

**Appendix D. States' Assessment System, School Performance Ratings
Summarized by States for their Full-Time Virtual and Blended Learning Schools**

State	2014-15 Grades 3-11 ELA and Math, State-level Results	Full-time Virtual (FT-V)	Blended Learning Schools (BLS)
AK	Alaska Measures of Progress	Not rated	Not rated
AR	PARCC	Not rated	Not rated
AZ	Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT) AzMerit Performance Levels: Highly Proficient; Proficient; Partially Proficient; Minimally Proficient state average in ELA, grades 3-11 (%Proficient)-28% state average in Math, grades 3-11 (%Proficient)-23.89%	1 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 5 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	2 BLS failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations
CA	Smarter Balanced-4 Levels (Exceeded Standards, Met Standards, Nearly Met Standards, Did Not Meet Standards) state average in ELA/Literacy: 44% met or exceeded the benchmark expectation for proficiency state average in Math: 33% met or exceeded the benchmark expectation for proficiency	18 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 4 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	17 BLS failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 5 BLS met or exceeded expectations
CO	PARCC-5 levels (Exceeded Expectations, Met Expectations, Approached Expectations, Partially Met Expectations, Did Not Yet Meet Expectations) state average in ELA/Literacy: 39.61% met or exceeded the benchmark expectation for proficiency state average in Math: 28.67%(K-8) and 24.2% (9-12) met or exceeded the benchmark expectation for proficiency	7 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 2 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	6 BLS failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 1 BLS met or exceeded expectations
FL	FL Florida Standards Assessments	No data	No data

IA	AYP (Yes/No)-Reading and Math Proficiency Met; Watch (missing AYP for 1 yr); Removed from Watch status; School-in-Need-of-Assistance (SINA) X denoting the number of years in improvement status	1 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 3 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not applicable (NA)
HI	Smarter Balanced	No data	No data
GA	Georgia Milestones Assessment System Percent Proficient: State Summary ELA Math 3rd Grade 26.5% 30.3% 4th Grade 28.0% 31.3% 5th Grade 31.3% 27.5% 6th Grade 31.3% 26.4% 7th Grade 30.2% 25.0% 8th Grade 31.4% 24.8%	3 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 1 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not applicable (NA)
ID	Uses the results of the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) to calculate AYP state average in ELA, All students: % Adv:(17.9); % Prof:(33.2); % Basic:(26.0);%Below Basic(22.9) state average in Math, All students: % Adv:(15.2); % Prof:(24.1); % Basic:(31.4);%Below Basic(29.3)	3 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 3 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not applicable (NA)
IL	PARCC-5 levels (Exceeded Expectations, Met Expectations, Approached Expectations, Partially Met Expectations, Did Not Yet Meet Expectations) state average in ELA/Literacy: 36%(3-8) and 31%(H.S.) met or exceeded the benchmark expectation for proficiency state average in Math: 29.17%(K-8) and 17% (9-12) met or exceeded the benchmark expectation for proficiency	1 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not rated

IN	Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) A-F School Ratings & Percent of Schools in Each Category A: 36 Schools-12.5% B: 41 Schools-14.2% C: 109 Schools-37.7% D: 92 Schools-31.8% F: 11 Schools-3.8%	4 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 0 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not rated
KS	Kansas Assessment Program	Not rated	Not rated
LA	PARCC; Grading scale of A through F State: Mastery+ =27%; Basic+ =65%	4 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 0 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not applicable (NA)
MA	PARCC or Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) Proficiency Gap Narrowing-ELA All students: 2015 CPI: 86.8; Target: 91.5; PPI Points: 50; Rating: Improved Below Target Proficiency Gap Narrowing-Math All students: 2015 CPI: 80.7; Target: 86.6; PPI Points: 50; Rating: Improved Below Target	1 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 1 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not applicable (NA)
MI	Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) state average in ELA/Literacy: 48.14% met or exceeded the benchmark expectation for proficiency state average in Math: 35.57% met or exceeded the benchmark expectation for proficiency	16 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 3 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	6 BLS failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 0 BLS met or exceeded expectations

