

Celebrating 20 Years

as a Public School Academy Authorizer

CONTRACT PERFORMANCE REPORT

2016-2017



Huron Academy

Charter Schools Office

Ferris State University
Big Rapids, MI 49307
(231) 591-5802
www.ferris.edu/charterschools

Copyright © 2017 Ferris State University Charter Schools Office

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTRACTUAL GOALS	6
ACADEMY OVERVIEW	8
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE	10
MEASURE 1: GROWTH	
MEASURE 2: ACHIEVEMENT	
MEASURE 3: STATE & FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY	
THE CHARTER CONTRACT	14
BOARD of DIRECTORS	15
FISCAL PERFORMANCE	16
OTHER MEASURES	18
END NOTES	19

Mission

The Ferris State University Charter Schools Office focuses on student success and continuous improvement through quality oversight, professional learning opportunities, and relevant resources for its authorized public school academies.

Vision

Ferris State University will authorize public school academies that promise to transform the lives of students by demonstrating high-quality performance.

Core Values

The core values of the Ferris State University Charter Schools Office are the foundation of our organization's culture. Our values are static, unchanging and non-negotiable, built from the belief that learning is a lifelong process and all students can learn.

We Value:

Student Learning

As a higher education institution, student learning is in our DNA; we see the opportunities created when students succeed, and we focus our oversight and support efforts on continual student success.

A Collaborative Working Environment

By supporting each other and building partnerships, we encourage a sense of community through cooperation, teamwork and consensus building with our stakeholders.

Diversity

Recognizing that stakeholders are made up of diverse populations, we honor diversity of ideas, beliefs, and cultures.

Opportunities

Through the work we do as a charter school authorizer, we help create learning opportunities and environments by lending support for professional growth and development.

Excellence

Committed to superior results, we engage in practices that produce the highest quality outcomes in all our endeavors.

Accountability

Accountability leads to academic progress—we believe in being held accountable for our work as an authorizer as deeply as we believe in holding all stakeholders accountable for their work.

Integrity & Trust

Our actions are guided by fairness and respect through transparency, effective communication and the building of positive relationships with each other and our stakeholders.

October 2017

TO OUR
Partners in Education

It is with pleasure that we present our stakeholders with the newest edition of the **Contract Performance Report** (CPR), individually prepared for each of the Ferris State University authorized public school academies by the Charter Schools Office (CSO). The CPR provides a comprehensive look at the charter contract components of finance, compliance, governance, and student achievement performance and growth. We have also included a wealth of demographic information, including the composite resident district that shows where students who attend the academy come from.

Besides providing information about each academy, our hope is that the CPR will be a valuable diagnostic tool for Boards, administration, and educational service providers by providing accurate and timely data. As an informational tool, the CPR provides a baseline to show each academy how they compare in fiduciary responsibility and student performance with other academies in the Ferris State University charter school portfolio. The governance section contains information pertaining to each academy Board of Directors. The CPR is one of the most important documents the CSO uses when determining the overall performance of the Academy and in decisions relative to school support and reauthorization. We hope you will find it valuable as well.

I would also have you note that August 2017 marked the 20th anniversary of Ferris State University's first charter school contract. As a State authorizer of public school academies, the CSO has grown over the years not only in personnel, but also in our understanding of the role of quality oversight and responsibility for the academies that our University has authorized. We take this role seriously, and we have worked to assist our academies in achieving the contractual expectations. The CPR is but one example of that assistance. Above all, please know that as your authorizer we are committed to seeing each academy achieve success in all areas of performance and responsibility. We look forward to continuing to serve not only as your authorizer, but also as a resource for you as you continue your valuable work.

The CPR is a collaborative effort by the CSO Executive Leadership Team and it is my pleasure to introduce that team to you:



Dr. RONALD S. RIZZO
Director



Charissa Talsma
Academic Assessment Specialist



Ronald Schneider
Associate Director



Mindy Britton
Compliance Auditor/Board Liaison

CONTRACTUAL GOALS

EDUCATIONAL GOALS

Pursuant to the Terms and Conditions of the Contract (“Contract”) issued by the Ferris State University Board of Trustees (“University Board”), these Educational Goal Policies (“EG Policies”) have been prepared by the Charter Schools Office (CSO). They now become part of the Contract and will go into effect 30 days after Academy Board notification, as stated in Article XII, Section 12.16 of the Contract for all academies being authorized or re-authorized pursuant to Contracts issued by the University Board. Failure by the Academy Board to comply with these Policies may result in the non-issuance of a Contract, or for existing academies, the initiation of suspension, termination or revocation proceedings under the Contract, and will be taken into account when considering reauthorization of an academy upon expiration of the contract.

