

Supplemental Report 3

Notes on Methods Used to Gather and Analyze Information Included in the Accountability Report and Supplemental Reports

Parent, Staff and Student Surveys

In 2006-07 the Mayor's Office partnered with the Center of Excellence in Leadership of Learning (CELL) at the University of Indianapolis, the Center for School Choice at Vanderbilt University, and the Network of Effective Small Schools in Indianapolis (NESSI), for survey development and administration. Data was collected in all 16 schools between the end of April and June 2007. A sample copy of the parent, staff, and student survey instruments are available online at www.indygov.org/eGov/Mayor/Education/Charter/Accountability/2007/

Parent surveys. Parent surveys took approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Each family was asked to complete one survey even if more than one child from a family attended the charter school. Schools distributed copies of the surveys on-site during parent-teacher conferences, sent them home with students, and handed them to parents and guardians as they dropped off or picked up their students at school. Parents had the option to complete the surveys at home or at school and to return the surveys either to collection boxes at each school or by mail in envelopes provided by CELL. To increase response rates, the Center for School Choice at Vanderbilt University provided incentives for teachers and parents. Parents completing the survey received a \$25 gift card available for use at one of two local retail stores. Teachers achieving an 80 percent or higher response rate from parents of students in their class received \$200 for use on classroom supplies and student-related activities. In 15 of the 16 schools, 80 percent or more of parents completed and returned the surveys. The table below contains response rates for each school.

Teacher surveys. The teacher survey took approximately 30 to 40 minutes to complete. Teachers at each of the 16 schools completed paper and pencil copies of the teacher survey during a regularly scheduled staff meeting at each school. All schools had 100 percent of their teachers participate in the teacher survey.

Student surveys. Student surveys took 15 to 20 minutes to complete for students in grades 6 through 8 and 20 to 30 minutes for students in grades 9 through 12. The high school (grades 9-12) survey contained more questions than the upper elementary/middle school survey. CELL staff provided copies of the survey and technical assistance as needed, including data collection in classrooms.

Survey calculations. Results were rounded to the nearest whole percentage point and, as a result, percentages may not always equal 100. Calculations for the three surveys do not include missing or "don't know" responses.

Figure A. Parent and staff survey response rates

	Parent survey		Staff survey		Student survey	
	Number of respondents	Response rate	Number of respondents	Response rate	Number of respondents	Response rate
21 st Century Fall Creek Charter School	216	84%	20	100%	102	93%
21 st Century Charter School at Fountain Square	97	82%	21	100%	102	71%
Andrew J. Brown Academy	359	83%	33	100%	109	90%
Challenge Foundation Academy	200	92%	16	100%	N/A	N/A
Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School	168	89%	25	100%	218	94%
Christel House Academy	253	84%	32	100%	51	75%
Decatur Discovery Academy	85	81%	11	100%	105	92%
Flanner House Elementary School	186	88%	17	100%	17	82%
Herron High School	72	80%	11	100%	83	89%
Hope Academy	17	63%	6	100%	12	57%
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School	236	81%	28	100%	35	84%
Indianapolis Metropolitan Career Academy #1	80	80%	16	100%	85	76%
Indianapolis Metropolitan Career Academy #2	74	80%	11	100%	87	86%
KIPP Indianapolis College Preparatory	172	82%	19	100%	127	90%
Lawrence Early College High School	105	81%	13	100%	115	95%
Southeast Neighborhood School of Excellence	160	83%	21	100%	N/A	N/A

Source: All results are from confidential surveys of Mayor-sponsored charter school parents, staff, and students administered in spring 2007 by CELL.

Survey analyses and verifications. Dr. Ruth Green, Senior Fellow for School Evaluation at CELL, led the overall survey administration. Dr. Zora Ziazi and Dr. Mary Jo Ratterman, Research Associates at CELL, coordinated the survey data collection for the surveys. Analysis of the survey data was completed by Dr. Laura Green, an experimental psychologist and Research Associate with the Research Triangle Institute in Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

Expert Site Visits

CELL developed a detailed protocol to guide expert site visits of Mayor-sponsored schools. The protocol, which addresses the overarching questions outlined in the Charter School Performance Framework, sets forth a detailed schedule for the visits, including lists of questions to be posed to different groups of school stakeholders.

