PUERTO RICO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PERSISTENTLY LOWEST ACHIEVING SCHOOLS DEFINITION

The Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) used the following sets of rules to determine the schools for the three 1003(g) Tiers.

IDENTIFYING PERSISTENTLY LOWEST ACHIEVING

Three factors have been taken on consideration on identifying Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools:

FACTOR 1: All Title I schools that were identified in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in **2009-2010** were assessed.

FACTOR 2: **Assessment data for year 2009-2010** was used to identify 'persistence'. Academic achievement of the "all students group"-Students scores under the "all student group" for Math, Spanish and English were ranked according to the "adding ranks method" for the universe of schools that fall under the FACTOR 1 criteria.

This process produced a list of **1,256** candidate schools.

FACTOR 3: Failure to Make Progress- PRDE decided to weight a school's "failure to make progress" as 25% of the overall rank a school receives. This means that the "adding ranks" method described in Factor II was weighted as 75% of the overall rank a school receives.

DETERMINING TIER CANDIDATES

TIER I

DEFINITION OF A TIER I SCHOOL:
(a) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that:

(i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

From the list of **1,256** candidate schools, the SEA identified the lowest achieving 5% as TIER I.

TIER II

DEFINITION OF A TIER II SCHOOL:

(b) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that —

(i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

Based upon the criteria, the PRDE has no eligible TIER II schools.

- All schools eligible for Title I funding receive it. The requirement of having *secondary schools eligible for Title I, Part A funds and do not receive it* is not met.
- No High School has at least two consecutive years with graduation rates below 60%. (Page 13 of the June 29, 2010 Guidance) Requirement *(B)(2) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years* is not met.

TIER III

DEFINITION OF A TIER III SCHOOL:

In addition to the Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not Tier I (or Tier II) schools, at its option, an SEA may identify as a Tier III school a school that is eligible for Title I, Part A funds and that:

(a) (i) Has not made AYP for at least two years; or
(ii) Is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

(b) Does not meet the requirements to be a Tier I or Tier II school.

In accordance with this definition, an SEA may not identify as a Tier III school any newly eligible school that is as low achieving as a Tier I or Tier II school or a high school that has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.

The PRDE as the SEA will identify as Tier 3 schools the remaining **1,193** schools that are on the **1,256** schools list that met FACTOR 1 FACTOR 2 and FACTOR 3, and are not part of the Tier 1 schools list. In addition, based on available program funding, the schools selected will be the lowest performing of these **1,193** schools and that are in districts determined to have the capacity to manage school improvement.

Factor III: Failure to Make Progress

Based on the criteria identified in Factors I and II above, PRDE identified **1,256** schools as eligible for consideration for implementation of one of the SIG models. The list of **1,256** schools was analyzed to determine which schools demonstrated a "failure to make progress". PRDE determined "failure to make progress" based on a school's year of improvement. PRDE included a school's improvement status for the **09-10** academic year in the determination of "failure to make progress".

The number of years in improvement for each of the 1,256 identified schools ranged in value from 1 year to 10 years. The number of years in improvement for the considered year was used to produce the NUMBER OF YEARS IN IMPROVEMENT criteria. For example, a school that has been only in improvement for 1 year would have an NUMBER OF YEARS IN IMPROVEMENT of 1. Alternately, a school that has been in improvement most recently in year 10 of improvement, could have a NUMBER OF YEARS IN IMPROVEMENT of 10.

Table 1 provides illustration of the NUMBER OF YEARS IN IMPROVEMENT for six (6) different schools. Based on the distribution of number of years in improvement for the considered year for all schools, the maximum overall school improvement scores of 10 (See School F).

TABLE 1

School/IMP YR	Years in Improvement	
	2009-2010	NUMBER OF YEARS IN IMPROVEMENT
School A	1	1
School B	2	2
School C	5	5
School D	6	6
School E	8	8
School F[1]	10	10

[1] Illustrates worst-case scenario and greatest number of years in improvement for each year under consideration. The maximum value for the Number of Years In Improvement is 10.

The value for NUMBER OF YEARS IN IMPROVEMENT needed to be translated into a value that was comparable in scale to the value used in the "adding ranks" method. This translation would allow PRDE to combine the GLOBAL RANK produced through the use of the "adding ranks method" (Factor II) with the NUMBER OF YEARS IN IMPROVEMENT (Factor III) to produce a COMPOSITE SIG SCORE.

