FULFILLING THE CHARTER PROMISE:
A PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD'S
HIGH SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY POLICY

by
Melodi Sampson

A capstone project submitted to Johns Hopkins University in conformity with the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Public Management

Baltimore, Maryland
May, 2019

Abstract

Washington, DC's public charter school movement was billed as a promising alternative to the struggling District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS). The District is over twenty years into its public charter school experiment, and evidence suggests public charter schools are performing no better than DCPS. Reading and math proficiency, graduation, dropout, and college enrollment rates all indicate that public charter high schools are not sufficiently educating their students. The DC Public Charter School Board, the sole authorizer of the city's public charter schools, uses an academic accountability policy known as the Performance Management Framework (PMF) to assess school quality. The most recent PMF identifies half of the District's public charter high schools as high-performing, despite evidence demonstrating schools' weaknesses. This capstone project proposes a PMF policy amendment designed to improve the Board's ability to identify public charter high school deficiencies. The amended PMF policy could spur programmatic adjustments at the school-level, potentially resulting in positive academic outcomes for DC public charter high school students.

Advisor: Director Paul Weinstein Jr., Johns Hopkins University

All statements of opinion and analysis expressed in this capstone are those of the author and do not reflect official positions or views of the DC Public Charter School Board.

Table of Contents

TO: Scott Pearson, Executive Director, DC Public Charter School Board

FROM: Melodi Sampson

SUBJECT: Recommendation to Amend the DC Public Charter School Board's High School Accountability Policy

DATE: May 7, 2019

I.   Action-Forcing Event

In January 2019, the DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) voted to close one of its 19 public charter high schools because of unsatisfactory academic performance. During the same period, another public charter high school relinquished its charter (again, because of unsatisfactory academic performance), and a public charter school serving middle and high schoolers announced plans to close one of its campuses. These decisions will result in school disruptions for nearly 1,000 public charter high school students. [1] These closures have sparked criticism of the District's public charter high schools and DC PCSB's high school accountability policy.

II.   Statement of Problem

Washington, DC's public charter high schools are not sufficiently educating their students, and DC PCSB's high school accountability policy does not adequately report DC public charter high schools' deficiencies. The tables below, produced by the DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), display high school Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) data for school years

---

[1] Perry Stein, "'It's absolutely terrible': When a Charter School Closes, What Happens to the Kids," *The Washington Post*, January 31, 2019, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/its-absolutely-terrible-when-a-charter-school-closes-what-happens-to-the-kids/2019/01/31/d786350a-1a9e-11e9-88fe-f9f77a3bcb6c_story.html?utm_term=.192c08db577a.

2016-2017 and 2017-2018.[2,3] During these school years, fewer than a third of DC public charter high school students were proficient in English language arts (ELA) and math.[4] More specifically, in school year 2017-2018, 25.8 percent of DC public charter high school students met or exceeded PARCC ELA expectations, while 12.2 percent of DC public charter high school students met or exceeded PARCC math expectations. While the data show year-to-year improvement, this progress is modest. Furthermore, DC's traditional public school system posted greater gains in ELA and math than the public charter school sector for the past two school years.[5] As discussed in the "History/Background" section below, this is noteworthy because the District's public charter schools were promoted as a promising alternative to the traditional public school system that struggled to serve its students.

Table 1. PARCC ELA Results for DC High Schoolers at Public Charter Schools and Traditional Public Schools[6]

12. ELA Grades 9-12 Results by Test & Sector

Enrolled Grade - Test	State % 4+			PCS % 4+			DCPS % 4+		
	2017	2018	% Point Change	2017	2018	% Point Change	2017	2018	% Point Change
9-12 - All	27.3%	29.3%	2.0%	22.4%	25.8%	3.4%	30.3%	31.8%	1.5%

[2] OSSE, "DC's 2018 PARCC Results," August 16, 2018, https://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/page_content/attachments/2018%20PARCC%20Results%20Release%20%28Aug.%2016%2C%202018%29.pdf.

[3] These images show DC-wide PARCC performance, public charter PARCC performance, and traditional public school PARCC performance. The term "4+" refers to PARCC scoring: students who earn a four or higher on the PARCC are identified as meeting or exceeding expectations.

[4] OSSE, "DC's 2018 PARCC Results."

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

Table 2. PARCC Math Results for DC High Schoolers at Public Charter Schools and Traditional Public Schools [7]

Enrolled Grade - Test	State % 4+			PCS % 4+			DCPS % 4+		
	2017	2018	% Point Change	2017	2018	% Point Change	2017	2018	% Point Change
Grades 9-12 - All tests	12.9%	13.6%	0.7%	13.5%	12.2%	-1.3%	12.7%	14.8%	2.1%
Grades 9-12 - Geometry	10.3%	10.4%	0.1%	10.7%	9.8%	-0.9%	10.3%	11.0%	0.7%
Grades 9-12 - Algebra II	52.5%	65.5%	13.0%	n/a	n<10	n<10	52.5%	65.1%	12.6%
Grades 9-12 - Integrated Math II	48.7%	34.2%	-14.5%	48.7%	34.2%	-14.5%	n/a	n/a	n<10

Washington, DC's public charter high school graduation rates are further evidence the charter sector is not sufficiently serving its students. Per OSSE, the school year 2017-2018 charter sector graduation rate was 72.4 percent, down from 73.8 percent the previous school year.[8] The average charter graduation rate across school years 2014-2015 through 2017-2018 is 72.2 percent. Given earlier comparisons between DC's public charter high schools and the city's traditional public high schools, it is worth noting DC public charter high schools have a slightly higher graduation rate than the traditional schools. In school year 2016-2017, public charter schools' graduation rate was 0.6 percent higher than the traditional schools' graduation rate. In school year 2017-2018, public charter schools' graduation rate was 3.8 percent higher than the traditional schools' graduation rate.[9] Nevertheless, the charter sector's graduation rate is

---

[7] Ibid.
[8] OSSE, "High School Graduation Rates," accessed February 19, 2019, https://osse.dc.gov/service/high-school-graduation-rates-0.
[9] Ibid.

significantly lower than the national graduation rate. The national graduation rate was 84.6 percent at the end of school year 2016-2017 (the most recent year for which data are available).[10]

When students reach the fourth year of high school and do not graduate, they may feel discouraged, losing the will to complete school altogether. As a result, low graduation rates give way to high dropout rates. At the end of school year 2017-2018, 14.0 percent of public charter high school students (who completed four years of high school) were identified as "educationally disengaged," meaning they did not graduate and are not currently enrolled in school.[11] For perspective, the national dropout rate was 6.0 percent in 2016.[12] These figures demonstrate that the District's high school charter sector is underperforming.

DC public charter school graduates' college enrollment rates also reveal the city's public charter schools are not sufficiently serving their students. The table below reports college enrollment data (for the years 2014 through 2016) the National Student Clearinghouse released to DC PCSB.[13]

Table 3. DC Public Charter School Graduates and College Enrollment Rates [14]

Year	Number of DC Public Charter School Graduates	Number of DC Public Charter School Graduates Enrolled in College One Year Post-Graduation	Rate of DC Public Charter School Graduates Enrolled in College One Year Post-Graduation
2014	986	639	64.8%
2015	1,087	673	61.9%

---

[10] National Center for Education Statistics, "Fast Facts: High School Graduation Rates," accessed February 19, 2019, https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=805.
[11] OSSE, "2017-18 Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate," November 9, 2018, https://osse.dc.gov/publication/2017-18-adjusted-cohort-graduation-rate.
[12] National Center for Education Statistics, "Fast Facts: Dropout Rates," accessed February 19, 2019, https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=16.
[13] DC PCSB, "HS 2017-18 PMF Task Force Meeting: College Entrance and Persistence," August 8, 2017, https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/xtdI5WOrhV/.
[14] DC PCSB, "HS 2017-18 PMF Task Force Meeting: College Entrance and Persistence."

Year	Number of DC Public Charter School Graduates	Number of DC Public Charter School Graduates Enrolled in College One Year Post-Graduation	Rate of DC Public Charter School Graduates Enrolled in College One Year Post-Graduation
2016	1,167	696	59.6%

The data show that the rate of DC charter graduates enrolling in college or university one year after completing high school is declining. The rate of students persisting (i.e., enrolling in college or university two years after graduating from high school) is also on the decline.[15] The ability to enroll and persist in college requires students' financial investment, which, given the cost of higher education, can be daunting.[16] However, these rates also suggest students are exiting DC public charter schools without the skills needed to succeed in college, and imply schools are not providing their students with adequate college-going resources (e.g., robust advising, financial planning support). The Washington, DC job market is saturated with careers that require post-secondary education.[17] Fewer than half of DC charter graduates are persisting in higher education, which means fewer than half of DC charter graduates are prepared for their city's job market. The majority of DC public charter high schools' mission is to prepare their students for college and career success; evidently, they are not fulfilling their mission.

As publicly funded entities, public charter schools are obligated to provide their students with high-quality educational services. Standardized assessment data suggest at least half of DC public charter students are matriculating through the system with subpar literacy and numeracy skills. Graduation, dropout, and college enrollment rates for DC

---

[15] Ibid.

[16] Still, Washington, DC offers tuition subsidies to support its students' post-secondary pathways.

[17] DC Workforce Investment Council, "Workforce Innovation & Opportunity Act (WIOA) 2016-2020 Unified State Plan Modification," April 13, 2018, https://dcworks.dc.gov/node/1323536.

public charter students suggest the District's charter sector is not providing its pupils with adequate educational services. This is a problem on its own that is exacerbated when one considers the amount of money the city invests in its schools. Each year, the District spends an average of $20,000 per student, a funding rate that is higher than the per pupil spending allotment in all but two states.[18] A return on investment analysis comparing student outcomes to education spending would likely reveal an inefficient use of funds. Improved public charter school programming (in which students exit the system prepared for college and career) would also improve the city's financial efficiency.

