Delaware Academic Performance Review Report (*Alternative Framework*) Positive Outcomes Charter School ID#570

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

Exceeds Standard
Meets Standard
Does Not Meet Standard
Falls Far Below Standard

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

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

1.STUDENT PROGRESS OVER TIME (GROWTH)

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

No alternative framework methodology applied.

Percentage of Students Meeting Growth Targets.

Subject	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Math	45.3%	44.4%	58.2%
ELA	28.0%	50.0%	63.3%

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

No alternative framework methodology applied.

Percentage of Students in the Lowest Quartile Meeting Growth Targets.

Subject	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Math	66.7%	66.7%	85.0%
ELA	36.4%	52.4%	52.4%

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

Alternative framework targets applied.

Percentage of Students Making Sufficient Growth.

Subject	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Math	37.3%	43.2%	40.5%
ELA	22.7%	43.8%	60.8%

2. STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT (STATUS)

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

Alternative framework methodology applied. 1

School Proficiency Scores, State Comparison Averages and Percentiles

Subject and Year	School Prof %	Special Population School Average	Special Population 90th Percentile	Special Population 20th Percentile
Math, 2010-11	22.4%	9.6%	24.6%	0.0%
Math, 2011-12	35.0%	13.3%	40.6%	0.0%
Math, 2012-13	26.6%	13.1%	29.3%	0.0%
ELA, 2010-11	21.1%	9.8%	38.8%	0.0%
ELA, 2011-12	33.8%	17.9%	61.5%	0.0%
ELA, 2012-13	52.5%	19.8%	56.5%	0.2%

Note: 2013 State Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) were 70.0% for Reading and 70.2% for Mathematics.

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

Brennan School[†] John G. Leach[†] Positive Change (Parkway Academy)

Camelot Non-Secure Detention Kent County Community School Providence Corporation

Carver Center Kent County Alternative School Richardson Park Learning Center

Central School Kent County Secondary ILC Program

Charlton School Lake Forest ILC School for the Deaf

Chris Sturmfels Youth Center

Laurel Secondary ILC

Search Pyle Academy

School for the Deaf

Search Pyle Academy

School for the Deaf

Search Pyle Academy

School for the Deaf

Search Pyle Academy

Cleveland White School Lewes Day Treatment Center Silver Lake Treatment

Delaware Day Treatment Center Meadowood Program Smyrna Intensive Learning Center Smyrna Intensive Learning Center

Douglass SchoolNew Castle County Detention CenterStevenson HouseDSCYFNew Castle SchoolSussex ConsortiumFerris SchoolNortheast TreatmentTerry Psychiatric

First State School People's Place II – Townsend NSD[†] The Wallin School[†] Grace and Snowden School People's Place Non-Secure Detention[†] Western Sussex Academy^{***}

Howard T. Ennis[†]

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

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

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

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

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

Alternative framework methodology applied.²

NOTE: If a total subgroup population at a school was below 30, results are not reported and are presented as a ***.

Low Socio-Economic Status

Subject and Year	School Proficiency Rate	State Average Proficiency Rate	State Proficiency Rate at 90th Percentile	State Proficiency Rate at 20th Percentile
Math, 2010-11	18.4%	47.7%	75.8%	33.2%
Math, 2011-12	37.5%	62.3%	85.4%	46.0%
Math, 2012-13	25.0%	56.7%	87.2%	37.2%
ELA, 2010-11	26.5%	47.2%	73.6%	35.9%
ELA, 2011-12	30.4%	60.1%	86.6%	46.4%
ELA, 2012-13	51.2%	58.1%	83.0%	45.0%

Note: 2013 State Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) were 59.2% for Reading and 60.0% for Mathematics.