A. Educational Goals and Related Measures:

The Academy shall pursue the educational goal of preparing all students academically for success in college, work, and life. Although an increase in academic achievement for all groups of pupils as measured by assessments and other objective criteria is the most important factor in determining the Academy’s progress toward the achievement of the educational goal, the CSO also considers other factors. Upon request, the Academy shall provide to Ferris State University a written report, along with supporting data, demonstrating:

1. Improved academic achievement for all groups of students, and
2. Measurable progress toward the achievement of the educational goal.

It is expected that the Academy will meet the State of Michigan’s accreditation standards and any improvement targets required to be achieved pursuant to state and federal law. The Academy is also expected to remain off the Priority and Focus school lists published by the Michigan Department of Education. If the Academy already has school buildings identified on these lists, it is expected to make the progress necessary for them to no longer be identified.

B. Educational Goal to Be Achieved:

Prepare students academically for success in college, work and life.

C. Measure for Determining Goal Achievement:

To determine whether the Academy is demonstrating measurable progress in preparing all students academically for success in college, work, and life, Ferris State University will assess the Academy’s performance using the following measures of student growth and achievement. The Academy will properly administer the tests detailed under each of the following metrics in accordance with the time frames identified in the Academy’s Master Calendar of Reporting Requirements.

Measure 1: Student Growth Towards Achievement (All academies)

Improved academic achievement for all students in grades 2-10 regardless of achievement level. On average, all students, regardless of academic ability, will meet or exceed national average growth.

GRADES	GOAL	METRIC
Grades 2-10	The Fall to Spring growth rate in for all students in Math and Reading of each grade and subject area as measured by the CSO designated nationally norm-referenced test will fall at or above the 50th percentile.	Average Percent of Growth (Gains Percentile) as measured by the CSO required nationally normed test for each grade level and subject area.

Measure 2: Student Achievement

The academic achievement of all students in grades 2-10, who have been enrolled for a full academic year at the Academy, will be, on average, at or above the 50th percentile and/or improve from year-to-year and over the course of the charter contract. **

GRADES	GOAL	METRIC
Grades 2-10	The average spring percentile ranking for the Academy on a nationally normed assessment will be at the 50th percentile in both Math and Reading.	The average national achievement percentile ranking for Math and Reading (grades 2-8 combined).

**The CSO will look at the percentile ranking for each subject area in determining progress towards this student achievement goal (i.e. if a school's average percentile ranking is not at or above the 50th percentile in any area, the CSO will look at whether the school's percentile ranking is increasing from year-to-year and over the course of the charter contract).

Measure 3: Student Achievement & Growth-Relative Performance and State/Federal Accountability

State Assessment:

GRADES	GOAL	METRIC
Grades 3-8	The percent proficient of all grade levels assessed in ELA and Math will be at or above the resident and composite district.	State Required Assessment Composite resident district will be determined based on pupil enrollment as submitted to CEPI via MSDS in the fall of each academic year.
Grade 11	The Percent proficient in ELA and Math will be at or above the resident and composite district.	State assigned college entrance exam.
All grades assessed (3-8)	The average growth percentile of each grade level assessed will be at or above the 40th percentile in ELA and Math.	Average student growth percentile on the State required assessment.

College Entrance:

GRADES	GOAL	METRIC
Grade 11	The average composite score on the state selected college entrance exam will be at or above the Academy's resident and composite district.	State required college entrance exam.

State/Federal Accountability:

GRADES	GOAL	METRIC
School	The Academy will be at or above the 40th percentile in the Top-to-Bottom ranking. Based on contractual language, the Academy cannot have a Top-to-Bottom ranking of 0-4% at any time.	School Reform Office (SRO) Michigan Department of Education Annual Top-to-Bottom Ranking

Strict Discipline Academies and Alternative Education Academies

Academies designated as Strict Discipline Academies or Alternative Education Academies, as per the Michigan School Code, may be exempted from certain parts of these requirements due to their unique nature. In all cases, specific educational goals will be mutually developed and agreed upon by the Academy and FSU-CSO and shall be attached to this contract.