Despite evidence the District's public charter high schools are not sufficiently serving their students, DC PCSB ranked half of the public charter high schools in its portfolio as high-performing in its most recent School Quality Report.[19] As a government agency and the sole overseer of the District's public charter schools, DC PCSB has a responsibility to the public to adequately assess its schools' performance. The agency's academic accountability policy (known as the Performance Management Framework), which forms the basis of the School Quality Report, fails to capture the sector's academic weaknesses appropriately. If it did, fewer schools would be identified as high-performing.

III.   History/Background

Josephine Baker, DC PCSB's founding Board Chair and former Executive Director, characterized the District's charter movement was a "desperate response to the

---

[18] US Census Bureau, "States Leading Per Student Spending," June 2017, https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/2017/comm/cb17-97-public-education-finance.html.
[19] DC PCSB, 2017-18 School Quality Report, December 7, 2018, https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/NWTM37IDqT/.

traditional school system's decades-long decline."[20] *Children in Crisis*, a 1996 report by

the DC Financial Control Board,[21] provided an extensive review of the traditional school

system's decline and failure to "teach its pupils even the basics of education."[22] Much

like the analysis presented in the above "Statement of the Problem" section, the Financial

Control Board cited a series of indicators (e.g., falling reading and math proficiency

scores, high dropout rates, and low graduation rates) and conditions (e.g., the

preponderance of violent behaviors in schools and the inefficient use of per pupil

funding) to demonstrate weaknesses within District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS),

the traditional school system. [23] The report's standout conclusion, that "for each

additional year that students stay in DCPS, the less likely they are to succeed…because

the system does not prepare them to succeed," affirmed local and national leaders' calls

to reform DC schools.[24]

One such national leader is Newt Gingrich, the Speaker of the United States

House of Representatives from 1995-1999. Per Baker, Gingrich "was determined

to…assert his power over the city," and he expressed an aggressive desire to overhaul the

District's school system.[25] During his first year as Speaker, Gingrich commissioned a

task force on DC school reform and sought improvement plans from the DC Board of

Education. Concurrently, the Council of the District of Columbia (DC Council) held its

own school reform hearings, soliciting input from DC school leaders and community

---

[20] Josephine Baker, *The Evolution & Revolution of DC Charter Schools* (Washington, DC: Josephine Baker, 2014), 1.
[21] The DC Financial Control Board is a now defunct financial oversight committee that was established in 1995 by the United States Congress in response to DC's lowly economic status.
[22] DC Financial Control Board, *Children in Crisis: The Failure of Public Education in the District*, November 12, 1996, https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/local/longterm/library/dc/control/part2.htm.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Baker, 23.

advocates. Some school reform planners recommended establishing a public charter

school sector in the District to create an alternative to the struggling DCPS system.

In the summer of 1995, the DC Council approved the DC Charter Schools Act to

establish public charter schools. DC Mayor Marion Berry signed the Act into law and

sent the legislation to the United States Congress for approval. Around the same time,

Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton, the District's non-voting member in the US House of

Representatives, pressed Gingrich to drop his quest to establish a school voucher system

in DC, one the primary school reform efforts Gingrich championed.[26] Norton encouraged

Gingrich to "defer to the already existing fledgling charter school system that had been

created by the District."[27] Instead of approving the DC Charter Schools Act, the United

States Congress passed the School Reform Act (SRA) in the spring of 1996, and

President Bill Clinton signed it into law.

The SRA called for the creation of DC PCSB, a seven-person board whose

members are appointed by the mayor and approved by DC Council. DC PCSB is an

independent government agency authorized to perform the following functions: approve

or deny petitions for public charter schools, monitor public charter schools' operational

performance, ensure public charter schools' compliance with applicable law, and monitor

public charter schools' progress in meeting student academic achievement goals.

Per the SRA, schools that do not meet their student academic achievement goals

may lose their charter. John "Skip" McKoy, a former DC PCSB Board Chair, was critical

of schools' academic achievement goals, saying "many of the goals were apple pie and

---

[26] Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton, "Norton Says D.C.'s Home-Rule Alternative to DCPS is Charter Schools, Not Private School Vouchers," May 13, 2015, https://norton.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/norton-says-dc-s-home-rule-alternative-to-dcps-is-charter-schools-not.
[27] Ibid.

fluff."[28] Other board members and staff agreed with McKoy's characterization; they found many schools' goals too weak (i.e., neither specific nor measurable) to assess academic performance adequately.

As a result, in 2008, the Board asked DC PCSB staff to create a tool to evaluate school performance. The tool, known as the Performance Management Framework (PMF), was not designed to replace schools' goals (though many schools have adopted the PMF as their student academic achievement goals); rather, the PMF was created to supplement the evaluation practices the agency already employed. As written in the 2009 DC PCSB Annual Report, the Board expected the policy to

> improve PCSB's ability to define high, medium and low-performing standards, and to clearly communicate the expectations, rewards, and consequences to schools, families, and communities. It will enable the PCSB to make clear judgments about school performance and better manage the portfolio of public charter school offerings. The overarching objective is to drive high-achieving schools to full potential, mediocre schools to high-achieving levels, and to eliminate low-performing schools so that D.C. students and families have a diversity of high quality public school options from which to choose.[29]

With financial support from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, DC PCSB convened a working group in which the Board's staff collaborated with researchers, school leaders, and other stakeholders to develop a set of academic performance

---

[28] David Osborne, *Reinventing America's Schools*, (New York: Bloomsbury USA, 2017), 93.
[29] DC PCSB, Annual Report 2009, accessed March 6, 2019, https://www.dcpcsb.org/sites/default/files/report/2009%20Annual%20Report%20%281%29.pdf, 10.

indicators for elementary, middle, and high schools. [30] After months of policy development, DC PCSB staff codified the evaluation tool, asking the Board to approve the first PMF Policy and Technical Guide (PMF Policy). Though school leaders participated in the policy's creation, many were apprehensive about its implementation.[31] As a result, DC PCSB staff agreed to pilot the framework with a limited number of schools during school year 2008-2009. At the end of school year 2009-2010, DC PCSB implemented the framework, applying it to all PK-3 through 12th grade-serving public charter schools. [32] DC PCSB has produced its School Quality Report (the vehicle for reporting PMF data) every year since 2010.[33]

The PMF includes the High School framework (HS PMF). The HS PMF comprises four categories, which are summarized in the table below.

Table 4. PMF Category Descriptions[34]

PMF Category	Description
Student Progress	This category reports students' year-to-year growth in ELA and math on the PARCC.
Student Achievement	This category reports students' PARCC ELA and math proficiency.
Gateway	This category reports students' college and career readiness. It includes measures such as 4-year graduation rate, college acceptance rate, and SAT/ACT performance rate.[35]
School Environment	This category reports student attendance and re-enrollment rates.

---

[30] Baker, 88.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Since then, DC PCSB expanded its PMF Policy to include an evaluation of adult and alternative school performance. However, as previously noted, this proposal focuses on high school performance.
[33] DC PCSB, "School Quality Reports," accessed March 20, 2019, https://www.dcpcsb.org/schoolquality.
[34] DC PCSB, *2018-19 Performance Management Framework Policy and Technical Guide*, November 8, 2018, https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/sK7g1OPLmH/, 56.
[35] Ibid., 21.

Each category has a set of measures (i.e., a series of performance indicators) and metrics (i.e., the "calculation method… for a given measure").[36] DC PCSB scores schools' performance by assigning "each measure…a "weight," which is the maximum possible points that can be awarded for that measure."[37] The total number of points possible is 100. Schools that earn 65 points or more are identified as high-performing. Schools that earn between 64.9 points and 35 points are identified as mid-performing. Schools that earn fewer than 35 points are identified as low-performing. High-performing schools are "generally exempt" from site reviews, and are encouraged to expand to educate more students.[38] Low-performing schools must undergo site reviews. Additionally, low-performing schools may be subject to a high-stakes review in which the Board considers charter revocation.[39]

Per DC PCSB's Deputy Director, Naomi DeVeaux, "the rating system is designed to get tougher each year so that schools must improve their performance in order to earn the same score."[40] To that end, every year, DC PCSB staff host task force meetings involving stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, public charter school advocates, researchers, assessment experts) to discuss ways to adjust or set new PMF Policy measures. DC PCSB staff ask school leaders to vote for or against proposed PMF Policy modifications. Typically, DC PCSB staff recommend the Board approve PMF modifications "when two-thirds of the task force votes in favor of a revision."[41] Less frequently, DC PCSB staff

---

[36] Ibid., 8.
[37] Ibid., 9.
[38] Ibid., 7.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Emma Brown, "D.C. Charter Board Releases School Ratings," *The Washington Post*, November 7, 2012, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/dc-charter-board-releases-school-ratings/2012/11/07/05ef81ba-2908-11e2-96b6-8e6a7524553f_story.html?utm_term=.1921ad391e88.
[41] DC PCSB, "2018-19 Adult Education PMF Policy & Technical Guide,

encourage the Board to approve a "change contrary to the task force members' recommendation."[42]

IV.   Policy Proposal

The goal of this proposal is to modify DC PCSB's PMF Policy so no more than a quarter of public charter high schools are ranked Tier 1 (i.e., high-performing). The proposed PMF Policy modifications are devised to more accurately report academic performance among DC public charter high schools, thereby improving DC PCSB's ability to identify and respond to school deficiencies. Implementing this proposal should also increase public charter school leaders' ability to recognize and address program weaknesses. Combined, these modifications may lead to better academic outcomes for Washington, DC's public charter high school students. The policy authorization tool is an amendment to the PMF Policy,[43] to be implemented school year 2020-2021. Specific PMF Policy revisions are summarized below.

