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Figure 6. Estimated Number of Additional Graduates Needed to Reach a 90 Percent Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR) by State, 2013-14
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National Total: 284,591

Low-Graduation-Rate High Schools

To keep in line with ESSA, we moved from looking solely at the large high schools (300 or more students) producing significant numbers of non-graduates to further examining the high schools enrolling 100 or more students that reported an ACGR of 67 percent or less.
Figure 10. Percentage of High Schools (enrolling 100 or more students) with ACGR 67 Percent or Less, 2013-14
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Low-Graduation-Rate Schools

- When examining low-graduation-rate high schools by type:
  - 41% are regular district schools
  - 28% are alternative schools
  - 26% are charter schools
  - 7% are virtual schools

- To break it down further:
  - When removing alternative charter and alternative virtual from the alternative school category (10 and 2 percent of these schools, respectively), 23 percent of all low-graduation-rate high schools were alternative schools (district-operated).
  - This allows us to focus more intently on the schools that make up large percentages in each school type category.
# Breaking it Down by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
<th>% of Total Schools</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>% of Total Students</th>
<th># of School ACGR&lt;=67%</th>
<th># of Total Schools ACGR&lt;=67%</th>
<th># of Non-Graduates</th>
<th>% of Total Non-Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>15,132</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>12,642,786</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>413,484</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>34,426</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2,404</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>141,106</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4,414</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>242,794</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38,050</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>784,899</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>47,021</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>202,043</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20,673</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,104</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,048,054</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,397</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>526,046</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. States with the Highest Percentage of Low-Graduation-Rate High Schools that were Alternative Schools, 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>State Level AGGR for All Students, 2013-14</th>
<th>% of High Schools with AGGR of 67 Percent or Less that were Alternative High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The high schools in the above table have a total enrollment of 100 students or more. These alternative school calculations include all alternative schools, including charter and virtual schools that fall into NCES’ alternative typology.

Challenges & Limitations of Current Data

• Identification of programs vs. schools

• Misidentification of alternative programs/schools in federal data
  – A public elementary/secondary school that (1) addresses needs of students that typically cannot be met in a regular school, (2) provides nontraditional education, (3) serves as an adjunct to a regular school, or (4) falls outside the categories of regular, special education, or vocational education (NCES).

• Issues with using a four-year cohort grad rate
Extended-Year Graduation Rates

- Five-year graduation rates were available for 31 states, across 73 graduating cohorts over four years.
  - On average, five-year rates led to a three percent increase in overall graduation rates.

- Six-year graduation rates were available for 23 graduating cohorts in 13 states.
  - Six-year grad rates showed an average gain of one percent.

- When factoring in 5- and 6-year graduation rates, the national graduation rate would be closer to 86-87%.
Audience Q&A
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Background on Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) in Colorado

Jessica Knevals, MPA
Accountability and Policy Specialist, Accountability and Data Analysis
Colorado Department of Education
In Colorado, schools that serve primarily high-risk students are called “Alternative Education Campuses” or AECs for short.

As of 2014, Colorado had 84 AECs which serve just over 16,000 students.

AECs are outlined in C.R.S. 22-7-604.5 as schools:

- (I) “Having a specialized mission and serving a special needs or at-risk population”,
- (V) “Having nontraditional methods of instruction delivery”,
- (VI) (A) “Serving students who have severe limitations…”, and
- (VI)(B) “Serving a student population in which more than 90% of the students have an individualized education program...or meet the definition of a high-risk student”.
“High-Risk Student” is a student who has one or more of the following conditions:

- juvenile delinquent
- dropped out of school
- expelled from school
- history of personal drug or alcohol use
- history of personal street gang involvement
- history of child abuse or neglect
- has a parent or guardian in prison
- has an IEP
- family history of domestic violence
- repeated school suspensions
- parent or pregnant woman
- migrant child*
- homeless child
- history of a serious psychiatric or behavioral disorder*
- is over traditional school age for his or her grade level and lacks adequate credit hours for his or her grade level**
History of AECs in Colorado

2002
- C.R.S. 22-7-604.5
- Established definition of AECs

2008
- CO Coalition of Alt Ed Campuses commissioned to establish basic framework for alt. ed.