GLOBAL RANK + NUMBER OF YEARS IN IMPROVEMENT = COMPOSITE SIG SCORE.

PRDE decided that a school's "failure to make progress" should be a maximum of 25% of the overall COMPOSITE SIG SCORE. Thus, the GLOBAL RANK produced via the "adding ranks" method described in Factor II was weighted as maximum of 75% of the COMPOSITE SIG SCORE.

The highest point value obtained through the "adding ranks" method described in Factor II was **287**. This score was used to determine the total possible points that could be allocated when the "failure to make progress" factor is combined with the "adding ranks" factor. The equation below illustrates the mathematical computations conducted to determine the maximum number of points that could be allocated for the COMPOSITE SIG SCORE where **n** = maximum COMPOSITE SIG SCORE

$$287 = .75(n)$$

$$287/.75 = n$$

$$n = 383$$

The above equation shows that if **287** is equal to 75% of the total possible points that can be allocated based on the "adding ranks" method, the maximum number of points that can be included in the COMPOSITE SIG SCORE is **383**. The equation below was used to determine the maximum number of points that could be allocated for within the "failure to make progress" factor.

$$383 - 287 = X$$

$$383 - 287 = 96$$

Thus, a maximum of **96** points can be allocated for "failure to make progress". The maximum number of points for "failure to make progress" was divided into equal units based on the maximum number of years in improvement reported for any one school in the last year. The maximum number of years any school had been in improvement **in** 2010 was **10** years. Thus, the maximum NUMBER OF YEARS IN IMPROVEMENT for any one school was **10**. (See School F in Table 1 above).

The maximum number of points available within the "failure to make progress" category (**96**) was divided by the maximum number of years in improvement (**10**) to determine the number of points that should be allocated for any year in improvement. This calculation is shown in the equation below:

96/10= X

96/10= 9.6

Thus, the number of points that should be allocated for the any one year in improvement is approximately **10**.

Table 2 provides an illustration of how points were allocated for NUMBER OF YEARS IN IMPROVEMENT. The table shows that for a school that has been in improvement for the **considered** year and was most recently in year 8 of improvement, **80** would be added to that school's GLOBAL RANK produced using the "adding ranks" method.

TABLE 2

Year in Improvement 2009-2010	**Number of Years in Improvement (X)**	Points awarded from the "failure to make progress" Factor (**10*X**)
8	**8**	**80**

The equation below was used to calculate **COMPOSITE SIG SCORE**, where X is the total number of years in improvement and Y is the total points awarded using the "adding ranks" method.

$$(Y_{max}) + (10*X_{max}) = 383$$

$$(Y) + (10*X) = \text{COMPOSITE SIG SCORE}$$

Table 3 shows that when the 200 points allocated to a school using the "adding ranks" method is added to the 80 points allocated for "failure to make progress", the school's **COMPOSITE SIG SCORE** is 280.

TABLE 3

Year in Improvement **2009-2010**	**Number of Years in Improvement (X)**	Points awarded from the "failure to make progress" Factor (10***X**)
8	8	80
Points awarded from the "adding ranks" method		**200**
COMPOSITE SIG SCORE		280

200 + (10 *8) = 280

COMPOSITE SIG SCORE = 280

The COMPOSITE SIG SCORE for all schools was used to rank schools, from highest to lowest. When the list of 1,256 schools was re-ranked according to their **COMPOSITE SIG SCORE**, the schools with the highest COMPOSITE SIG SCORE are considered to be the worst performing schools.

The 5% (63 schools) of the total 1,256 schools with the highest COMPOSITE SIG SCORE were identified as target schools (Tier I) for the implementation of one of the 4 SIG models. The remaining 1,193 schools were identified as Tier III, considering that PRDE do not qualify for Tier II.

DEFINITIONS

ADDING RANKS METHOD: method outlined in guidance used to calculate GLOBAL RANK

COMPOSITE SIG SCORE: value produced when GLOBAL RANK and NUMBER OF YEARS IN IMPROVEMENT are combined

FAILURE TO MAKE PROGRESS: determined by adding up the number of years a school has been in improvement for the **considered** year

GLOBAL RANK: determined by adding the ranking assigned to a schools based on percent proficient (in Spanish, Math and English) of all students for the **considered** year. Lower percent proficiencies correspond to higher ranks

NUMBER OF YEARS IN IMPROVEMENT: the total number of years in improvement a school has been over the last years