Category: Student Achievement

Measures: 1.) Approaching PARCC Expectations and above in ELA (PARCC ELA 3+), 2.) Approaching PARCC Expectations and above in Math (PARCC Math 3+), 3.) Meeting or Exceeding PARCC Expectations in ELA (PARCC ELA 4+), 4.) Meeting or Exceeding PARCC Expectations in Math (PARCC Math 4+)

Open for Public Comment," June 29, 2018, http://www.livebinders.com/media/get/MTc5NjE0NzI=.
[42] Ibid.
[43] DC PCSB, *2018-19 Performance Management Framework Policy and Technical Guide*.

Current Policy: The Student Achievement category reports the percent of students who are approaching, meeting, and exceeding expectations PARCC ELA and math. A level three on the PARCC indicates a student is approaching expectations, a level four indicates a student is meeting expectations in the tested subject, and a level five indicates a student is exceeding expectations. Under the HS PMF, schools can earn as many points when students score a level three on the PARCC as they can earn when students score a level four or five. Each measure has a floor (the minimum rate a school must earn to start earning points) and a target (the maximum rate a school can earn to achieve all of a measure's points).[44] In the current PMF Policy, the floors for the Student Achievement measures are set at the 10th percentile of DC public charter high school PARCC performance. Two of the Student Achievement targets are set at an "aspirational" 100.[45] The other two Student Achievement targets are set at the 90th percentile of DC public charter high school PARCC performance.[46]

Proposed Amendment: Award public charter high schools more points when their students score a level four or five on the PARCC than when their students score a level three on the PARCC. Additionally, set rigorous floors (e.g., 60.0-80.0) and ambitious targets (e.g., 90.0-100) for all Student Achievement measures. See the table below for details.

---

[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid, 60.
[46] Ibid.

Table 5. PMF Policy Proposal for Student Achievement

Category	Measure	Current Points Possible	Proposed Points Possible	Current Floor	Proposed Floor	Current Target	Proposed Target
Student Achievement	PARCC ELA 3+	5.0	2.0	23.3	80.0	100	No Change
	PARCC Math 3+	5.0	2.0	11.4	80.0	100	No Change
	PARCC ELA 4+	5.0	8.0	7.7	60.0	39.2	90.0
	PARCC Math 4+	5.0	8.0	0.0	60.0	12.6	90.0

Category: Gateway

Measures: 1.) Four-Year Graduation Rate, 2.) Five-Year Graduation Rate

Current Provision: The Graduation Rate measures report the percentage of public charter school students who graduate in four or five years.[47] Under the current PMF Policy, schools can earn more points when students graduate in five years than when students graduate in four years. Specifically, schools can earn up to six points for their five-year graduation rate compared to four points for their four-year graduation rate.

Proposed Amendment: Award more points to schools when public charter high school students graduate in four years than when students graduate in five years. See the table below for details.

---

[47] Ibid., 61.

Table 6. PMF Policy Proposal for Gateway – Graduation Rates

Category	Measure	Current Points Possible	Proposed Points Possible
Gateway	Four-Year Graduation Rate	4.0	6.0
Gateway	Five-Year Graduation Rate	6.0	4.0

Category: Gateway

Measure: College Acceptance

Current Provision: The College Acceptance measure reports the rate of graduating public charter school students who were accepted into a two- or four-year college.[48]

Proposed Amendment: Reduce the number of points schools can earn for this measure. See the table below for details.

Table 7. PMF Policy Proposal for Gateway – College Acceptance

Category	Measure	Current Points Possible	Proposed Points Possible
Gateway	College Acceptance	5.0	2.0

---

[48] Ibid., 62.

Category: Gateway

Measure: College Enrollment (new)

Proposed Amendment: Add a measure to the Gateway category that reports the rate of public charter high school graduates from the prior school year who were 1.) positively counted in the College Acceptance measure and 2.) enrolled in a two- or four-year college the following school year. See the table below for details.

Table 8. PMF Policy Proposal for Gateway – College Enrollment

Category	Measure	Current Points Possible	Proposed Points Possible
Gateway	College Enrollment	0	3.0

To implement this proposal, DC PCSB's data manager will have to reconfigure portions of the agency's data system. Additionally, the Financial and Academic Quality team (the individuals who develop the PMF Policy and produce the School Quality Report), will have to expand their data collection and validation process. While DC PCSB staff will be responsible for adjusting the data system and adopting new processes to support policy implementation, these modifications will not incur fees beyond that which the agency has already budgeted. (As noted in the "History/Background" section, DC PCSB amends its PMF Policy on an almost annual basis; the agency's budget already reflects the costs that are associated with PMF Policy revision.)

While DC PCSB will not spend additional funds to implement this proposal, as described further in the "Political Analysis" section of this memorandum, it is probable public charter high schools will adjust their spending plans in response to the revised

expectations. This amendment will motivate schools to change their programming (e.g., instructional methods, staffing plans) and processes (e.g., data and document collection, retention, and reporting). Schools may need to re-allocate funds to accommodate program and process adjustments. Public charter high school leaders may claim this proposal will require additional funding from the District's education budget. It is not clear whether additional expenditures are genuinely needed (again, the city already spends some $20,000 per student; this rate is higher than all but two states' per pupil spending levels).[49] Furthermore, if additional funding is necessary, it is difficult to project how much funding this proposal will incur because there is considerable variation between school spending plans.

V.   **Policy Analysis**

This policy proposal fulfills its goal: it reduces the percent of public charter high schools that are ranked Tier 1 such that fewer than a quarter of schools are rated high-performing. This determination is based on simulations using actual PMF data from the past two school years. The simulations were completed by inputting the PMF rates from school years 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 into a modified version of DC PCSB's HS PMF Calculator.[50,51] It is important to note the simulation does not include the proposed College Enrollment measure; it is not possible to include this measure in the simulation because the underlying data are not publicly available. See the Appendix to review the simulation results for each high school.

---

[49] US Census Bureau, "States Leading Per Student Spending," June 2017, https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/2017/comm/cb17-97-public-education-finance.html.
[50] DC PCSB, "Performance Management Framework (PMF) Calculators," accessed April 4, 2019, https://www.dcpcsb.org/performance-management-framework-pmf/performance-management-framework-pmf-calculators.
[51] DC PCSB, "School Quality Reports," accessed March 20, 2019, https://www.dcpcsb.org/schoolquality.

The table below shows the published PMF scores and tiers public charter high schools earned during school year 2016-2017.[52] It also shows the simulated scores and tiers public charter high schools would have earned had the proposed policy been in effect. There is an additional table summarizing the official school year 2016-2017 tier rankings compared to tier rankings schools would have received had the proposed policy been in effect.

Table 9. Simulated PMF Policy Proposal Based on School Year 2016-2017 Data

Simulation Based on School Year 2016-2017 PMF Data						
Public Charter High School	**Actual 2016-2017 Score**	**Simulated Score**	**Score Difference**	**Actual 2016-2017 Tier**	**Simulated Tier**	**Tier Change**
School A	42.7	26.8	-15.9	2	3	Yes
School B	67.2	53.7	-13.5	1	2	Yes
School C	66.1	61.8	-4.3	1	2	Yes
School D	95.5	81.0	-14.5	1	1	No
School E	62.7	47.3	-15.4	2	2	No
School F	65.3	56.1	-9.2	1	2	Yes
School G	89.1	75.2	-13.9	1	1	No
School H	27.9	16.5	-11.4	3	3	No
School I	52.2	47.2	-5.0	2	2	No
School J	53.6	52.4	-1.2	2	2	No
School K	50.1	44.6	-5.5	2	2	No
School L	44.0	40.0	-4.0	2	2	No
School M	41.5	31.1	-10.4	2	3	Yes
School N	54.5	52.3	-2.2	2	2	No
School O	48.5	40.1	-8.4	2	2	No
School P	66.5	52.7	-13.8	1	2	Yes

---

[52] The public charter high schools included in this simulation are those that had a publicly available score and tier in both 2016-2017 and 2017-2018. Sixteen of 19 public charter high schools met these conditions. In the tables, these 16 schools are lettered instead of being listed by name.

Table 10. Simulated PMF Policy Proposal Summary Based on School Year 2016-2017 Data

Simulation Summary Based on School Year 2016-2017 Data		
PMF Ranking	**Count Under Current PMF Policy (% of the Public Charter High School Sector)**	**Count Under Proposed PMF Policy (% of the Public Charter High School Sector)**
Tier 1 (High-Performing)	6 (38%)	2 (13%)
Tier 2 (Mid-Performing)	9 (56%)	11 (69%)
Tier 3 (Low-Performing)	1 (6%)	3 (19%)

Under the proposed policy, no more than a quarter of public charter high schools are ranked Tier 1, due largely to the increase in public charter high schools that are ranked Tier 2. Had this proposal been in effect during school year 2016-2017, two additional public charter high schools would have been flagged as Tier 3 (i.e., low-performing) schools. (As the table above shows, only one public charter high school was identified as low-performing in school year 2016-2017.) Had Schools A and M been identified as low-performing in school year 2016-2017, DC PCSB staff would have conducted on-site instructional observations and provided those schools' leaders with a detailed assessment of school performance.[53] DC PCSB may have also held formal meetings with leaders from Schools A and M to discuss performance concerns. The agency might have considered initiating a high-stakes review for Schools A and M.