2009
- SB 09-163, CO Education Accountability Act
- Determined AECs no longer exempt from accountability

2010
- School Performance Framework (SPF) for AECs includes Academic Achievement, Academic Growth, Student Engagement, and Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

2011
- AECs allowed to include optional measures in School Performance Framework

2015
- HB15-1350
- Created AEC accountability work group to refine and update the current AEC accountability system

2016
- HB16-1429 (based on work group recs)
- Modifies minimum % of high-risk students and certain “high-risk indicators”
Alternative Accountability in Colorado
## AEC Accountability: Flexibility with Optional Measures

Alternative Education Campuses receive a School Performance Framework annually, similar to traditional schools. The main exception is AECs are measured on Student Engagement measure, rather than Growth Gaps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>State-Required Measures and Metrics</th>
<th>Optional Measures and Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Achievement</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>CMAS/PARCC % of students proficient in Reading, Math, Writing, Science</td>
<td>NWEA MAP, Scantron, Acuity, Galileo, Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT), Test for Adult Basic Education (TABE), STAR, and/or Accuplacer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Growth</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>CMAS/PARCC median growth percentiles in Reading, Math, Writing, and ACCESS (English language proficiency)</td>
<td>NWEA MAP, Scantron, Acuity, Galileo, Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT), Test for Adult Basic Education (TABE), ACCESS, STAR, and/or Accuplacer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Engagement</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1. Attendance rate</td>
<td>1. Student Re-engagement, 2. Returning students, 3. Socio-Emotional or Psychological Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2. Truancy rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postsecondary &amp; Workforce Readiness</strong></td>
<td>N/A 30%</td>
<td>1. Completion rate (best of 4, 5, 6, or 7 year rate)</td>
<td>1. Credit/course completion, 2. Workforce Readiness, 3. Post-Completion Success, 4. Successful transition (for non-degree granting schools only), 5. Graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dropout rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Colorado ACT score (average)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Use of Additional Measures on 2014 AEC SPF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>School Has State-Required Measures and Metrics</th>
<th>School Only Has State-Required Measures and Metrics</th>
<th>School Does Not Have State-Required Measures and Metrics</th>
<th>Total Percentage of AEC Schools that Submitted Optional Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Growth</td>
<td><strong>52.4%</strong></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td><strong>69.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary &amp; Workforce Readiness</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td><strong>55.6%</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schools receive a **rating** on each of the **performance indicators**:  
- **Exceeds** (4 pts), **Meets** (3), **Approaching** (2), **Does Not Meet** (1)

The **ratings roll up** to an overall evaluation of the school’s performance, which determines the **school plan type rating**:
- **Performance**, **Improvement**, **Priority Improvement**, **Turnaround**

Under SB 09-163, the “Colorado Education Accountability Act”, if a public school is required to implement a **priority improvement plan** or **turnaround plan** for 5 consecutive school years, the state board must recommend that the public school's school district or the institute **take one of several actions** specified in statute with regard to the public school.
AECs in Colorado are measured similarly to traditional schools, but the **weightings are lowered** to take into account the high-risk population served.

Without allowing **additional measures and revised cut-points** in the AEC SPF, **86% of AECs** would be on **priority improvement** or **turnaround** plans, whereas, now **only 24%** were.

AECs in Colorado are **gradually improving over time**. In 2011, **39% of AECs** were on **priority improvement** or **turnaround** plans, and in 2014, **only 24%** were.

