

# School Designation Detailed Methodology

## Reward

**Identify the “highest-performing schools” and “high-progress schools” based in all-students group over a number of years to recognize achievement and mentor lower-performing schools**

### ***Highest-performing (Title I schools):***

- Top 30% of schools based on average ELA and Math performance of the all students group (percent proficient and above) in each of the years 2011 through 2013 and on 2013 graduation rates\* (for schools with graduation rate data); and
- Within-school achievement gap (as defined in focus schools section) in the lowest 30% across all participating schools for 2013; or
- The lowest performing subgroup in each school has improved from 2011 to 2013 (i.e. change is >0); and
- Met CA AYP in 2013, defined as the following, per AYP guidelines:
  - Met proficiency rates for all students and all subgroups; and
  - Reached 770 API or grew by at least 1 point; and
  - Met the graduation rate requirement (or the growth target)

### ***High-progress (Title I schools):***

- Top 10% most improved academic performance from 2011 to 2013 across average ELA and Math in all grades in the “all students” group (percent proficient and above) and
- Top 30% most improved graduation rate from 2011 to 2013\*; and
- The lowest performing subgroup in each school has improved by at least 5% points from 2011 to 2013
  - Schools cannot be designated highest-progress if they have a stagnant or worsening achievement gap. By showing significant improved performance for a school’s lowest performing subgroup, our methodology meets USED’s requirement that a High-Progress school must not have significant achievement gaps that are not closing

**Before finalization, superintendents were asked to review lists and identify schools that should be excluded (e.g., credit recovery programs, independent study schools, schools for students with severe disabilities, early education programs, “newcomer” schools)**

*\*Years of graduation rates reflect the AYP reporting year. So, for instance, 2013 reflects 2013 AYP graduation rates (based upon the graduation rate of the class of 2012).*

## School Designation Detailed Methodology

### Priority

**Note:** Only those schools that were not part of last year's designation analysis were eligible to be newly identified as Priority.

**Identify lowest-performing schools based on all-students group for partnership with a Reward or other high-performing/high-progress school**

- Includes Current SIG schools
- Includes Title I schools in the lowest 5% of proficiency based upon average ELA and Math proficiency rates (proficient and above) of the "all students" group (Lowest 5% for 2013, 2012; lowest 10% for 2011)
- Includes Title I schools with graduation rate of <60% for each of the last 3 years

### Focus

**Note:** Only those schools that were not part of last year's designation analysis were eligible to be newly identified as Focus.

**Identify schools with "within-school-gaps" and "low-achieving-subgroups" over a number of years to enter communities of practice designed to improve performance of lowest-achieving subgroups**

- Within-School Achievement Gap: includes Title I schools in the lowest 5% of based upon their achievement gap (lowest 5% for 2013, 2012, and 2011)
  - Achievement gap determined by subtracting the minimum subgroup performance from the maximum subgroup performance
  - Subgroup performance defined as the average ELA and Math percent proficient or above in each year
  - Includes all subgroups with performance information in the AYP datasets
- Low-Achieving Subgroup: includes Title I schools with subgroups with less than 20% average proficiency on Math and ELA assessments in 2013 and less than 5 percentage points of improvement from 2011-2013
  - Includes all subgroups with performance information in the AYP datasets
- Low Graduation: includes Title I schools with a graduation rate of less than 60% in 2013\* that is not already identified as a Priority school.

Before finalization, superintendents were asked to review lists and identify schools that should be excluded (e.g., credit recovery programs, independent study schools, schools for students with severe disabilities, early education programs)

\*Years of graduation rates reflect the AYP reporting year. So, for instance, 2013 reflects 2013 AYP graduation rates (based upon the graduation rate of the class of 2012).

## School Designation Detailed Methodology

### Did Not Meet AMO

Identifies schools that do not meet their annual CA API growth or graduation rate target and are in the bottom 30% of the CA API scores among CORE waiver districts

- Includes Title I schools that:
  - Do not meet their annual CA API growth target in 2013 OR
  - Do not meet their CA graduation rate target in 2013 AND
  - Are in the bottom 30% of the CA API scores for 2013 among participating schools in CORE waiver districts
- This metric will change in measurement until the full AMO goal is in effect in 2017-18, as detailed on [page 173 of the redlined waiver](#).

#### Determining intervention status of schools that did not meet the AMO:

- If a school was part of the analysis in Summer 2013, missed the AMO in Summer 2013, and met the AMO in Summer 2014, then the school is no longer part of mandatory interventions (e.g., the Community of Practice program)
- If a school was part of the analysis in Summer 2013, missed the AMO in Summer 2013, and missed the AMO again in Summer 2014, then the school is in year 2 of mandatory interventions (e.g., the Community of Practice program)
- If a school was part of the analysis in Summer 2013, met the AMO in Summer 2013 and missed the AMO in Summer 2014 for the first time, then that school is in year 1 of missing their AMO and not part of mandatory interventions yet. If such schools miss the AMO again next year, they will be part of mandatory interventions.
- *If a school was not part of the analysis in Summer 2013 and missed the AMO in Summer 2014, then we may choose to have such schools participate in Communities of Practice to be consistent with our approach with first time schools for other designations.*

Before finalization, superintendents were asked to review lists and identify schools that should be excluded (e.g., credit recovery programs, independent study schools, schools for students with severe disabilities, early education programs)