The table below shows the published PMF scores and tiers public charter high schools earned during school year 2017-2018 along with the simulated scores and tiers. There is an additional table summarizing the official school year 2017-2018 tier rankings

---

[53] Per the PMF Policy, schools that are ranked Tier 3 are subject to a Quality Site Review the following school year.

compared to the tier rankings schools would have received had the proposed policy been

in effect.

Table 11. Simulated PMF Policy Proposal Based on School Year 2017-2018 Data

Public Charter High School	Actual 2017-2018 Score	Simulated Score	Score Difference	Actual 2017-2018 Tier	Simulated Tier	Tier Change
Simulation Based on School Year 2017-2018 PMF Data						
School A	47.1	35.9	-11.2	2	2	No
School B	75.5	59.4	-16.1	1	2	Yes
School C	65.4	57.2	-8.2	1	2	Yes
School D	97.3	80.7	-16.6	1	1	No
School E	66.8	62.3	-4.5	1	2	Yes
School F	83.6	70.7	-12.9	1	1	No
School G	93.4	80.8	-12.6	1	1	No
School H	26.7	20.4	-6.3	3	3	No
School I	59.8	51.1	-8.7	2	2	No
School J	51.9	47.1	-4.8	2	2	No
School K	52.8	44.7	-8.1	2	2	No
School L	49.6	46.6	-3.0	2	2	No
School M	50.4	44.2	-6.2	2	2	No
School N	77.9	60.4	-17.5	1	2	Yes
School O	50.9	40.9	-10.0	2	2	No
School P	68.1	55.4	-12.7	1	2	Yes

Table 12. Simulated PMF Policy Proposal Summary Based on School Year 2017-2018 Data

PMF Ranking	Count Under Current PMF Policy (% of the Public Charter High School Sector)	Count Under Proposed PMF Policy (% of the Public Charter High School Sector)
Simulation Summary for School Year 2017-2018		
Tier 1 (High-Performing)	8 (50%)	3 (19%)
Tier 2 (Mid-Performing)	7 (44%)	12 (75%)
Tier 3 (Low-Performing)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)

As with the school year 2016-2017 simulation, the proportion of Tier 1 schools declines (falling from 50 percent to 19 percent). Unlike the 2016-2017 simulation, no additional schools were ranked Tier 3; however, the policy's goal was not necessarily to identify more Tier 3 schools.

This policy proposal sets higher performance expectations than the currently approved PMF Policy, which, in the long run, could lead to better student outcomes. The revised policy gives schools more points when their students attain PARCC proficiency. (Recall, in the current PMF Policy, schools can earn as many points when students score a level three on the PARCC as they can earn when students score a level four or five.) Since the District adopted PARCC as its official assessment in school year 2014-2015, DCPS has evaluated its students' performance using scores of four (meeting expectations) and five (exceeding expectations) as the barometer for achievement.[54] By contrast, DC PCSB includes a score of three (approaching expectations) in its barometer for achievement. This evaluation disparity may explain, at least in part, why DCPS outperformed public charter schools on the PARCC exam for the past two school years.[55] DCPS set a higher standard, and their educators are working to meet that standard. DC PCSB set a more attainable standard, and, perhaps as a consequence, public charter schools are not performing as well on the state assessment as DCPS. To be clear, public charter school educators are working as hard as their DCPS counterparts. However, their target is lower, which means they are employing instructional and programmatic approaches aimed at different (i.e., less rigorous) targets. As education economists David

[54] DCPS, "DC Public Schools PARCC Scores Released for High School Students," October 27, 2015, https://dcps.dc.gov/node/1120832.
[55] OSSE, "DC's 2018 PARCC Results."

Figlio and Susanna Loeb write, "measuring and reporting school performance…provides incentives that encourage educators to concentrate on the subjects and materials that are being measured and to potentially alter the methods through which they educate students."[56] Adjusting DC PCSB's public charter high school accountability policy could result in more effective instructional practices, which may yield improved student performance.

This proposal directs more attention to college preparation than the current PMF policy does. The amended policy is apt to motivate school leaders to refine their instructional methods and college placement strategies. Some public charter high schools already offer robust college planning supports.[57] Per the DC public charter college matriculation data referenced in the "Statement of Problem" section of this memorandum, evidently, many public charter high schools are not providing their students with sufficient college planning supports. The addition of a College Enrollment measure incentivizes public charter high schools' investment in their college counseling programming. It also provides the public with more information about how successful public charter high schools are in preparing graduates for higher education. This is valuable information parents and students would benefit from using as they exercise school choice.

Despite these pros, this policy proposal has pronounced cons. For example, the amended PMF Policy may result in fewer parents enrolling their children in the District's public charter high schools. Parents may lose confidence in the public charter sector if

---

[56] David Figlio and Susanna Loeb, "School Accountability," in *Handbook of the Economics of Education*: *Volume 3*, eds. Eric Hanushek and Finis Welch (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 2006), 387.
[57] KIPP DC, "KIPP Through College and Career," accessed April 6, 2019, https://www.kippdc.org/kipp-through-college-careers/.

fewer schools are identified as high-performers. If enrollment falls at DC public charter high schools, many of those students will likely enroll in the traditional school system. If this happens, DCPS may be overwhelmed by the influx of students, which would impinge on their ability to serve the students who are already enrolled in their high schools. If a particularly large portion of students withdraws from public charter high schools, those schools may be at risk of closure. For example, when public charter schools lose a sizeable number of students, they become programmatically and financially unsustainable, forcing school leaders to consider school closure. While diminished enrollment is possible, it is not inevitable. Of the seven public charter schools that were rated low-performing in school year 2017-2018, four saw increased enrollment counts the following school year, and only three saw enrollment decreases.[58,59]

Another consequence of diminishing enrollment is that DC PCSB's budget will shrink. DC PCSB levies an administrative fee against the public charter schools in its portfolio; this is "DC PCSB's primary source of revenue."[60] The amount a school must render is based on its enrollment; the greater the student population, the greater the administrative fee. If this policy spurred an enrollment decline, DC PCSB's budget would decrease, and the agency could face operational challenges that could inhibit its school oversight capacity. Again, while this outcome is possible, it is not probable given public charter schools' historical ability to attract students despite Tier 3 PMF status.

Academic Richard Rothstein posits some general criticisms of school accountability plans, particularly when they are primarily focused on students'

[58] DC PCSB, "School Quality Reports," accessed March 20, 2019, https://www.dcpcsb.org/schoolquality.
[59] OSSE, "Enrollment Audit Data," accessed April 22, 2019, https://osse.dc.gov/enrollment.
[60] DC PCSB, "Administrative Fee Policy," March 22, 2016, https://www.dcpcsb.org/policy/administrative-fee-policy-0.

standardized test performance. His contributions are worth considering because the PMF

Policy (both its current iteration and the proposed amendment) are reliant on PARCC

scores. In *Grading Education*, Rothstein discusses the challenges disadvantaged children

experience such as hunger, health conditions, crime, and parents who do not have the

capacity to support their learning.[61] He writes "test-based accountability will erode

support for public education." [62] Rothstein's rationale for this erosion is that educators

will claim they can close the achievement gap, a feat that is "impossible" given students'

life challenges.[63] Per Rothstein, "when these educators fail to fulfill the impossible

expectations, they themselves have endorsed, the reasonable conclusion can only be that

they and their colleagues in public education are hopelessly incompetent."[64] The scholar

goes on to argue that proficiency-based accountability systems that are not accompanied

by extensive anti-poverty investment are not worth pursuit.

VI.   Political Analysis

As DC PCSB's Executive Director, your primary stakeholders are the agency's

board members: Chair Rick Cruz, Vice Chair Saba Bireda, Steve Bumbaugh, Lea Crusey,

Ricarda Ganjam, and Naomi Shelton. All of the board members support the PMF Policy

and the agency's reliance on the Framework for assessing school quality. None of the

current board members are on record speaking about the kind of modifications that are

included in this proposal. However, former Board Chair Darren Woodruff spoke publicly

about adding college enrollment data to the PMF Policy. Specifically, in June 2017,

Woodruff "requested that college entrance and persistence be included on the 2017-18

---

[61] Richard Rothstein, Rebecca Jacobsen, and Tamara Wilder, *Grading Education: Getting Accountability Right* (Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute, 2008), 70.
[62] Ibid., 71.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Ibid.

HS PMF."[65] Of course, Woodruff is no longer on the Board; it is not clear whether current members also hold this interest. That said, for at least the past four years, the Board has affirmed every PMF Policy amendment as recommended by DC PCSB staff. The Board's consistent affirmation signals confidence in DC PCSB staff. If DC PCSB staff support this policy proposal, the Board is apt to vote in favor of the amendment.

Unlike the Board, public charter high school leaders will not support the policy proposal. In general, school leaders will not support a PMF Policy amendment that makes achieving a Tier 1 ranking more difficult. More specifically, there is clear evidence school leaders will not support adding college-going measures to the PMF Policy. In August 2017, DC PCSB staff met with the HS PMF Task Force to determine how to report college enrollment and persistence "information as a display-only measure on the 2017-18 scorecard."[66] A display-only measure is one that is shown on the School Quality Report (for the public's interest) though the data are not factored into schools' score or tier. Representatives from eight public charter high schools attended the meeting.[67] (In other words, half of the District's public charter high schools participated in the meeting.) Per the meeting notes and a summary of school leaders' comments on the proposal, not a single public charter high school leader supported publishing college enrollment data on the School Quality Report.[68,69]

School leaders voiced operational and philosophical concerns regarding displaying college enrollment data on the School Quality Report. Many school leaders

---

[65] DC PCSB, "HS 2017-18 PMF Task Force Meeting: College Entrance and Persistence," August 8, 2017, https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/xtdI5WOrhV/, 4.
[66] Ibid.
[67] DC PCSB, PMF HS Task Force Meeting, August 8, 2017, https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/b0KRlNEYm6/.
[68] Ibid.
[69] DC PCSB, Summary of School Leader Comments Regarding College Entrance and Persistence Display Measures, August 21, 2017, https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/Gy0d15NCvx/.

said displaying the information would create an "administrative burden" for their college counseling and data management teams (e.g., this change would require school staff to track, collect, report, and share additional data and supporting documents).[70] Some school leaders highlighted the financial implications associated with adding college enrollment and persistence measures to the PMF report. For example, in a letter to former Board Chair Darren Woodruff, a public charter high school executive director wrote that her school budgets nearly $400,000 each year to operate a "College Office" that provides students with college-going assistance.[71] In the letter, the executive director said the school funds "activities to support our alumni entirely through private philanthropy, not through public dollars."[72] This demonstrates a perceived or actual need for additional funding to support graduates' post-secondary pursuits.