Mayor-sponsored charter schools in their first, second, and third year of operation were visited by multi-member expert site teams during 2006-07. Each of the seven schools in their first or second year of operation received a site visit for one full day in late fall and again in the spring.

A site visit team also visited the five third year schools throughout the school year. Dr. Ruth Green of CELL served as the team leader for each site visit conducted in 2006-07.

To maintain independent, third-party objectivity, Mayor's Office staff does not participate in the site visits. The site visit team conducted classroom observations, held focus groups with staff, students, and parents, and reviewed curriculum- and business-related items. Additionally, each third-year school received technical assistance and conducted a self-evaluation, and those schools' site visits included activities related to their self-evaluation.

At the end of each visit, the site visit team provided school leaders and the Mayor's Office with oral and written feedback based on their observations, citing key commendations and areas for improvement. The Mayor's Office uses the findings in the written reports, along with the other feedback, as the basis for some of the observations on school performance included in this Accountability Report.

The Mayor's Office retained SchoolWorks, an educational consulting group, to train local experts to conduct the fourth-year charter review (FYCR) of the sole fourth-year school. This team of independent experts conducted a two-and-a-half day evaluation of the school's programs and practices. The team visited the school in March and May 2007. David Soots, an experienced educator and site visit team member, led the review team. The FYCR team conducted classroom observations, held focus groups with staff, students, and parents, and reviewed academic systems and governance structure. The Mayor's Office uses the findings in the fourth year reports, along with the other feedback, as the basis for some of the observations on school performance included in the Accountability Report.

For the three schools in their fifth year of operation, an expert site visit team conducted a follow-up review on any areas in which each school received a "Does Not Meet Standard" rating in its FYCR. These reviews were customized for each school based on the area in which the school received the "Does Not Meet Standard" rating.

Detailed descriptions of the site visit process and protocol, and the fourth year charter review and fifth year follow-up protocol is available online at www.indygov.org/eGov/Mayor/Education/Charter/Accountability/2007/

Test Score Analysis

Validity of Norm-Referenced Tests: Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress

Measuring school performance fairly is best done through multiple lenses. The Mayor's Office has determined that it should not only look at the performance of students at a given point in time – such as the performance of students in a given year on the Indiana Statewide Testing of Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+) – but should also consider the growth or improvement of those students over time.

The ISTEP+ measures of proficiency in math and English provide essential information. At the present time, however, it is not possible for the Mayor's Office to track the progress of individual students on the ISTEP+ from year to year. Also, because first-year schools had just opened when ISTEP+ was administered in fall 2006, their results do not indicate how much students had learned at those charter schools. Instead, those schools' results provide information about their students' starting levels of knowledge and skills.

To ensure that the Mayor's Office, the schools, and the general public have an ongoing sense of the progress of Mayor-sponsored charter schools, the Mayor's Office requires the schools to administer an additional norm-referenced test in both the fall and spring of each year for all students in grades 2nd through 10th. This test, the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), is produced by the well-respected Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA). It is a battery of tests in several subject areas and is administered under uniform conditions in each subject and grade level. The test produces scores that can be compared to the average scores attained by students across Indiana and the nation as a whole.

State and national averages for the test enable observers to compare student results to similar students in Indiana and nationally. NWEA developed its norm groups by extensive sampling of student performance across districts from the major geographic regions of the country, the spectrum of district enrollment, and a broad range of socio-economic status. For example, over 2.3 million students are included in the most recent norming group. They are drawn from 5,616 schools in 794 school districts and 32 states, and include 1,942,468 students tested in the fall of 2003 and 2004 and 1,818,403 students tested in the spring of 2003 and 2004. Within Indiana, NWEA used a norming sample for reading of 323,582 students in the fall and 425,143 students in the spring. In short, the MAP is a sound, nationally- and state-normed test that is representative and recent.

Test Score Analysis Methods

In addition to using NWEA's assessments, the Mayor's Office also enlisted NWEA to conduct a rigorous analysis of the growth of school performance from fall to spring in the Mayor's charter schools during the 2006-07 academic year.

When producing the analysis, a three-step process was implemented for each grade and subject area.

First, NWEA identified students who had taken a particular subject test in both fall 2006 and spring 2007. Students whose growth rates were more than 40 points above or below mean growth were excluded from the analysis. According to NWEA, growth rates this far away from the mean are extraordinarily likely to reflect data entry or other errors rather than actual changes in student performance over the course of the year. Only 29 out of 3,182 total scores across the three different tests, or 0.1%, were excluded from the analysis due to this rule. Using the remaining students' scores only, NWEA calculated the difference between the average spring score and the average fall score, by grade and subject area for each school. This difference was deemed the average growth rate for that school in that particular grade and subject.