New Academies

After one and two years of operation, new academies will be expected to improve academic achievement for all grades and subject areas using the following measures:

Measure 1: Student Growth

Measure 2: Student Achievement- Exempt

Measure 3: Relative Performance & State/Federal Accountability

HURON ACADEMY

MISSION

Huron Academy's mission is to be a leader in the areas of academic excellence and safety, while developing the character of our students.

PRINCIPAL Mark Talbot

GRADES SERVED: PreK-7


YEAR OPENED: 1999

CURRENT CHARTER CONTRACT TERM: 2016-2023


EDUCATIONAL SERVICE PROVIDER: CS Partners

RESIDENT DISTRICT: Utica Community Schools


Enrollment by Year



Number of Students in Each Grade



Length of Enrollment



Student Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Academy	Local District	State
American Indian or Alaskan Native	<1%	<1%	<1%
Asian American	9%	4%	3%
Black or African American	25%	5%	18%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0%	<1%	<1%
Caucasian	57%	86%	67%
Hispanic or Latino	5%	3%	8%
Multi-racial	4%	2%	4%

COMPOSITE DISTRICT


The composite district is a proxy district using the weighted average of the public school districts where the Academy's students reside. The composite district is a more accurate comparison to the Academy than the resident district, based on the make-up of the student body. This comparator is used as a benchmark for student performance in various academic measures, such as the M-STEP and SAT assessments. A list of districts that make up the composite district are presented in the table to the right.

RESIDENT DISTRICT


The resident district, identified on the prior page, refers to the public school district in which the Academy physically resides. Similar to the composite district, this district is used as a comparison for student performance in various academic measures.

District in Which Students Live	% of Students From That District
Warren Consolidated Schools	34.6%
Utica Community Schools	31.5%
Chippewa Valley Schools	7.3%
Fraser Public Schools	4.3%
Clintondale Community Schools	3.5%
Roseville Community Schools	2.8%
Van Dyke Public Schools	2.1%
East Detroit Public Schools	1.9%
Detroit Public Schools Community District	1.7%
L'Anse Creuse Public Schools	1.6%
Troy School District	1.6%
Mount Clemens Community School District	1.4%
Fitzgerald Public Schools	1.0%
Center Line Public Schools	1.0%
Southfield Public School District	0.7%
Warren Woods Public Schools	0.5%
Lake Shore Public Schools (Macomb)	0.5%
Lakeview Public Schools (Macomb)	0.3%
Romeo Community Schools	0.3%
Other	1.2%


Free & Reduced Price Eligibility



General & Special Education Status



English Language Learners (ELL)



M-STEP Proficiency

Grade	Subject	Prior Year 2015-2016	Current Year 2016-2017	Composite District	Resident District	State
Grade 3	ELA	42.1%	27.3%	40.2%	54.1%	44.1%
	Math	26.7%	22.1%	44.7%	59.4%	46.8%
Grade 4	ELA	32.4%	47.2%	39.0%	55.0%	44.2%
	Math	29.4%	31.9%	37.3%	51.4%	42.0%
Grade 5	ELA	56.8%	56.6%	48.8%	62.8%	51.1%
	Math	25.9%	19.7%	32.7%	44.2%	35.0%
Grade 6	ELA	47.7%	57.0%	45.3%	55.8%	43.6%
	Math	32.3%	40.5%	32.8%	45.9%	34.2%
Grade 7	ELA		52.9%	46.7%	53.5%	44.8%
	Math		41.2%	36.1%	47.5%	36.2%
Grade 8	ELA			NA	56.0%	48.0%
	Math			NA	47.3%	33.5%
Grade 11	ELA (SAT)			NA	71.2%	60.3%
	Math (SAT)			NA	52.1%	36.8%

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE


MEASURE 1: STUDENT GROWTH

NWEA MAP Growth Percentiles for Grades 2 through 10

School Conditional Growth Percentile (Gains Percentile) for Reading & Math in grades 2 through 10 will be at or above the 50th percentile.