Other school leaders made philosophical arguments against displaying college enrollment and persistence information. For example, one school leader wrote to DC PCSB arguing the "Board should recognize that not all students wish to attend colleges or continue post-secondary education. The Board should…not impose additional values on students and families that may have different plans or goals."[73] Another head of school wrote to DC PCSB staff, "[w]hile we care deeply about our students being college ready and we work hard to support their acceptance to and enrollment in the colleges…we have learned from experience that college matriculation and persistence are often beyond our locus of control."[74] This statement alludes to the societal conditions (i.e., poverty) that

[70] DC PCSB, PMF HS Task Force Meeting, 1.
[71] Hilary Darilek to Darren Woodruff, July 19, 2017, https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/euonDCZgWV/.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Richard Pohlman to DC PCSB, July 14, 2017, https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/7rhfqyCWSN/.
[74] Peter Anderson to Scott Pearson, Naomi DeVeaux, and Erin Kupferberg, August 15, 2017, https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/yFV145gN4h/.

create a blockade to college enrollment for many DC graduates. While quality

educational programming is a critical part of poverty mitigation, high-performing schools

can't solve poverty alone. As long as poverty persists, students will continue to

experience barriers to college enrollment—barriers schools will have difficulty helping

their graduates overcome.

Public charter high school leaders' opposition to displaying college-going metrics

on the School Quality Report will only grow stronger with the prospect of adding a

college enrollment measure to the PMF Policy that counts towards schools' score and

tier. Though the current proposal does not include reporting college persistence as DC

PCSB staff suggested in August 2017, it is unlikely school leaders will embrace the

change. After all, the concerns and challenges they described in 2017 persist under the

current PMF Policy proposal.

Public charter high school leaders will have an ally in Friends of Choice in Urban

Schools (FOCUS), another stakeholder. FOCUS is a non-profit public charter school

advocacy organization. DC PCSB staff enjoy a friendly relationship with FOCUS, and

the organizations rarely take divergent policy positions.[75] However, FOCUS' chief aim is

protecting DC public charter schools' interests, which occasionally propels FOCUS to

reject DC PCSB policy.[76] The advocacy organization may argue this PMF Policy

proposal is an overreach that sets unreasonable targets for public charter high schools.

Even if FOCUS does not make such an argument publicly, they are apt to mobilize public

charter high schools behind the scenes, helping school administrators to present a united

front against the proposal.

---

[75] In fact, DC PCSB's Deputy Director is a former FOCUS employee.
[76] FOCUS, "About Us," accessed April 18, 2019, https://focusdc.org/about-us.

Parents of current and prospective public charter high school students are yet another stakeholder. Parents rarely advocate for or against PMF Policy amendment proposals. The last time they did was in 2013 when DC PCSB staff proposed adding early childhood accountability measures to the Framework.[77] Since then, parents have been largely silent on PMF Policy revisions. While they do not engage in PMF Policy amendment conversations, parents rely on PMF data to inform their school application and enrollment choices. A cursory review of DC Urban Moms and Dads (an anonymous web forum for DC parents) reveals parents scrutinize DC PCSB's School Quality Report, paying special attention to schools' tier status.[78] It is reasonable to assume that parents will support the policy proposal because the amendment will increase transparency, thereby improving parents' ability to identify which public charter high schools are operating optimal programs.

The Washington Teachers Union (WTU) is not an obvious stakeholder, given the lack of unionized public charter schools in the District. Nevertheless, WTU has been critical of the public charter sector, and they were particularly vocal when a DC public charter school suddenly announced it is closing its only unionized campus.[79] It is unlikely WTU will express support for or against the PMF Policy proposal; however, if the Board approves the policy, WTU may leverage the subsequent performance data to advance an

[77] Michael Alison Chandler, "D.C. Charter Board asked to Reconsider Preschool Ranking Plan," *The Washington Post*, September 11, 2013, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/dc-charter-board-asked-to-reconsider-preschool-ranking-plan/2013/09/11/245991de-1af4-11e3-8685-5021e0c41964_story.html?utm_term=.14087aa82a10.

[78] DC Urban Moms and Dads, "I Just Scooped the DCPCSB – 2018 Tiers," October 30, 2018, https://www.dcurbanmom.com/jforum/posts/list/762002.page.

[79] Perry Stein, "D.C.'s Only Unionized Charter School Filed Another Federal Labor Complaint — this Time as its Campus is Shutting Down," *The Washington Post*, March 6, 2019, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/dcs-only-unionized-charter-school-filed-another-federal-labor-complaint--this-time-as-its-campus-is-shutting-down/2019/03/06/fd82b52c-4022-11e9-9361-301ffb5bd5e6_story.html?utm_term=.f6cdc68d56ac.

anti-charter agenda. If the proposal is approved and implemented, public charter high schools' PMF scores will decrease, and fewer schools will be ranked Tier 1. The WTU (and other public charter school critics) will almost surely seize on evidence that public charter schools are underperforming. This could embolden their narrative that DCPS should be the sole public education provider in the District.

The final set of stakeholders are DC PCSB's partners in education: the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME), DC Council's Committee on Education (Education Committee), and OSSE. The DME and the Education Committee do not typically weigh in on DC PCSB's academic accountability policies. DC PCSB is an independent government agency; as a result, DME and the Education Committee seem to defer to DC PCSB on public charter school issues. While OSSE also does not comment publicly on DC PCSB policy, it may take an interest in this particular proposal. In December 2018, OSSE released its School Transparency and Reporting (STAR) rating system, an academic and non-academic evaluation tool for both DCPS and DC public charter schools. OSSE will publish STAR performance reports on an annual basis in compliance with the Every Student Succeeds Act, a federal law that requires state education agencies to produce accountability frameworks. There is considerable overlap between OSSE's STAR system and DC PCSB's PMF. While DC PCSB is committed to producing the PMF, the agency has not articulated plans to significantly adjust the PMF Policy. It is difficult to predict how OSSE will react if the Board approves the policy proposal. OSSE may privately criticize the policy amendment because it may divert attention from the STAR rating system to the PMF. Alternatively, OSSE may privately support the amendment, recognizing DC PCSB as the sole agency with public charter

school oversight authority. OSSE will also take an interest in the proposal because DC PCSB relies on OSSE to provide some of the underlying data required for PMF production. It is worth noting that the proposed policy will not require OSSE to send any additional data DC PCSB, which should help data management staff at both agencies maintain a healthy working relationship.

VII. Recommendation

I recommend approving the policy proposal because it enables DC PCSB to better fulfill its responsibilities as the sole authorizer of DC's public charter schools. The public charter school model can be distilled "in mathematical terms: flexibility under state education law + autonomy of decision-making by the governing body of the school + the highest accountability in public K-12 education = increased student achievement."[80] Researchers affirm this theory of action, identifying public charter school authorizers as critical actors in creating a "healthier charter sector" in which students achieve academic success.[81] You demonstrated a commitment to this theory of action in 2013 when you said, "the board has [a] "vital role" to ensure that taxpayer-funded charter schools are high quality."[82]

DC PCSB is responsible for maintaining an academic accountability policy that—in tandem with autonomous schools—leads to positive student outcomes. The agency's current academic accountability tool, the PMF Policy, does not set

---

[80] Andrew Lewis, "Fulfilling the Charter School Promise: Accountability Matters; So Do Freedom, Fair Funding, and Strong Operators," *The 74*, March 7, 2018, https://www.the74million.org/article/fulfilling-the-charter-school-promise-accountability-matters-so-does-freedom-fair-funding-and-strong-operators/.

[81] Emily Peltason and Margaret Raymond, *Charter School Growth and Replication: Volume I* (Stanford: Center for Research on Education Outcomes at Stanford University, 2013), 2.

[82] Michael Alison Chandler, "D.C. Charter Board Asked to Reconsider Preschool Ranking Plan," *The Washington Post*, September 11, 2013, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/dc-charter-board-asked-to-reconsider-preschool-ranking-plan/2013/09/11/245991de-1af4-11e3-8685-5021e0c41964_story.html?utm_term=.14087aa82a10.

performance expectations that are leading to positive student outcomes. Instead, the

PMF Policy *hides* public charter high schools' deficiencies. For example, the 2018

School Quality Report, which is based off PMF data from school year 2017-2018,

indicates half of the District's public charter high schools are high-performing;

however, during the same period, just over a quarter of public charter high school

students met or exceeded PARCC ELA expectations, while a mere 12.2 percent of DC

public charter high school students met or exceeded PARCC math expectations. How can

DC PCSB reasonably claim its public charter high schools are high-performing when the

vast majority of students attending these schools are not demonstrating proficiency in

literacy and numeracy? The PMF Policy results in misleading performance data, thereby

limiting DC PCSB and school leaders' ability to identify and respond to programmatic

weaknesses. DC PCSB is unable to provide its struggling public charter high schools

with meaningful oversight because the agency's accountability tool does not identify all

of the struggling public charter high schools in its portfolio. Approving the proposed

PMF Policy amendment will improve DC PCSB's ability to identify schools'

weaknesses. As such, school leaders will be better positioned to develop strategies to

improve their programs to the benefit of public charter high school students.