AECs only constitute **5% of total schools in Colorado**, of the 190 schools on **priority improvement** or **turnaround** plans,

However, 21 of those 190 are AECs, which represents **11% of all schools** on **priority improvement** or **turnaround** plans.
HB15-1350: The Alternative Education Campus Accountability Work Group
Purpose and Charge for the AEC AWG

The Department of Education shall convene stakeholder meetings with the purpose to provide recommendations to the Commissioner, the education committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and the State Board of Education regarding performance indicators for the next iteration of the Alternative Education Campus School Performance Framework (AEC SPF) for release in the fall of 2016.
The commissioner selected at least one workgroup member from each of the subcategories outlined in HB15-1350 to comprehensively represent the AEC community in Colorado.
Charge of the Work Group

Qualitative and Quantitative Measures

- 95% high-risk threshold as Alt. Ed. Campus designation & student groups included
- Measure-specific cut points
- Investigate a comparison group to compare high-risk students across schools
- Current weighting system
Changes Needed for AEC Work Group Charge

Statute

95% threshold for Alt. Ed. Campus designation & student groups included

Rule

Qualitative and Quantitative Measures

Policy

Development of measure-specific cut points
Weighting System
Methods/costs associated with using cross-school student comparison groups
Documentation and verification methods for certifying that 95% threshold has been met
Recommendations of the AEC Accountability Work Group

**Qualitative and Quantitative Measures**
- Opportunity Measures indicator unique to a school’s design and mission
- Pilot a school quality review process

**Measure-specific cut points**
- Proposed a process for determining AEC appropriate cut-points for AEC SPF measures
- Created a guidance for how all measures are developed for AECs

**Current weighting system**
- Weigh achievement and growth results by the number of students included in each measure (as opposed to weighting each measure equally).

**Investigate a comparison group to compare high-risk students across schools**
- Identify a comparison group by using easily available data for identifying high risk conditions based on AEC student’s characteristics prior to enrolling in the AEC.

**95% high-risk threshold as Alt. Ed. Campus designation & student groups included**
- Lower the high-risk threshold for designation of an alternative education campus from 95% to 90% high-risk
- Expand 5 criteria of student groups included in high-risk threshold
Audience Q&A
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EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS AND APPROPRIATE ACCOUNTABILITY METRICS

NOVEMBER 14, 2016

Carla Gay, Director Early Warning Systems

Kirsten Plumeau, Director Contracted Alternative Schools
OVERVIEW OF CONTRACTING IN PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

- Determining Contractors: Five year bid process, all contracts are reviewed and renewed annually
- Annual Contracts: Calls for alternative accountability measures
- Alternative Schools: Programs (non-profits or other private alternative schools) with data that feeds the district data
- Paying Contractors: Oregon law allows district to use state school dollars to pay for contracted students at either the full amount or at 80% of per pupil net operating expense-based on daily attendance
- Attending an Alternative: Students must meet one of the three indicators – Attendance, Behavior, Course Performance
THE ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

- Metrics established by PPS staff and alternative school leaders over a two-year period
- Use the Annual CBO Program Accountability Goals form to establish goals with each school
- Data is compiled at the end of the year to create the Alternative Accountability Report Card
# THE PORTLAND FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Progress</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILL GROWTH</td>
<td>Percent of students who meet or exceed growth targets in Reading and Math on either MAP or CASAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDIT ATTAINMENT</td>
<td>Percent of students who meet targets for the number of credits earned for length of enrollment or earn their maximum required credits while in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Successful Completion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE YEAR HS GRADUATION RATE</td>
<td>Percent of students eligible for graduation who graduate within one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE READY GED ATTAINMENT RATE</td>
<td>Percent of students who meet/exceed GED target composite score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTSECONDARY READINESS</td>
<td>Percent of students who meet/exceed target college readiness scores on COMPASS or ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Connection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE</td>
<td>Percent of days attended by students enrolled at the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROWTH IN ATTENDANCE</td>
<td>Percent of students that show growth in their individual daily attendance rates compared to their individual daily attendance rate in the previous school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNUAL RETENTION RATE</td>
<td>Percent of students enrolled at an alternative school and retained from the point of enrollment to the end of the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL CLIMATE</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY METRICS</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC PROGRESS:</td>
<td>Skill Growth in Reading and Math on either MAP or CASAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of Students who meet or exceed growth targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION:</td>
<td>Postsecondary Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of students who meet/exceed target college readiness scores on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMPASS or ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL CONNECTION:</td>
<td>Annual Retention Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of students enrolled at the end of the school year who remained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enrolled or completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL CLIMATE:</td>
<td>School Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PPS Alternative High Schools