READING

	Count	Fall 2016 RIT	Spring 2017 RIT	Observed Growth	Projected Growth	# Meeting Growth Proj.	% Meeting Growth Proj.	School Conditional Growth Percentile
Grade 2	60	171.9	192.3	20.4	14.5	46	76.7%	99.0
Grade 3	76	184.8	194.4	9.6	10.9	35	46.1%	32.0
Grade 4	70	195.9	209.1	13.2	8.1	61	87.1%	99.0
Grade 5	75	202.6	211.3	8.7	6.6	50	66.7%	92.0
Grade 6	78	212.7	220.5	7.8	4.5	57	73.1%	95.0
Grade 7	51	214.6	221.0	6.4	3.7	36	70.6%	93.0



MATH

	Count	Fall 2016 RIT	Spring 2017 RIT	Observed Growth	Projected Growth	# Meeting Growth Proj.	% Meeting Growth Proj.	School Conditional Growth Percentile
Grade 2	60	173.6	191.9	18.3	15.6	43	71.7%	87.0
Grade 3	76	183.1	196.4	13.3	13.5	38	50.0%	60.0
Grade 4	70	195.9	208.5	12.6	11.8	48	68.6%	77.0
Grade 5	75	204.5	219.8	15.3	10.0	62	82.7%	99.0
Grade 6	78	214.9	230.7	15.8	7.9	70	89.7%	99.0
Grade 7	51	221.9	234.0	12.1	6.0	38	74.5%	99.0



* Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) – Federal law that prohibits student identifiable education data from being publicly disseminated. A group of 10 or less students is considered to contain student identifiable data.


ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

MEASURE 2: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Spring NWEA MAP Achievement for Grades 2 through 10

The average national achievement percentile ranking for Reading and Math in grades 2-8 (combined) will be at the 50th percentile.

READING



Current Year	58.6	42.8	57.0	49.5	60.3	57.5					53.9
Prior Year	54.3	51.6	48.2	56.2	55.8						53.2
Change	4.3	-8.7	8.8	-6.7	4.5						0.7

MATH



Current Year	50.8	35.3	39.3	47.0	59.8	59.5					48.0
Prior Year	41.1	38.1	35.8	49.0	51.2						42.9
Change	9.7	-2.8	3.5	-2.0	8.6						5.1


* Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) – Federal law that prohibits student identifiable education data from being publicly disseminated. A group of 10 or less students is considered to contain student identifiable data.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

MEASURE 3: STATE & FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY

M-STEP Proficiency in Grades 3 through 8

Percent proficient for all students, as compared to the composite district, resident district, and state average.



M-STEP Proficiency by Subgroup

Percent proficient for all students, as compared to the state average.

ELA

	Academy	State
All Students	47.9%	48.0%
Ethnic/Racial Minorities	46.3%	44.3%
Students with Disabilities	14.8%	14.2%
Limited English Proficient	38.4%	22.8%
Economically Disadvantaged	42.2%	31.3%
Male	38.7%	43.1%
Female	55.7%	53.1%


MATH

	Academy	State
All Students	30.4%	37.7%
Ethnic/Racial Minorities	25.6%	34.2%
Students with Disabilities	7.4%	11.3%
Limited English Proficient	21.9%	21.8%
Economically Disadvantaged	22.8%	21.4%
Male	32.5%	39.0%
Female	28.6%	36.4%


M-STEP Growth in Grades 3 through 8

Average student growth percentile for all students, as compared to the 40th percentile.

ELA



MATH




* Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) – Federal law that prohibits student identifiable education data from being publicly disseminated. A group of 10 or less students is considered to contain student identifiable data.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

MEASURE 3: STATE & FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY

SAT Results of Grade 11


Percent of students meeting college readiness, with comparisons.



	Current Year	Prior Year	Change
ELA (SAT)	71.2%	60.3%	NA
Math (SAT)	52.1%	36.8%	NA

M-STEP Results of Grade 11

Percent of students proficient, with comparisons.



	Current Year	Prior Year	Change
Science	41.5%	33.6%	NA
Social Studies	52.5%	46.0%	NA

■ Academy Spring 2015 ■ Academy Spring 2016 ■ Academy Spring 2017 ■ Composite District ■ Resident District ■ State Average

SAT Total Score Results 2017

List of composite SAT scores, with comparison districts.