If the proposed PMF Policy is enacted, the number of public charter high

schools classified as high-performing will fall, which will be concerning to some DC

PCSB stakeholders. DC PCSB's communications team will have to be proactive in

crafting a message for parents and community members to help them understand the

PMF rank changes. The agency's messaging should focus on the policy proposal's

benefits (e.g., more appropriate performance rankings that will aid DC PCSB and

school staff in assessing and responding to school needs) and the original vision for the PMF Policy (i.e., increasing the Framework's rigor over time to ensure schools are constantly striving to build high-quality schools).

It is imperative DC PCSB pursue the policy proposal despite school leaders' resistance. To assuage school leaders' concerns about implementing the policy proposal, DC PCSB can pilot the amended PMF Policy at the end of school year 2019-2020. This will help school leaders identify the operational and programmatic changes they need to make to improve their PMF performance before the new policy is enacted in school year 2020-2021. DC PCSB will not be able to mollify school leaders fully, but the agency can certainly provide schools with supports (e.g., hosting communications trainings, sharing best practices in record collection) as it transitions to the revised academic accountability policy.

It is unwise to ignore Richard Rothstein's criticisms of academic accountability systems that rely on standardized test performance. While his argument is largely speculative, it is rationally conceived. It is easily fathomable that people will lose confidence in public education if accountability systems show schools experiencing difficulty closing achievement gaps. Still, how can schools and school authorizers close achievement gaps if they do not know they exist? DC PCSB's academic accountability tool must acknowledge school weaknesses, better positioning DC PCSB and school staff's ability to develop strategies to improve educational offerings.

DC PCSB's mission is to "provide quality public charter school options for DC students, families, and communities," and its vision is to "lead the transformation of public education in DC, and serve as a national role model for charter school authorizing

and accountability."[83] The agency has a reputation as being "one of the top charter school authorizers in the country."[84] DC PCSB is not a worthwhile model for authorizing nor is it worthy of its reputation unless its policies give way to high-performing schools in which students achieve positive academic outcomes. Amending the PMF Policy gives the agency an opportunity to embrace its mission, playing a vital role in supporting schools' efforts to educate Washington, DC public charter high school students.

---

[83] DC PCSB, "Who We Are," accessed April 22, 2019, https://www.dcpcsb.org/our-people.

[84] National Association of Charter School Authorizers, "District of Columbia Public Charter School Board Quality Practice Project," accessed April 24, 2019, https://www.qualitycharters.org/district-columbia-public-charter-school-board/.

VIII.   **Appendix**

Simulated Performance Under Proposed PMF Policy

School A - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School A, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary
Tier — 3
Total Points — 20.6 (out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points — **26.8%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
Student Progress (0)							
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0		65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0		65.0			
Student Achievement (20)							
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	40.8	80.0		100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	46.3	80.0		100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	15.5	60.0		90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	9.1	60.0		90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
Gateway (34.5)							
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	78.3	67.0		90.0	5.0	2.5	49.1%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	66.1	67.0		90.0	6.0	0.0	0.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	72.9	67.0		100.0	4.0	0.7	17.9%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	24.5	5.3		50.0	5.0	2.1	43.0%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	45.5	15.9		75.0	5.0	2.5	50.1%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9		47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2		24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2		100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE Certif	18.2	3.3		33.6	7.5	3.7	49.2%
School Environment (22.5)							
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	87.7	82.0		92.0	12.5	7.1	57.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	73.2	74.0		91.5	10.0	0.0	0.0%

School A - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School A, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary
Tier	2
Total Points	32.2
	(out of 89.5)
Percent of Possible Points	**35.9%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
1 Student Progress (7.5)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math	57.0	30.0					65.0	7.5	5.8	77.1%
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	33.9	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	41.2	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	11.9	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	11.8	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	75.3	67.0					90.0	5.0	1.8	36.1%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	58.3	67.0					90.0	6.0	0.0	0.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	77.2	67.0					100.0	4.0	1.2	30.9%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	34.8	5.3					50.0	5.0	3.3	66.0%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	48.1	15.9					75.0	5.0	2.7	54.5%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	28.8	17.9					47.0	2.5	0.9	37.5%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	7.7	4.2					24.4	2.5	0.4	17.3%
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE Certif	34.6	3.3					33.6	7.5	7.5	100.0%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	85.1	82.0					92.0	12.5	3.9	31.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	78.5	74.0					91.5	10.0	2.6	25.7%

School B - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School B, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	41.3 (out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	53.7%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	52.6	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	50.0	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	27.8	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	10.6	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	76.1	67.0					90.0	5.0	2.0	39.6%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	81.8	67.0					90.0	6.0	3.9	64.3%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	87.0	67.0					100.0	4.0	2.4	60.6%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	45.0	5.3					50.0	5.0	4.4	88.8%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	82.6	15.9					75.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	26.1	3.3					33.6	7.5	5.6	75.2%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	92.3	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	80.1	74.0					91.5	10.0	3.5	34.9%

School B - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School B, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	57.6
	(out of 97)
Percent of Possible Points	**59.4%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range 25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
1 Student Progress (15)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA	54.0	30.0					65.0	7.5	5.1	68.6%
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math	65.0	30.0					65.0	7.5	7.5	100.0%
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	64.5	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	49.4	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	41.4	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	16.1	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	77.5	67.0					90.0	5.0	2.3	45.7%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	80.0	67.0					90.0	6.0	3.4	56.5%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	87.7	67.0					100.0	4.0	2.5	62.7%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	45.7	5.3					50.0	5.0	4.5	90.4%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	88.1	15.9					75.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	59.7	17.9					47.0	2.5	2.5	100.0%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	38.8	4.2					24.4	2.5	2.5	100.0%
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	26.9	3.3					33.6	7.5	5.8	77.9%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	92.0	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	77.3	74.0					91.5	10.0	1.9	18.9%

School C - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School C, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	44.1
	(out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	**57.2%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	38.1	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	35.7	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	19.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	4.8	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	83.1	67.0					90.0	5.0	3.5	70.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	88.5	67.0					90.0	6.0	5.6	93.5%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	96.2	67.0					100.0	4.0	3.5	88.5%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	34.6	5.3					50.0	5.0	3.3	65.5%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	85.7	15.9					75.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	95.2	88.2					100.0	2.0	1.2	59.3%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	4.8	3.3					33.6	7.5	0.4	5.0%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	93.8	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	89.9	74.0					91.5	10.0	9.1	90.9%

School C - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School C, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	50.6 (out of 82)
Percent of Possible Points	**61.8%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	30.8	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	24.3	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	12.8	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	0.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	91.5	67.0					90.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	94.7	67.0					90.0	6.0	6.0	100.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	100.0	67.0					100.0	4.0	4.0	100.0%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	51.9	5.3					50.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	73.1	15.9					75.0	5.0	4.8	96.8%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	50.0	17.9					47.0	2.5	2.5	100.0%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	3.8	4.2					24.4	2.5	0.0	0.0%
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	3.8	3.3					33.6	7.5	0.1	1.7%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	94.8	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	89.2	74.0					91.5	10.0	8.7	86.9%

School D - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School D, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	1
Total Points	59.1 (out of 73)
Percent of Possible Points	81.0%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range 25	% of Target Range 50	% of Target Range 75	% of Target Range 100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	85.7	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.6	28.5%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	90.0	80.0					100.0	2.0	1.0	50.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	71.5	60.0					90.0	8.0	3.1	38.3%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	75.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	4.0	50.0%
3 Gateway (30.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	98.2	67.0					90.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	100.0	67.0					90.0	6.0	6.0	100.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate		67.0					100.0			
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	100.0	5.3					50.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	93.3	15.9					75.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE Certif	100.0	3.3					33.6	7.5	7.5	100.0%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	94.2	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	87.1	74.0					91.5	10.0	7.5	74.9%

School D - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School D, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	1
Total Points	52.0 (out of 64.5)
Percent of Possible Points	**80.7%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
① Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
② Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	90.0	80.0					100.0	2.0	1.0	50.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	81.4	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.1	7.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	84.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	6.4	80.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	54.2	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
③ Gateway (22)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	98.0	67.0					90.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	100.0	67.0					90.0	6.0	6.0	100.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	100.0	67.0					100.0	4.0	4.0	100.0%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	95.5	5.3					50.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)		15.9					75.0			
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE		3.3					33.6			
④ School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	95.2	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	92.6	74.0					91.5	10.0	10.0	100.0%

School E - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School E, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	36.4 (out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	47.3%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	62.2	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	47.5	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	30.6	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	19.7	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	84.0	67.0					90.0	5.0	3.7	73.9%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	76.1	67.0					90.0	6.0	2.4	39.6%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	88.6	67.0					100.0	4.0	2.6	65.5%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	26.0	5.3					50.0	5.0	2.3	46.3%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	51.6	15.9					75.0	5.0	3.0	60.4%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	94.8	88.2					100.0	2.0	1.1	55.9%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	16.5	3.3					33.6	7.5	3.3	43.6%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	88.4	82.0					92.0	12.5	8.0	64.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	95.1	74.0					91.5	10.0	10.0	100.0%