Second, to provide state and national comparisons, the average growth rates within each subject and grade for a school were compared to the average growth rate for Indiana and the nation, respectively, as reported by NWEA. A statistical test was performed to determine if the school's growth rate was significantly different from the state or national average growth rate. If the school's growth rate was significantly larger than the average, the school was deemed to have "gained ground" compared to peers in the state or nation. If the school's growth rate was significantly smaller than the average, the school was deemed to have "lost ground" compared to peers in the state or nation. Otherwise, the school was deemed to have "stayed even."

Third, NWEA determined the percentage of students in grades 2 through 8 who were "on track" to reach proficiency. For each of these students, NWEA identified a target score on the MAP that the student would need to achieve to be proficient in math, reading, and language. If the student already met the target, he or she was deemed to be "on track." If the student had not yet met the target, NWEA determined how much growth the student needed to achieve from fall

2006 to spring 2007 to be on track to reach the target within a certain period of time, usually two years (see Figure B). If the student achieved the necessary amount of growth, he or she was deemed to be on target. The percentage of students whose growth rate is sufficient to become proficient over time is then calculated for each grade and subject within each school.

For example, a school has a 3rd grade student who in fall 2006 was 34 points below the target score needed to be proficient by the end of 5th grade (and therefore proficient in the 5th grade Indiana Standards, measured by the ISTEP+ test administered at the beginning of 6th grade). According to NWEA's large database of student information, students normally achieve about 45% of their growth toward proficiency in the first year of this set. This student therefore needs to grow by about 15 points (45% of 34) in 3rd grade in order to be on track.

The MAP assessment does not have specific proficiency cut points or performance standards, but it does correlate to the ISTEP+ test. For example, a MAP score of 216 for grade 8 in Language Arts correlates to a level of "Pass" on the ISTEP.¹ These cut points were used to determine whether students were on track to reach proficiency over time. NWEA projected no more than two years into the future for any given student. Figure B shows how this calculation worked for each grade.

Figure B. Explanation of how sufficient gains calculations were conducted for each grade level

For students in this grade level...	...the student's 2006-07 growth rate was projected for this many years...	...to determine if the student would be proficient according to Indiana standards by fall of this grade level:
2nd	2	5 th
3rd	2	6 th
4th	2	7 th
5th	2	8 th
6th	2	9 th
7th	1	9 th
8 th	0	9th
9th-12th	Calculation not possible for students in these grade levels because NWEA does not provide Indiana proficiency cutpoints beyond 9 th grade	

This analysis was not conducted for any grades beyond grade 8 because NWEA does not yet provide ISTEP+ correlated cut points for any grades beyond grade 9. If NWEA makes cut points available in higher grades in the future, the Mayor's Office may perform a similar analysis for these higher grades.

Sample Sizes

Figure C shows the number of students included in the comparisons of growth rates to state and national averages. Figure D shows the number of students included in the calculation of sufficient gains.

¹ For more information, please see the Northwest Evaluation Association Research Report, "A Study of the Ongoing Alignment of the NWEA RIT Scale with the Indiana Statewide Test for Educational Progress (ISTEP+)," September 2005.

The report only displays results in cases where at least 10 students' results were available for analysis.

Figure C. Number of students included in the comparative gains analysis, by school, subject, and grade level