Program Description

The Multiple Pathways to Graduation Mission is to provide educational options for all youth that empower, engage, and prepare them for college, work training, and citizenship while serving as a vanguard for systems educational change. Portland Public Schools’ Alternative Education Options has contracted with approximately 15 community-based education agencies or organizations in the Portland area to serve students who have dropped out or are at risk of dropping out of PPS schools.

Student Demographics 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Students of Color</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Mean Age at Entry</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,183</td>
<td>1,121/1,062</td>
<td>1,121/1,062</td>
<td>1,121/1,062</td>
<td>1,121/1,062</td>
<td>1,121/1,062</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PPS District (Gr 9-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Students of Color</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Mean Age at Entry</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14,276</td>
<td>1,121/1,062</td>
<td>1,121/1,062</td>
<td>1,121/1,062</td>
<td>1,121/1,062</td>
<td>1,121/1,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/Ethnic Distribution 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>Asian 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Black 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Native American 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Hispanic 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Other Multi 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Multiple Race 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade Levels Served 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jr - 7</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr - 11</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student History

- Average number of PPS schools attended prior to enrollment: 4
- Average number of weeks out of PPS schools prior to enrollment: 11
- Average number of credits upon entry by grade level: Fr - 1

Academic Progress

- SKILL GROWTH (READING): Percent of students who met or exceeded growth targets
- SKILL GROWTH (MATH): Percent of students who met or exceeded growth targets
- Credit attainment: Percent of students who met targets for the number of credits earned for length of enrollment or earn their maximum required credits while in school

Successful Completion

- One-year graduation rate: Percent of students eligible for graduation who graduate within one year
- GED attainment: Percent of students who attained a GED
- *POSTSECONDARY READINESS: Postsecondary readiness measured by performance on COMPASS or ACT
- Average daily attendance: Percent of students who attended 65% or more school days
- Growth in attendance: Percent of students that show growth in their individual daily attendance rates compared to their individual attendance rates in the previous school year
- *ANNUAL RETENTION RATE: Percent of students enrolled at the end of the school year who were retained or completed

School Climate

- TO BE DETERMINED

Data Points 2014-15

- Overall Completion Rate: 313 students
- Exit Survey Completion: 345 students
- Average Daily Attendance: 65.0% hours (N=150)

Scale

- Needs
- Improvement
- Growing
- Prone
- Exemptary

*Highlighted metrics are considered more critical in the accountability framework.
EARLY WARNING SYSTEM (EWS)

- EWS Indicators
  - Attendance
  - Behavior
  - Course Performance

- Goals
  - To promote the systemic use of data
  - To use data to identify, intervene and monitor students
  - To intervene early

DROPPING OUT IS A PROCESS NOT AN EVENT
A COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY

Prevention

Establish a proactive system for identifying indicators of risk factors

Intervention

Teams use data to determine and apply appropriate interventions based on level of risk

Intensive Intervention

Reengagement

Monitor and evaluate impact of interventions so that fewer students require intensive intervention and reengagement

Eliminate the dropout pipeline

The Goal = Align the Data Tracking and Intervention Efforts to Support All Students
An Early Warning System Supports Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)
Appropriate Metrics?

Appropriate Metrics?