School E - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School E, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	51.1 (out of 82)
Percent of Possible Points	62.3%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range 25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	26.0	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	42.4	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	6.3	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	5.9	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	96.1	67.0					90.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	85.9	67.0					90.0	6.0	4.9	82.2%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	92.7	67.0					100.0	4.0	3.1	77.9%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	43.0	5.3					50.0	5.0	4.2	84.3%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	53.8	15.9					75.0	5.0	3.2	64.1%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	30.1	17.9					47.0	2.5	1.0	41.9%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	19.4	4.2					24.4	2.5	1.9	75.2%
14. College Acceptance Rate	93.8	88.2					100.0	2.0	0.9	47.5%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	46.2	3.3					33.6	7.5	7.5	100.0%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	90.4	82.0					92.0	12.5	10.5	84.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	89.3	74.0					91.5	10.0	8.7	87.4%

43

School F - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School F, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	43.2 (out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	56.1%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range 25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	48.3	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	39.5	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	29.2	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	7.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	90.8	67.0					90.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	71.0	67.0					90.0	6.0	1.0	17.4%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	80.6	67.0					100.0	4.0	1.6	41.2%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	24.4	5.3					50.0	5.0	2.1	42.7%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	59.4	15.9					75.0	5.0	3.7	73.6%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	34.4	3.3					33.6	7.5	7.5	100.0%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	93.6	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	87.5	74.0					91.5	10.0	7.7	77.1%

School F - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School F, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	1
Total Points	68.6
	(out of 97)
Percent of Possible Points	70.7%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
1 Student Progress (15)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA	60.0	30.0					65.0	7.5	6.4	85.7%
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math	69.0	30.0					65.0	7.5	7.5	100.0%
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	69.0	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	43.0	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	46.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	5.8	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	83.5	67.0					90.0	5.0	3.6	71.7%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	90.8	67.0					90.0	6.0	6.0	100.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	98.4	67.0					100.0	4.0	3.8	95.2%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	39.7	5.3					50.0	5.0	3.8	77.0%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	61.2	15.9					75.0	5.0	3.8	76.6%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	46.3	17.9					47.0	2.5	2.4	97.6%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	17.9	4.2					24.4	2.5	1.7	67.8%
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	56.7	3.3					33.6	7.5	7.5	100.0%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	91.9	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.4	99.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	87.3	74.0					91.5	10.0	7.6	76.0%

45

School G - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School G, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	1
Total Points	57.9 (out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	**75.2%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
① Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
② Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	84.4	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.4	22.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	79.5	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	71.4	60.0					90.0	8.0	3.0	38.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	45.8	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
③ Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	87.5	67.0					90.0	5.0	4.5	89.1%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	90.3	67.0					90.0	6.0	6.0	100.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	100.0	67.0					100.0	4.0	4.0	100.0%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	70.1	5.3					50.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	86.5	15.9					75.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	81.4	88.2					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	100.0	3.3					33.6	7.5	7.5	100.0%
④ School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	93.7	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	95.3	74.0					91.5	10.0	10.0	100.0%

% of Target Range

School G - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School G, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	1
Total Points	72.3 (out of 89.5)
Percent of Possible Points	**80.8%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
① Student Progress (7.5)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA	63.0	30.0					65.0	7.5	7.1	94.3%
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
② Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	87.3	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.7	36.5%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	72.2	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	74.7	60.0					90.0	8.0	3.9	49.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	47.2	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
③ Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	97.7	67.0					90.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	90.8	67.0					90.0	6.0	6.0	100.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	97.6	67.0					100.0	4.0	3.7	92.7%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	71.4	5.3					50.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	88.6	15.9					75.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	81.0	17.9					47.0	2.5	2.5	100.0%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	55.7	4.2					24.4	2.5	2.5	100.0%
14. College Acceptance Rate	93.2	88.2					100.0	2.0	0.8	42.4%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	100.0	3.3					33.6	7.5	7.5	100.0%
④ School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	93.7	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	98.0	74.0					91.5	10.0	10.0	100.0%

47

School H - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School H, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	3
Total Points	12.7 (out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	**16.5%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	24.6	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	19.7	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	7.7	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	1.6	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	62.3	67.0					90.0	5.0	0.0	0.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	52.0	67.0					90.0	6.0	0.0	0.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	58.8	67.0					100.0	4.0	0.0	0.0%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	18.0	5.3					50.0	5.0	1.4	28.4%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	44.6	15.9					75.0	5.0	2.4	48.6%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	10.7	3.3					33.6	7.5	1.8	24.4%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	86.0	82.0					92.0	12.5	5.0	40.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	66.8	74.0					91.5	10.0	0.0	0.0%

School H - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School H, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	**3**
Total Points	**16.8** (out of 82)
Percent of Possible Points	**20.4%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	33.3	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	10.8	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	14.3	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	3.1	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	67.6	67.0					90.0	5.0	0.1	2.6%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	58.5	67.0					90.0	6.0	0.0	0.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	63.6	67.0					100.0	4.0	0.0	0.0%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	16.7	5.3					50.0	5.0	1.3	25.5%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	46.3	15.9					75.0	5.0	2.6	51.4%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	29.3	17.9					47.0	2.5	1.0	39.2%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	7.3	4.2					24.4	2.5	0.4	15.3%
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	14.6	3.3					33.6	7.5	2.8	37.3%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	87.3	82.0					92.0	12.5	6.6	53.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	71.0	74.0					91.5	10.0	0.0	0.0%

School I - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School I, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	36.3 (out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	**47.2%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range 25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
① Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
② Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	51.6	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	19.0	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	19.4	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	0.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
③ Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	91.6	67.0					90.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	90.7	67.0					90.0	6.0	6.0	100.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	92.0	67.0					100.0	4.0	3.0	75.8%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	17.9	5.3					50.0	5.0	1.4	28.2%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	55.4	15.9					75.0	5.0	3.3	66.8%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	98.4	88.2					100.0	2.0	1.7	86.4%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	16.9	3.3					33.6	7.5	3.4	44.9%
④ School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	90.6	82.0					92.0	12.5	10.8	86.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	77.0	74.0					91.5	10.0	1.7	17.1%

School I - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School I, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	41.9 (out of 82)
Percent of Possible Points	**51.1%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range 25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	43.8	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	28.0	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	14.6	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	7.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	84.5	67.0					90.0	5.0	3.8	76.1%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	87.1	67.0					90.0	6.0	5.2	87.4%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	94.0	67.0					100.0	4.0	3.3	81.8%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	28.7	5.3					50.0	5.0	2.6	52.3%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	60.0	15.9					75.0	5.0	3.7	74.6%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	45.0	17.9					47.0	2.5	2.3	93.1%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	10.0	4.2					24.4	2.5	0.7	28.7%
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	11.7	3.3					33.6	7.5	2.1	27.7%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	89.8	82.0					92.0	12.5	9.8	78.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	85.1	74.0					91.5	10.0	6.3	63.4%

School J - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School J, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	40.3 (out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	52.4%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	23.8	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	22.4	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	12.5	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	3.5	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	78.0	67.0					90.0	5.0	2.4	47.8%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	91.1	67.0					90.0	6.0	6.0	100.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	93.5	67.0					100.0	4.0	3.2	80.3%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	16.2	5.3					50.0	5.0	1.2	24.4%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	36.7	15.9					75.0	5.0	1.8	35.2%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	98.4	88.2					100.0	2.0	1.7	86.4%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	25.1	3.3					33.6	7.5	5.4	71.9%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	90.4	82.0					92.0	12.5	10.5	84.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	88.2	74.0					91.5	10.0	8.1	81.1%

School J - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School J, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	**2**
Total Points	**38.6**
	(out of 82)
Percent of Possible Points	**47.1%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	30.3	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	20.3	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	9.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	3.3	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	78.0	67.0					90.0	5.0	2.4	47.8%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	83.5	67.0					90.0	6.0	4.3	71.7%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	92.6	67.0					100.0	4.0	3.1	77.6%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	33.9	5.3					50.0	5.0	3.2	64.0%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	41.7	15.9					75.0	5.0	2.2	43.7%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	22.9	17.9					47.0	2.5	0.4	17.2%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	9.1	4.2					24.4	2.5	0.6	24.3%
14. College Acceptance Rate	99.3	88.2					100.0	2.0	1.9	94.1%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	39.4	3.3					33.6	7.5	7.5	100.0%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	88.0	82.0					92.0	12.5	7.5	60.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	83.6	74.0					91.5	10.0	5.5	54.9%

School K - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School K, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	34.3 (out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	44.6%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range 25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
① Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
② Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	22.6	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	27.8	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	8.9	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	6.1	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
③ Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	86.0	67.0					90.0	5.0	4.1	82.6%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	76.7	67.0					90.0	6.0	2.5	42.2%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	76.7	67.0					100.0	4.0	1.2	29.4%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	31.7	5.3					50.0	5.0	3.0	59.1%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	94.0	15.9					75.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	94.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	1.0	49.2%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	20.0	3.3					33.6	7.5	4.1	55.1%
④ School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	89.9	82.0					92.0	12.5	9.9	79.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	80.2	74.0					91.5	10.0	3.5	35.4%

54

School K - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School K, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	40.0 (out of 89.5)
Percent of Possible Points	44.7%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range 25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
1 Student Progress (7.5)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math	53.5	30.0					65.0	7.5	5.0	67.1%
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	33.8	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	33.6	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	16.2	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	5.8	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	85.3	67.0					90.0	5.0	4.0	79.6%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	74.5	67.0					90.0	6.0	2.0	32.6%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	85.0	67.0					100.0	4.0	2.2	54.5%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	38.2	5.3					50.0	5.0	3.7	73.6%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	46.8	15.9					75.0	5.0	2.6	52.3%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	23.4	17.9					47.0	2.5	0.5	18.9%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	11.7	4.2					24.4	2.5	0.9	37.1%
14. College Acceptance Rate	98.7	88.2					100.0	2.0	1.8	89.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	19.5	3.3					33.6	7.5	4.0	53.5%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	89.2	82.0					92.0	12.5	9.0	72.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	81.7	74.0					91.5	10.0	4.4	44.0%