School Name	Grade Level								
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Math									
21st Century Charter School at Fall Creek	12	28	19	23	24	24	27	14	5
21 st Century Charter School at Fountain Square	0	0	0	8	8	39	23	17	6
Andrew J. Brown Academy	61	67	68	54	55	42	16	0	0
Challenge Foundation Academy	35	37	39	33	0	0	0	0	0
Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School	0	0	0	0	37	33	55	24	30
Christel House Academy	45	46	51	45	30	17	16	0	0
Decatur Discovery Academy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	39
Flanner House Elementary School	30	29	26	26	16	0	0	0	0
Herron High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	0
Hope Academy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School	51	51	36	31	30	0	0	0	0
Indianapolis Metropolitan Career Academy #1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	25
Indianapolis Metropolitan Career Academy #2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	21
KIPP Indianapolis College Preparatory	0	0	0	54	54	58	0	0	0
Lawrence Early College High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	52
Southeast Neighborhood School of Excellence	41	37	33	18	0	0	0	0	0
Reading									
21st Century Charter School at Fall Creek	9	36	21	23	27	24	25	14	5
21 st Century Charter School at Fountain Square	0	0	0	8	8	39	25	17	8
Andrew J. Brown Academy	65	68	69	54	55	45	17	0	0
Challenge Foundation Academy	34	36	39	33	0	0	0	0	0
Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School	0	0	0	0	38	34	55	24	30
Christel House Academy	48	50	51	45	30	16	14	0	0
Decatur Discovery Academy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	40
Flanner House Elementary School	31	29	25	26	17	0	0	0	0
Herron High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	0
Hope Academy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School	50	51	37	31	26	0	0	0	0
Indianapolis Metropolitan Career Academy #1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	24
Indianapolis Metropolitan Career Academy #2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	21
KIPP Indianapolis College Preparatory	0	0	0	62	51	60	0	0	0
Lawrence Early College High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	51
Southeast Neighborhood School of Excellence	40	36	31	18	0	0	0	0	0
Language									
21st Century Charter School at Fall Creek	13	33	21	24	28	25	27	13	5
21 st Century Charter School at Fountain Square	0	0	0	8	8	41	24	17	8
Andrew J. Brown Academy	60	69	67	53	54	40	15	0	0
Challenge Foundation Academy	35	35	39	32	0	0	0	0	0
Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School	0	0	0	0	38	34	55	23	28
Christel House Academy	47	47	50	43	31	14	14	0	0
Decatur Discovery Academy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	40
Flanner House Elementary School	32	29	26	27	17	0	0	0	0
Herron High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	0
Hope Academy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School	40	45	29	31	24	0	0	0	0

School Name	Grade Level								
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Indianapolis Metropolitan Career Academy #1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19
Indianapolis Metropolitan Career Academy #2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	25
KIPP Indianapolis College Preparatory	0	0	0	54	56	45	0	0	0
Lawrence Early College High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	50
Southeast Neighborhood School of Excellence	41	36	31	18	0	0	0	0	0

Figure D. Number of students included in the sufficient gains analysis, by school, subject, and grade level

School Name	Grade Level							
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Math								
21st Century Charter School at Fall Creek	12	28	19	23	24	24	27	
21 st Century Charter School at Fountain Square	0	0	0	8	8	39	23	
Andrew J. Brown Academy	61	67	68	54	55	42	16	
Challenge Foundation Academy	35	37	39	33	0	0	0	
Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School	0	0	0	0	37	33	55	
Christel House Academy	45	46	51	45	30	17	16	
Flanner House Elementary School	30	29	26	26	16	0	0	
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School	51	51	36	31	30	0	0	
KIPP Indianapolis College Preparatory	0	0	0	54	54	58	0	
Southeast Neighborhood School of Excellence	41	37	33	18	0	0	0	
Reading								
21st Century Charter School at Fall Creek	9	36	21	23	27	24	25	
21 st Century Charter School at Fountain Square	0	0	0	8	8	40	25	
Andrew J. Brown Academy	65	68	69	54	55	45	17	
Challenge Foundation Academy	34	36	39	33	0	0	0	
Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School	0	0	0	0	38	34	55	
Christel House Academy	48	50	51	45	30	16	14	
Flanner House Elementary School	31	29	25	26	17	0	0	
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School	50	51	37	31	26	0	0	
KIPP Indianapolis College Preparatory	0	0	0	62	51	60	0	
Southeast Neighborhood School of Excellence	40	36	31	18	0	0	0	
Language								
21st Century Charter School at Fall Creek	13	33	21	24	28	25	27	
21 st Century Charter School at Fountain Square	0	0	0	8	8	41	24	
Andrew J. Brown Academy	60	69	67	53	54	40	15	
Challenge Foundation Academy	35	35	39	32	0	0	0	
Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School	0	0	0	0	38	34	55	
Christel House Academy	47	47	50	43	31	14	14	
Flanner House Elementary School	32	29	26	27	17	0	0	
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School	40	45	29	31	24	0	0	
KIPP Indianapolis College Preparatory	0	0	0	54	56	45	0	
Southeast Neighborhood School of Excellence	41	36	31	18	0	0	0	