAC at schools where not all grade levels are being tested?
  • As stated above, SY14/15 is a transition year, and any accountability system in place would need to evolve to accommodate issues related to the Smarter assessments.
  • The Secretary has stated publicly that DOE intends to have an assessment measure in 9th and 10th grade, even though it may not be a measure developed by SBAC.
  • This is still under development, and information will be communicated as it becomes available.

20. Why are we moving away from a pass/fail system to a system where schools can be ranked?
  • Schools will receive one of four ratings – Exceeds Standard, Meets Standards, Does Not Meet Standard, and Falls Far Below Standard. There is no pass/fail.
  • The AYP, pass/ fail measure of school performance does not honor the complexity of a school’s performance. This model values growth and proficiency and additional measures that are critical to student achievement.
  • This framework provides a transparent view of student achievement through multiple measures.

21. How will school accountability be calculated in summer of 2014?
  • Pending approval from USED, school classifications and district levels of support for SY14/15 would be made using the Academic Framework. AYP will still be calculated and reported, and used as a measure in the Academic Framework.
  • The reward, recognition, focus and priority schools will be identified using 13-14 data. This is answered in another question below.

22. On page 2 of the ESEA amendment document it talks about determining priority schools for the 2014-15 school year based on this framework, which seems like it would need the data from the 2013-14 school year? If this is approved by the Federal Govt before the end of the school year, this framework will be applied this school year?
  • Yes, the Academic Framework would be applied to the 2013-14 school year for the determination of a new cohort of Priority schools. Please see ESEA Flexibility Amendment Proposal.
23. With regard to "overall rating" at the end, why not just use the calculations with the weighting? Why assign them to a standard value 25, 50, 75, 100 then apply the weighting?
   - By assigning an individual measure score out of 100 – note: this means that 100 points has been evenly distributed across the four target levels – you are able to then calculate an overall score using the weights which is also out of 100% of the points possible in the framework. This approach promotes transparency and clarity about the rolling up process to an overall score/rating.
   - This is an easy communication tool with parents, community, teachers, leaders, etc. and allows schools to run the calculations themselves. The one caveat to keep in mind is that no school could achieve a score below 25% since the Falls Far Below Measure is given 25 points.

24. Will schools that only serve a “specific” group of students be graded/weighted the same? (KCILC)
   - For purposes of charter schools, Delaware has developed an Alternative Academic Framework.
     http://www.doe.k12.de.us/infosuites/schools/charterschools/files/AltAcadPerfFrmwrkPOCS.pdf

25. How were the weighted averages calculated/determined? (arbitrary or to provide a clear ranking or quartiles or to ensure there were schools that fell into each classification at the end) – ranging from 5% to 17.5%
   - See question 1. Data was analyzed, raw scores were graphed against expectations and then looked at in multiple formats by the stakeholders including but not limited to examining how the framework reacted to schools within the extremes as well as high performance and low growth, low performance but high growth, and multiple points in between. The goal is to have no schools weighted in the lowest two ratings, the expectation is that all schools will be high performing.

26. How will Low-SES be determined? (DHSS, FRL, ???)
   - Low Socio Economic status will be determined using the alternative poverty metric.

27. 2.a Proficiency = Why are we going back to the old DSTP ways and comparing/ranking schools in the State? Why are we not using the DCAS methodology and using the first year as a school’s/district’s baseline and then setting “Targets” (i.e. Reducing the number of non-proficient students by 50% over five years) This is more “fair” than comparing/ranking schools and using State averages.
   - The Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) were set based on the state average in 2010-2011. This is the same as the ESEA Flex AMOs. The AMOs in the Academic Framework align with the state AMOs.

28. 2.b Overall Subgroups = How is the “overall” subgroup calculation determined from each individual subgroup evaluation? How is this fair to schools that have “all” subgroups represented as compared to schools that have only one or two subgroups represented?
• This is detailed in the methodology document on page 11 also look at the model performance review report on pages 27-30.

29. Why are we not using the DCAS methodology and using the first year as a school's/district’s baseline and then setting “Targets” (i.e. Reducing the number of non-proficient students by 50% over five years) This is more “fair” than comparing/ranking schools and using State averages.
   • The Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) were set based on the state average in 2010-2011. This is the same as the ESEA Flex AMOs. The AMOs in the Academic Framework align with the state AMOs.

30. 2.c District comparison = This data point was created to compare Charter Schools to the same grade level schools in the District they served. How does this work with districts that have only one school at a particular level? Comparing a school to itself will always be “meets standard”, but never “exceeds standard”. Also, how is it fair, for example if a district has only two high schools, that this data point basically has one pass, one fail, and could possible generate public conflict to which high school a child should attend? (or “dividing” “meets standard” and “does not meet standard” elementary schools) The potential application of this data point can become very volatile if you are comparing one school to another within a district.
   • This measure is under consideration for exclusion from the 2014-15 Academic Framework.

31. 2.d Similar Schools = The title of this data point is misleading in the table. It is a “statistically similar school”. This is going to a bit challenging to explain this data point to different audiences – very complex metrics. The main concern is the fact that is it a “virtual school” – not real – it is taking into account many, many subgroup analysis – great, but does it also take into account absenteeism, tardy rate, discipline, parent involvement, other statically impactful variables on student performance. (For example, Table 5 in the framework methodology show the basic concept – point – African American (SpEd, FRL, ELL) but does it take into account the other variables listed above – attendance, discipline, etc. – so it is a virtual school, but is it “really” a similar school?
   • The level of data and type of data used is consistent with the available data and demographics currently used for accountability. There is not a current plan to align student discipline, attendance, parent involvement, etc into academic data performance flags.

32. 3a and 4b – They are connected. For example, fail the graduation rate and fail the AYP?
   • The Academic Framework is made up of multiple measures. You could get credit for the graduation rate, but miss AYP.

33. SAT Scores – are they really a fair data point when comparing schools with a very large Low SES population to a school with a very small Low SES population?
   • The expectation is that all schools are moving all students toward college and career ready, regardless of demographic subgroups.