Appropriate Metrics?
## Design Appropriate Metrics: The ABCs of Differentiated EWS Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tiers</th>
<th>Attendance School Connection</th>
<th>Behavior School Climate</th>
<th>Course Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Maintain 90% or better attendance</td>
<td>Zero behavioral incidents; sense of belonging and goals</td>
<td>Standard 1 year growth in 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Improved attendance with 90% or better</td>
<td>1-2 behavior incidents or referrals; target is 0 exclusionary disc</td>
<td>Accelerated growth in 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Improved attendance with target of 80% or better</td>
<td>Fewer behavior incidents or referrals than prior year; target is 0 exclusionary disc</td>
<td>Accelerated growth over 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Improved attendance from prior school enrollment; target of 90% or greater in alt setting</td>
<td>After returning to school, improved self-management and goal setting; individualized metrics</td>
<td>Accelerated growth over 2 + years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audience Q&A

To submit live questions, please use the “Questions” box
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About the Brief

- Co-authored with Zachary Malter, Policy Research Assistant, AYPF
- Overview of “alternative” accountability measures used by states and districts to assess college and career readiness
- Focused on settings that serve at-risk or high-risk students

This Ask the CCRS Center Brief provides an overview of the accountability measures used by states and districts to assess the college and career readiness of students who are educated in alternative programs and schools (defined herein as alternative settings). Alternative settings are designed to serve at-risk students by providing pathways to educational success for students whose needs are not met in traditional school environments. Accountability measures currently used in alternative settings acknowledge the differing needs of students served and offer flexibility for measuring readiness as students progress through alternative settings.

Given that states now have the opportunity to design new accountability systems under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), they will have the flexibility to consider the needs of, and to develop accountability measures for, students in alternative settings. Whether states develop new accountability systems for alternative settings or revise existing measures, they can use this opportunity to ensure that all students receive a high-quality education that adequately prepares them for life beyond high school.

This brief describes various accountability measures used in alternative settings and offers recommendations for states as they move forward in designing new accountability systems under ESSA.
Participants in Alternative Education

Alternative schools are designed to serve at-risk students who are:

- Chronically absent
- Pregnant/parenting
- Have disciplinary problems
- Re-engaging with school
- Primary caregivers
- Returning from incarceration/adjudication
- Wards of the state
- In need of extra assistance
# Types of Alternative Education

| Setting                      | • Alternative Schools/Campuses  
|                             | • Alternative Programs within Traditional School |
| Instructional Format        | • Traditional Learning  
|                             | • Online/Blended Learning  
|                             | • Personalized Learning |
| Authorizer                  | • State Mandated, Authorized and Defined  
|                             | • Locally Mandated, Authorized, and Defined |
| Participation               | • Mandatory  
|                             | • Voluntary |
## Categories of Measures

### Table 1. Alternative Education Accountability Measures by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readiness to Receive Education</th>
<th>Demonstration of Learning</th>
<th>Readiness for College and Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reengagement</strong></td>
<td>Academic Credit Growth</td>
<td>One-Year Graduation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do students who previously dropped out stay enrolled once they have reengaged?</td>
<td>To what extent do students show growth in academic credits?</td>
<td>Do graduation-eligible students graduate at the end of the school year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Stabilization Rate</strong></td>
<td>Indicators of Academic Progress</td>
<td>Postsecondary/Workforce Readiness Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do students remain in school until the end of the school year?</td>
<td>Do students achieve specified academic goals?</td>
<td>How do students perform relative to various postsecondary and workforce readiness criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance Rate Growth</strong></td>
<td>Learning Gains</td>
<td>Pass Rate on College Readiness Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do students improve their school attendance?</td>
<td>To what extent do students make progressively greater learning gains throughout the year?</td>
<td>Do students pass a college readiness examination?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considerations for States

- Assess college and career readiness using a variety of measures throughout students’ academic trajectories.
- Identify measures that reflect the overall growth of the student and not just academic proficiency.
- Leverage ESSA to support at-risk students.

Note: While critically important for alternative settings, these measures can be useful for all students in all settings.
To submit live questions, please use the “Questions” box.
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