School	Total Score
Marshall Academy	1043
National Average	1020
Statewide	1008
Michigan Connections Academy	971
Creative Technologies Academy	953
Grand Rapids Public Schools	927
Detroit City School District	887
Conner Creek Academy East	864
Blended Learning Academies Credit Recovery High School	863
Lansing Public School District	854
Voyageur Academy	848
Hope Academy of West Michigan	834
Clara B. Ford Academy (SDA)	817
Lighthouse Academy (SDA)	811
Flint Public Schools	811
Detroit Delta Preparatory Academy for Social Justice	787

Top-to-Bottom List 2016

State ranking of all Ferris charter schools in 2015-2016.

School	State Ranking
Huron Academy	56
Bridge Academy West	55
Muskegon Montessori Academy for Environmental Change	54 - Reward
Michigan Connections Academy	45
Creative Technologies Academy	44
Hope of Detroit Academy	43
Marshall Academy	37
New Bedford Academy	21
Northridge Academy	20
Conner Creek Academy East - MI Collegiate High	19
Voyageur Academy	13
Hope Academy of West Michigan	10
Joy Preparatory Academy	10
Voyageur College Prep	10
Conner Creek Academy East - Elementary	8
Benton Harbor Charter School Academy	7
Battle Creek Montessori Academy	4
Conner Creek Academy East - MI Collegiate Middle	2

* Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) – Federal law that prohibits student identifiable education data from being publicly disseminated. A group of 10 or less students is considered to contain student identifiable data.

THE CHARTER CONTRACT

COMPLIANCE & CONTRACT LENGTH OF TERM

Charter Contract Compliance History

On-time compliance record for the Board's compliance activities, the Academy's compliance activities, and overall compliance.

Year	On-time Compliance Overall	On-time Compliance Board	On-time Compliance Academy
2014-2015	100%	100%	100%
2015-2016	100%	100%	100%
2016-2017	100%	100%	100%



100%



100%



100%

Charter Contract Timeline

History of the Academy's charter contracts, along with key aspects to each contract period.

Length of Term	Dates	Amendments During the Contract	Notes
7 year	2016-2023	Y	
5 year	2011-2016	Y	
2 year	2004-2011	Y	Contract Extension
5 year	2004-2009	Y	
5 year	1999-2004	Y	Initial Contract

BOARD of DIRECTORS

BOARD MEMBERSHIP & ACTIVITIES

Academy Board Service

Board demographics and required professional development credits.

Board Member	Office	Length of Service	Term Expiration
Jeffrey Duchene	President	13 Years	6/30/2020
Colleen Dickey	Vice President	10 Years	6/30/2018
James Perna	Treasurer	15 Years	6/30/2017
Katherine Columbo	Secretary	17 Years	6/30/2018
Ramzi Twal	Director	11 Years	6/30/2017
Suzan Karadsheh	Director	4 Years	6/30/2019
Jeffrey Parlow	Director	<1 Year	6/30/2020

Academy Board Meetings, Attendance, and Position Vacancies

Board Meetings



13 TOTAL BOARD MEETINGS HELD

Board Attendance



81% AVERAGE BOARD ATTENDANCE

Board Position Vacancies



0 BOARD POSITION VACANCIES

Board Professional Development Credits



3 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CREDITS

FISCAL PERFORMANCE

BUDGETING & REPORTING


Your Academy's Revenue

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	Trend	% of Revenue
Enrollment	515	510	566		
Per-pupil Foundation Allowance	\$7,218	\$7,391	\$7,511		
General Fund Revenues					
Local	\$40,746	\$29,585	\$80,535		2%
State	\$3,963,046	\$3,968,835	\$4,472,951		94%
Federal	\$204,701	\$187,645	\$225,463		5%
Other	\$32,845	\$23,623	\$0		<1%
Detail					
51c Spec Ed Headlee Obligation	\$73,560	\$53,679	\$48,297		1%
22b Discretionary Payment	\$863,671	\$941,220	\$1,112,175		23%
11(3) PSA Protected	\$2,846,525	\$2,823,755	\$3,131,315		66%
31A At Risk	\$110,164	\$152,535	\$185,526		4%
152a Headlee Obligation for Data Collection	\$12,929	\$12,927	\$14,383		<1%
31d School Lunch	\$3,808	\$3,683	\$4,107		<1%
99s(6) Science Olympiad and STEM Progra			\$2,000		<1%
104d Computer Adaptive Tests			\$3,171		<1%
22f Best Practice Incentive	\$25,878				
22f Best Practice Residual	\$869				
22j Performance-Based Funding	\$30,980				
22c Foundation Equity Payment	\$17,078				
Total	\$3,985,462	\$3,987,798	\$4,500,974		
Total General Fund Revenues	\$4,241,338	\$4,209,688	\$4,778,949		