MN	<p>Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCAs)</p> <p>All Schools: Making AYP(773 Schools-33.89%); Not Making AYP:(1310 Schools-57.43%)</p> <p>High Schools: Making AYP(93 Schools-21.14%); Not Making AYP:(342 Schools-77.72%)</p> <p>Junior High Schools: Making AYP(65 Schools-26.64%); Not Making AYP:(176 Schools-72.13%)</p> <p>Elementary Schools: Making AYP(376 Schools-40.30%); Not Making AYP:(550 Schools-58.95%)</p> <p>Alternate Learning Programs: Making AYP(111 Schools-38.32%); Not Making AYP:(152 Schools-46.06%)</p> <p>All Other Schools: Making AYP(128 Schools-38.32%); Not Making AYP:(90 Schools-26.94%)</p>	6 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 3 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	2 BLS failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 2 BLS met or exceeded expectations
NH	Smarter Balanced	Not rated	Not applicable (NA)
NM	PARCC	Not rated	Not applicable (NA)
NV	<p>Smarter Balanced</p> <p>5 Star Schools: 99(15.6%)</p> <p>4 Star Schools: 95(15%)</p> <p>3 Star Schools: 281(44.4%)</p> <p>2 Star Schools: 130(20.5%)</p> <p>1 Star Schools: 28(4.4%)</p>	4 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 3 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not applicable (NA)
OH	<p>PARCC (grades 4-8 ELA, 3-8 math)-2 Levels: Proficient or Above; Below Proficient</p> <p>state average in ELA (Percent Proficient or Above Level)-71.97%(Public Districts);49.63%(Community Schools); 70.4%Total Public</p> <p>state average in Math (Percent Proficient or Above Level)-65.2%(Public Districts);36.67%(Community Schools); 63.28%Total Public</p>	16 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 0 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	4 BLS failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 0 BLS met or exceeded expectations
OK	<p>Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests in Reading/ELA and Math</p> <p>State Average: D+ (67-Performance Scale)</p>	7 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 0 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not applicable (NA)

OR	Smarter Balanced-Levels 1-5 state average in ELA/Literacy: 54.1% met or exceeded the benchmark expectation for proficiency (Level 3 or 4) state average in Math: 40.8% met or exceeded the benchmark expectation for proficiency (Level 3 or 4)	8 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 0 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	1 BLS failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 0 BLS met or exceeded expectations
PA	Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) in ELA and Math State Average: All students ELA: %Advanced(17.5); %Proficient(42.5);% Basic(28.9);%Below Basic(19.6) Math:%Advanced(13.5); %Proficient(26.1);% Basic(31.1);%Below Basic(29.2) Science: %Advanced(33.9); %Proficient(33.9);% Basic(15.2);%Below Basic(17.0)	16 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 0 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not applicable (NA)
SC	ACT Aspire tests in English, reading, mathematics and writing, grades 3-8 Students Exceeding or Meeting Standards: State Average English: 68.2% Reading: 37.2% Writing: 24.4% Math: 47%	5 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 0 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not applicable (NA)
TN	student achievement growth on the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS)- 5 levels (1: Significantly below expectations; 2: Below expectations; 3: At expectations; 4: Above expectations; 5: Significantly above expectations)	3 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 2 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not rated

TX	<p>State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) reading and math in grades 3-8</p> <p>Accountability Rating System: Met Standard/Alternative; Improvement Required; Not rated. Rating is based on four areas: Student achievement; student progress; closing performance gaps; postsecondary readiness</p> <p>Percent Met Standard: 94.4% (District (983) + Charter (168)= Total 1,151 schools)</p> <p>Percent Met Alternative Standard: 2.6% (District (NA) + Charter (32)= Total 32 schools)</p> <p>Percent Improvement Required: 4.7% (District (40) + Charter (17)= Total 57 schools)</p> <p>Percent Not rated: 0.9% (District (1) + Charter (10)= Total 11 schools)</p>	3 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 2 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	Not applicable (NA)
UT	<p>Student Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE)</p> <p>Percent Proficient: State Average</p> <p>Language Arts 44.1%</p> <p>Mathematics 44.6%</p> <p>Science 46.8%</p>	4 FT-V failed to meet or exceed the benchmark expectations; 0 FT-V met or exceeded expectations	1 BLS met or exceeded expectations
WA	AYP (Yes/No)-Reading and Math Proficiency Met;	No data	No data
WI	Smarter Balanced	No data	No data
WY	Proficiency Assessments for Wyoming Students (PAWS) in reading and math (Grades 3-8) and Student Assessment of Writing (SAWS) (Grades 3, 5, 7)	No data	No data