

# **Minnesota Association of Alternative Programs**

## **POSITION PAPER**

### **Determining Adequate Yearly Progress with Multiple Measures for Accountability**

Nearly all alternative programs in Minnesota serve "at-risk" students. At-risk students are defined by law as having one or more of the following 11 characteristics: (1) are performing substantially below grade level; (2) at least one year behind in credits for graduation; (3) are pregnant or parents; (4) have experienced physical or sexual abuse; (5) are chemically dependent; (6) have mental health problems; (7) have been homeless recently; (8) have withdrawn from school or been chronically truant; or (9) speak English as a second language or have limited English proficiency.

Because alternative programs have a non-normal population of students, the same measures of program success used for schools with a normal population of students will be unfair, misleading and harmful. Nonetheless, alternative schools are highly vested in being accountable for results. In fact, they have worked hard for many years on school improvement processes. We believe the context of alternative schools and programs requires accommodations in the usual measures that determine adequate yearly progress. Clearly, a program for substance abuse students or dropouts will require more time to achieve the same results as a conventional high school.

Alternative programs work now to pioneer approaches that will be successful with at-risk students. In that spirit, alternative schools will willingly pilot new measures of accountability. We propose that alternative schools and programs be judged using multiple measures as described below.

## **PARAMETERS**

### **Adequate Yearly Progress reporting must:**

- State that AYP reports only one small aspect of school/program success.
- Recognize that not all learning institutions have the same mission and structural design as, for example in the following types of programs: academic, sobriety, parenting, self-image, seat time, independent study, online, community based, life transition, experimental. These may have very different populations, expectations, and programming.
- Recognize that a student's life situation may place him/her in jeopardy of school failure and that requires extraordinary efforts on behalf of the school/program, for example: physical/mental illness, family trauma, pregnancy, drug use & treatment.
- Recognize school/program processes that have contributed to student success regardless of the AYP requirements.

Here are some standard and unique measures that can be used with alternative programs to determine school success:

## MULTIPLE MEASURES

<b>CRITERIA</b>  <u>AYP</u> = Annual Yearly Progress. <u>PP</u> = Position Paper <u>UAP</u> = Unique to Alt. Programs	<b>TYPE</b> <u>C</u> = Common <u>U</u> = Unique	<b>ACTION</b>  Collect data on a program and statewide basis that will: *Address the effectiveness of the NCLB/AYP process. * Identify unique alt. program needs. * Direct CI efforts toward student achievement.	<b>REASONING</b>  AYP gives MAAP statewide data to address CI of AYP  PP gives MAAP statewide data to support the position paper  UAP gives MAAP statewide comparative, best practice & benchmark data.	<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	<b>CONTACT PERSON</b>
AYP	C	# students served – current & past 2 yrs. Disag by grade	Compliance & comparative data	MARSS	District MARSS person
AYP,PP	C	# students this year who were served last year. Disag by grade	“	MARSS	“
AYP, PP	C	#students served this year also served last 2 yrs. Disag by grade	“	MARSS	“
AYP	C	ADM per stud served – current & past 2 yrs. Disag by grade	“	MARSS	“
AYP	C	ADA per stud served – current & past 2 yrs. Disag by grade	“	MARSS	“
	C	# studs who retook BST – current & past 2 yrs	Comparative data	Internal program	
	C	# studs who passed BST – current & past 2 yrs	Comparative data	“	
AYP, UAP	U	# students who could have graduated in the 4 yr time frame when they started – current & past 2 yrs	Comparative data	“	
AYP	U	# studs who did grad w/in the 4 yr time frame – current & past 2 yrs	compliance	“	

AYP, PP, UAP	U	# studs who did grad (regardless of timing) – current & last 2 yrs	Comparative data	“	
PP,UAP	U	Case studies - Summaries written by 2 students explaining why they are at this site	Comparative data	Internal program	
PP	U	Case studies - Summaries written by 2 teachers explaining what went well this year	Comparative data	Internal program	
PP, UAP	U	Length of average student stay in program (non-grads & grads) (turn over)	Comparative data	“	
PP, UAP	U	Satisfaction Surveys: Student, parent/ significant other, business, staff, other	Comparative data	Internal	
PP, UAP	U	# credits earned – past versus present	Comparative data	Internal	
AYP	U	# advanced courses (AP, IBP, Gifted, PSEO, Contract for services) & % of student use	Compliance	Internal	
AYP, PP, UAP	U	# remedial courses and % of student use	CI of AYP	Internal	
AYP	U C	Disciplinary incidents. Disag by incident	Compliance		
PP	U	Follow-up results of grads & early exit students	How helpful was the program & suggestions for improvement	Internal	
PP	U	Student Profile ( see attached)	Identify student & needs to set goals for program	Internal	
UAP	U	Statement of unique problems, concerns, opportunities, successes, etc.		Internal	
PP	U	Annual Report ( see attached or School Assessment Guide)	Shows progress regardless of AYP. Explain successes and needs to stakeholders	Internal	
PP	U	Program Continuous Improvement Plan (NCA, MCQ/Baldrige, other)	Shows CI efforts regardless of AYP. Show total program assessment, improvement plan, results, resource use & needs	Internal	

		School/term completion & # of credits earned		“	
		% of active enrollment to capacity		“	
		Cost per instructional hour. (Total costs / # of student hours)		“	
		Student teacher ratio		Internal/MARSS?	
		Length of time student out of school & what they did while out		Internal	
		# of students served per grade		internal	
		Break down of fulltime, part time, IS, dual enrolled.		Internal/MARSS?	
		Reading & math scores with yearly gain		(AYP results – other)	
		% of time students spend on core academics		internal	
		% of time in community based & (Voc) academic activities		internal	
		Content standard implementation		internal	