Students with Disabilities (Weighted by Disability Level)

Subject and Year	School Proficiency Rate	State Average Proficiency Rate	State Proficiency Rate at 90th Percentile	State Proficiency Rate at 20th Percentile
Math, 2010-11	7.1%	26.9%	59.7%	1.4%
Math, 2011-12	18.4%	35.2%	75.3%	1.3%
Math, 2012-13	18.2%	38.4%	76.5%	7.9%
ELA, 2010-11	9.5%	25.6%	58.8%	0.6%
ELA, 2011-12	20.4%	34.2%	73.4%	5.1%
ELA, 2012-13	36.4%	38.2%	78.1%	4.8%

Note: 2013 State Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) were 41.4% for Reading and 41.8% for Mathematics.

Supplemental Information (2012-13)

	SPED Level	# Tested at Positive Outcomes	School Proficiency Rate	State Weighted Average	
	200	5	20.0%	24.9%	
	300	23	13.0%	27.8%	
Math	601	11	9.1%	30.7%	
2	1000	13	38.5%	60.7%	
	1200	3	0.0%	74.8%	
	200	5	40.0%	31.6%	
	300	23	30.4%	27.1%	
ELA	601	11	9.1%	34.8%	
	1000	13	69.2%	54.5%	
	1200	3	33.3%	75.5%	

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

English Language Learners

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

Note: 2013 State Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) were 51.2% for Reading and 57.4% for Mathematics. No ELL results were reported for Positive Outcomes.

Subgroup Summary

9 1 7								
Year	Low	-SES	ELL		SWD		OVERALL RATING	
Teal	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA
10-11	F	F	***	***	D	D	F	F
11-12	F	F	***	***	D	D	F	F
12-13	F	D	***	***	D	D	F	D

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

Alternative framework methodology applied.³

School Proficiency Compared to Selected School Proficiency

Subject and Year	School Prof %	District Comparison
Math, 2010-11	22.4%	25.3%
Math, 2011-12	35.0%	5.9%
Math, 2012-13	26.6%	6.5%
ELA, 2010-11	21.1%	24.7%
ELA, 2011-12	33.8%	5.7%
ELA, 2012-13	52.5%	11.5%

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

Alternative framework methodology applied.4

School Proficiency Compared to Similar Schools Proficiency

Subject and Year	School Prof %	Similar Schools Prof%
Math, 2010-11	22.4%	47.0%
Math, 2011-12	35.0%	54.5%
Math, 2012-13	26.6%	52.4%
ELA, 2010-11	21.1%	47.2%
ELA, 2011-12	33.8%	55.1%
ELA, 2012-13	52.5%	54.3%

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

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

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

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

3. STATE AND FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Measure 3a. Did the school make AYP?

No alternative framework methodology applied.

Year	AYP Status					
2010-11	Does Not Meet					
2011-12	Meets					
2012-13	Does Not Meet					

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

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

No alternative framework methodology applied.

Percentage of Students receiving a 1550 or better on the SAT

Year	SAT High Score %						
2010-11	0.0%						
2011-12	0.0%						
2012-13	7.1%						

*2010-11: 2 students tested 2011-12: 5 students tested 2012-13: 13 students tested

Measure 4b. Are students graduating from high school?

No alternative framework methodology applied.

Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate

Year	Graduation Rate
2010-11	60.0%
2011-12	56.0%
2012-13	56.5%

Graduation rates are delayed one year, e.g. the 2012-13 performance framework includes the 2012 graduation rate.

5. MISSION-SPECIFIC ACADEMIC GOALS (OPTIONAL)

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

No alternative framework methodology applied.

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

SUMMARY AND OVERALL RATING

Alternative framework weighting applied.

Positive Outcomes Charter School

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

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

ır	1.a. Growth		1.b. Bottom 25%		1.c. Growth to Prof		2.a. Prof		2.b. Overall Subgroup		2.c. District		2.d. Similar Schools		- 3.a.	4.5	4.b.	5.a.	OVERALL RATING/
Year	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	AYP		Grad Rate	Mission Specific	TOTAL POINTS
10-11	D	F	М	F	D	F	М	М	F	F	D	D	F	F	D	F	F	NA	D/42
11-12	D	D	М	D	D	D	М	М	F	F	Е	Е	F	F	М	F	F	NA	D/53
12-13	D	М	Е	D	D	М	М	М	F	D	Е	Е	F	D	D	F	F	NA	D/60