Your Academy's Expenditures


	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	Trend	% of Expenditures
Expenses/Transfers					
Instruction	\$2,100,383	\$2,047,173	\$2,112,864		47%
Pupil Support Services	\$118,743	\$120,126	\$99,541		2%
Administration	\$975,072	\$960,310	\$1,045,034		23%
Operations and Maintenance	\$558,616	\$555,413	\$482,178		11%
Transportation	\$0	\$0	\$22,128		<1%
Other	\$96,292	\$73,208	\$99,397		2%
Outgoing Transfers & Other Transactions	\$357,326	\$568,042	\$679,174		15%
Total Expenses/Transfers	\$4,206,432	\$4,324,272	\$4,540,316		
Total Revenues over Expenses	\$34,906	-\$114,584	\$238,633		
General Fund Balance Beginning of Year	\$1,242,837	\$1,277,743	\$1,163,159		
General Fund Balance End of Year	\$1,277,743	\$1,163,159	\$1,401,792		
Fund Balance as a % of Revenue	30%	28%	29%		

Total Instruction*



55¢ OF EVERY DOLLAR WAS SPENT ON INSTRUCTION

Total Business & Administration*



27¢ OF EVERY DOLLAR WAS SPENT ON BUSINESS & ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

Total Operations & Maintenance*




12¢ OF EVERY DOLLAR WAS SPENT ON THE BUILDING & FACILITIES

*The calculations that determine the breakdown of expenditures for Total Instruction, Total Business & Administration, and Total Operations & Maintenance do not include Outgoing Transfers and Other Transactions expenses. Therefore, the percentages above may not match what is displayed in the Academy's budget expenditures table on p. 16.

Per-student Finances


HOW AVERAGE EXPENSES AND REVENUES PER STUDENT COMPARE



The Total Revenue per Student illustrates all revenues received, divided by the Academy's overall total enrollment. Similarly, the Total Expenses/Student illustrates total expenses, divided by enrollment. Revenue per Student should exceed Expenses per Student, with a trend to increase this difference. If the Expenses per Student exceed Revenue per Student, the Academy is operating in deficit spending.

Current Ratio

ABILITY OF THE ACADEMY TO PAY OFF DEBT IF IT CAME DUE



The current ratio illustrates the balance of debts to assets. This measures the ability of the Academy to pay back its short-term and long-term obligations with its current assets on hand. If the ratio is 1.0, then the Academy has an equal amount of debt to assets. If the ratio is below 1.0, then the Academy could not fulfill its current liabilities if they came due all at once.

OTHER MEASURES

REVIEWS

School Visits

In order to carry out its responsibility for evaluating academy performance, the CSO has developed the Mid-Contract and Reauthorization Visitation procedures. The CSO views these visitations as part of an ongoing evaluative process, and not as a single event. Visitation teams of three to four educators spend one to two days interviewing stakeholders, observing operations, and reviewing information for each visited school. Visitation guides are sent to each school outlining the procedures for their upcoming visit. The Academy Internal Review Guide focuses on what the school will do before the visit. This internal review process provides an opportunity for the Academy's School Improvement Team and other key stakeholders to self-reflect on some of the key indicators of quality student performance and organizational effectiveness. The Visitation Preparation Guide describes the review procedures and the responsibilities of the school and the CSO.

After each visit, CSO personnel discuss observations, review data, and create a comprehensive Visitation Report. These reports help determine placement in the School Support Team designation process, share visitation findings, and review the school's School Improvement Plan. In addition, the report contains Opportunities for Growth related to facilities, school systems, school culture, mission accomplishment, student academic outcomes, governance/leadership, resources, and the school's support system. Reauthorization Visits are used to make recommendations to the FSU Board of Trustees regarding contract renewal, extension, revocation, or non-renewal. Mid-Contract Visits help schools to focus on areas of concern, recognize points of pride, and ensure boards of directors and the CSO understand any issues that must be addressed before the Reauthorization Visit.