School L - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School L, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	21.0 (out of 52.5)
Percent of Possible Points	**40.0%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
① Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
② Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	28.6	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	10.7	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	14.3	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	7.1	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
③ Gateway (10)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	81.1	67.0					90.0	5.0	3.1	61.3%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate		67.0					90.0			
9. 5-year Graduation Rate		67.0					100.0			
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	25.0	5.3					50.0	5.0	2.2	44.1%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)		15.9					75.0			
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate		88.2					100.0			
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE		3.3					33.6			
④ School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	93.4	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	79.7	74.0					91.5	10.0	3.3	32.6%

School L - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School L, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary
Tier 2
Total Points 36.3
(out of 78)

Percent of
Possible 46.6%
Points

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	31.9	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	24.0	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	10.6	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	0.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (35.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	82.8	67.0					90.0	5.0	3.4	68.7%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	88.5	67.0					90.0	6.0	5.6	93.5%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate		67.0					100.0			
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	17.2	5.3					50.0	5.0	1.3	26.6%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	34.8	15.9					75.0	5.0	1.6	32.0%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	26.1	17.9					47.0	2.5	0.7	28.2%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	0.0	4.2					24.4	2.5	0.0	0.0%
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	34.8	3.3					33.6	7.5	7.5	100.0%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	94.0	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	76.9	74.0					91.5	10.0	1.7	16.6%

School M - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School M, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	**3**
Total Points	**23.9**
	(out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	**31.1%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			% of Target Range							
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	26.0	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	16.7	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	11.5	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	1.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	80.2	67.0					90.0	5.0	2.9	57.4%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	72.1	67.0					90.0	6.0	1.3	22.2%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	83.7	67.0					100.0	4.0	2.0	50.6%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	15.7	5.3					50.0	5.0	1.2	23.3%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	60.0	15.9					75.0	5.0	3.7	74.6%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	12.3	3.3					33.6	7.5	2.2	29.7%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	87.8	82.0					92.0	12.5	7.3	58.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	76.3	74.0					91.5	10.0	1.3	13.1%

School M - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School M, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	39.5
	(out of 89.5)
Percent of Possible Points	44.2%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
① Student Progress (7.5)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math	52.0	30.0					65.0	7.5	4.7	62.9%
② Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	34.5	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	24.6	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	22.4	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	0.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
③ Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	94.1	67.0					90.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	76.0	67.0					90.0	6.0	2.3	39.1%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	87.0	67.0					100.0	4.0	2.4	60.6%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	30.9	5.3					50.0	5.0	2.9	57.3%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	54.1	15.9					75.0	5.0	3.2	64.6%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	31.1	17.9					47.0	2.5	1.1	45.4%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	4.9	4.2					24.4	2.5	0.1	3.5%
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	27.9	3.3					33.6	7.5	6.1	81.2%
④ School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	86.5	82.0					92.0	12.5	5.6	45.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	81.0	74.0					91.5	10.0	4.0	40.0%

School N - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School N, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	40.3 (out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	52.3%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	31.7	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	10.4	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	13.3	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	0.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	79.1	67.0					90.0	5.0	2.6	52.6%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	92.6	67.0					90.0	6.0	6.0	100.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	92.6	67.0					100.0	4.0	3.1	77.6%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	20.5	5.3					50.0	5.0	1.7	34.0%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	36.4	15.9					75.0	5.0	1.7	34.7%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	13.6	3.3					33.6	7.5	2.5	34.0%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	92.3	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	88.1	74.0					91.5	10.0	8.1	80.6%

School N - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School N, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	49.5 (out of 82)
Percent of Possible Points	**60.4%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
① Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
② Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	61.0	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	47.5	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	35.6	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	13.6	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
③ Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	87.2	67.0					90.0	5.0	4.4	87.8%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	95.5	67.0					90.0	6.0	6.0	100.0%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	97.7	67.0					100.0	4.0	3.7	93.0%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	28.8	5.3					50.0	5.0	2.6	52.6%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	52.4	15.9					75.0	5.0	3.1	61.8%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	35.7	17.9					47.0	2.5	1.5	61.2%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	14.3	4.2					24.4	2.5	1.3	50.0%
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	61.9	3.3					33.6	7.5	7.5	100.0%
④ School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	93.9	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	82.6	74.0					91.5	10.0	4.9	49.1%

School O - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School O, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	30.9 (out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	40.1%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	44.4	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	34.6	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	21.0	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	6.2	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	89.5	67.0					90.0	5.0	4.9	97.8%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	78.3	67.0					90.0	6.0	2.9	49.1%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	86.7	67.0					100.0	4.0	2.4	59.7%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	16.0	5.3					50.0	5.0	1.2	23.9%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	22.4	15.9					75.0	5.0	0.5	11.0%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	85.7	88.2					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	4.1	3.3					33.6	7.5	0.2	2.6%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	93.7	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	84.9	74.0					91.5	10.0	6.2	62.3%

62

School O - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School O, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	36.6 (out of 89.5)
Percent of Possible Points	40.9%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range				Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
			25	50	75	100				
1 Student Progress (7.5)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA	49.0	30.0					65.0	7.5	4.1	54.3%
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	44.8	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	19.7	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	17.2	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	9.9	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	91.1	67.0					90.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	77.6	67.0					90.0	6.0	2.8	46.1%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	85.5	67.0					100.0	4.0	2.2	56.1%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	14.3	5.3					50.0	5.0	1.0	20.1%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	42.6	15.9					75.0	5.0	2.3	45.2%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	19.1	17.9					47.0	2.5	0.1	4.1%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	10.6	4.2					24.4	2.5	0.8	31.7%
14. College Acceptance Rate	100.0	88.2					100.0	2.0	2.0	100.0%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	0.0	3.3					33.6	7.5	0.0	0.0%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	95.9	82.0					92.0	12.5	12.5	100.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	80.7	74.0					91.5	10.0	3.8	38.3%

School P - 2016-2017 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School P, Sample Data 2016-17

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	40.6
	(out of 77)
Percent of Possible Points	**52.7%**

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	52.2	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	57.3	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	30.4	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	27.3	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (34.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	80.1	67.0					90.0	5.0	2.8	57.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	89.4	67.0					90.0	6.0	5.8	97.4%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	94.1	67.0					100.0	4.0	3.3	82.1%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	18.0	5.3					50.0	5.0	1.4	28.4%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	72.5	15.9					75.0	5.0	4.8	95.8%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)		17.9					47.0			
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)		4.2					24.4			
14. College Acceptance Rate	96.3	88.2					100.0	2.0	1.4	68.6%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	46.3	3.3					33.6	7.5	7.5	100.0%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	87.1	82.0					92.0	12.5	6.4	51.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	86.5	74.0					91.5	10.0	7.1	71.4%

School P - 2017-2018 Simulation

School Quality Report Calculator
School P, Sample Data 2017-18

Proposed High School PMF Policy

Performance Summary

Tier	2
Total Points	45.4
	(out of 82)
Percent of Possible Points	55.4%

Academic Review

Points Available in Each Academic Indicator Are Included in Parentheses ( )	ENTER VALUES BELOW	Floor	% of Target Range 25	50	75	100	Target	Points Possible	Points Earned	Possible Points
1 Student Progress (0)										
1. Median Growth Percentile - ELA		30.0					65.0			
2. Median Growth Percentile - Math		30.0					65.0			
2 Student Achievement (20)										
3. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 3+	46.5	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
4. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 3+	44.1	80.0					100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0%
5. PARCC/MSAA ELA Level 4+	22.4	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
6. PARCC/MSAA Math Level 4+	14.9	60.0					90.0	8.0	0.0	0.0%
3 Gateway (39.5)										
7. 9th Grade on Track to Graduate	90.3	67.0					90.0	5.0	5.0	100.0%
8. 4-year Graduation Rate	81.1	67.0					90.0	6.0	3.7	61.3%
9. 5-year Graduation Rate	92.2	67.0					100.0	4.0	3.1	76.4%
10. PSAT Performance (Grade 11)	36.2	5.3					50.0	5.0	3.5	69.1%
11. SAT/ACT Baseline Performance (Grade 12)	72.1	15.9					75.0	5.0	4.8	95.1%
12. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: ERW (Grade 12)	26.9	17.9					47.0	2.5	0.8	30.9%
13. SAT/ACT College and Career Ready: Math (Grade 12)	20.2	4.2					24.4	2.5	2.0	79.2%
14. College Acceptance Rate	94.2	88.2					100.0	2.0	1.0	50.8%
15. College Readiness: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE	51.0	3.3					33.6	7.5	7.5	100.0%
4 School Environment (22.5)										
16. In Seat Attendance Rate	87.7	82.0					92.0	12.5	7.1	57.0%
17. Re-Enrollment Rate	86.4	74.0					91.5	10.0	7.1	70.9%

Curriculum Vitae

Melodi Sampson was born in Springfield, Illinois on December 12, 1986. She worked for nearly four years in a Washington, DC public charter school where she was responsible for student enrollment and data management. Melodi is a Senior Specialist in the School Performance Department at the DC Public Charter School Board, where she has worked for over five years. She is responsible for managing the production of the agency's annual School Quality Reports, developing and implementing the agency's Adult Education Performance Management Framework, monitoring low-performing public charter schools, and evaluating petitions for new public charter schools. Melodi graduated *magna cum laude* with a Bachelor of Arts in International Studies from American University. She is a candidate for a Master of Arts in Public Management at Johns Hopkins University.