Visitation Reports are available on the FSU CSO website by selecting the authorized school and going to the Reports/Performance Data link (<https://ferris.edu/HTMLS/administration/academicaffairs/charterschools/schools/homepage.htm>)

Quality Reviews

The CSO may elect to contract with a nationally recognized expert in the area of charter school reviews to conduct a Quality School Review (QSR). An external review team conducts a multi-day site visit utilizing the QSR Protocol, which is grounded in the Charter Contract and focuses on critical areas of inquiry associated with curriculum, instruction, assessment, and a limited fiscal review of support of the Educational Program. The external team conducts classroom observations and schedules interviews with board members, administrators, staff members, and students. In addition to school reviews, the CSO may bring in external teams to provide an analysis of office procedures and policies.

END NOTES

SOURCES

Page 8:	Charter Contract, CSO Office, Ferris State University CEPI, Michigan Department of Education MSDS, Michigan Department of Education M-STEP, Michigan Department of Education SAT, Michigan Department of Education
Page 9:	CEPI, Michigan Department of Education MSDS, Michigan Department of Education M-STEP, Michigan Department of Education SAT, Michigan Department of Education
Page 10-11:	Measures of Academic Progress, NWEA
Page 12:	M-STEP, Michigan Department of Education
Page 13:	M-STEP, Michigan Department of Education SAT, Michigan Department of Education
Page 14-15:	Charter Contract, CSO Office, Ferris State University Epicenter, Academy Document Submission (current year represents 4th Quarter, unaudited)
Page 16-17:	FID, Michigan Department of Education Epicenter, Academy Document Submission

ACRONYMS & GLOSSARY

Composite District: The composite district is a proxy district using the weighted average of the public school districts where the Academy's students reside. The composite district is a more accurate comparison to the Academy than the resident district, based on the make-up of the student body. This comparator is used as a benchmark for student performance in various academic measures, such as the M-STEP and SAT assessments. A list of districts that make up the composite district are presented in the table to the right.

Conditional Growth Percentile (CGP): The students percentile rank for growth based on all other students who took the assessment nation-wide. A CGP of 50 means that the students growth was greater than 50% of similar students.

Current Ratio: The current ratio illustrates the balance of debts to assets. This measures the ability of the Academy to pay back its short-term and long-term obligations with its current assets on hand. If the ratio is 1.0, then the Academy has an equal amount of debt to assets. If the ratio is below 1.0, then the Academy could not fulfill its current liabilities if they came due all at once.

Expenditures: The amount the Academy spent on various activities to education its students.

Growth Percentile: The amount of growth students had between two tests; usually fall-to-spring (MAP), or year-to-year (M-STEP).

M-STEP: The state administered standardized assessment in grades 3 through 10.

MAP: A standardized assessment administered by NWEA in grades 2 through 8 that provides student diagnostics.

Per-student Finances: The Total Revenue per Student illustrates all revenues received, divided by the Academy's overall total enrollment. Similarly, the Total Expenses/Student illustrates total expenses, divided by enrollment. Revenue per Student should exceed Expenses per Student, with a trend to increase this difference. If the Expenses per Student exceed Revenue per Student, the Academy is operating in deficit spending.

Proficiency: A state-determined level of achievement that all students should obtain.

Projected Growth: The amount of growth a student (or group of students) should be able to obtain based on national trends and the student's prior test scores.

Resident District: The resident district, identified on the prior page, refers to the public school district in which the Academy physically resides. Similar to the composite district, this district is used as a comparison for student performance in various academic measures.

Revenue: The amount the Academy received from various sources, that it can allocate to operate the program.

RIT Score: The Rasch Unit used in the MAP test for measuring the difficulty and complexity of the assessment.

Student Achievement: The amount of academic content a student has learned over a set amount of time.

Student Growth: The amount of change (gain or loss) in student achievement over a set amount of time.



Charter Schools Office
Ferris State University
Big Rapids, MI 49307
(231) 591-5802
www.ferris.edu/charterschools