

**Arkansas Department of Education**  
**Little Rock Area Public Education Stakeholder Group**  
**Monday, July 11, 2016 - 5:00 PM**  
**ADE Auditorium**

**AGENDA**

- I. Little Rock Area Public Education Stakeholder Group Meeting Called to Order  
Presenter: Chair Tommy Branch
- II. Consideration to Approve Minutes - June 29, 2016 2  
The members are requested to approve the minutes for the June 29, 2016,  
meeting of the Little Rock Area Stakeholder Group.  
Presenter: Deborah Coffman
- III. Work Session  
The group will consider data to develop research questions.  
Presenter: Dr. Denise Airola
- IV. Consideration of Agenda for Next Meeting - July 25, 2016  
Presenter: Chair Tommy Branch
- V. Adjournment  
Presenter: Chair Tommy Branch
- VI. Materials submitted during the meeting 6  
Presenter: Dr. Denise Airola

**Minutes**  
**Little Rock Area Public Education Stakeholder Group Meeting**  
**Wednesday, June 29, 2016**

The Little Rock Area Public Education Stakeholder Group met Wednesday, June 29, 2016, in the Arkansas Department of Education Auditorium. Chair Tommy Branch called the meeting to order at 5:02 pm.

Members Present: Tommy Branch, Chair; Jim McKenzie, Vice-Chair; Tamika Edwards; Ann Brown Marshall; Antwan Phillips; Leticia Reta; and Dianna Varady.

Members Absent: none.

Audience: ADE staff, general public, and press.

The meeting was live streamed and the recording was posted on the ADE website at [http://www.arkansased.gov/state-board/minutes/board\\_meeting\\_categories/2016](http://www.arkansased.gov/state-board/minutes/board_meeting_categories/2016).

**Consideration to Approve Minutes – June 6, 2016**

Ms. Marshall moved, seconded by Mr. McKenzie, to approve the June 6, 2016 minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

**Glossary of Education Terms**

A glossary of education terms was provided compliments of the Arkansas School Boards Association.

**Consideration of the Transition from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and No Child Left Behind (NCLB) to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)**

Assistant Commissioner of Public School Accountability Ms. Annette Barnes provided background information on the transition from ESEA and NCLB to ESSA. She said the ADE was working on a strategic vision and mission. She said stakeholders would be engaged in providing input into the development of the state accountability plan. She said her office would provide a timeline of activities to meet the ESSA submission date. She said Arkansas would attempt to develop one accountability system that meets state and federal requirements. She said there are two windows for ESSA submission – March 2017 and July 2017. Ms. Barnes said states and the public have an opportunity to submit public comments to the U.S. Department of Education regarding the regulations for ESSA.

### **Consideration of Data Regarding Schools South of the River**

Director of the Office of Innovation in Education Dr. Denise Airola explained the data that she submitted in response to the request for briefing papers and data on current achievement of schools in the Little Rock area south of the Arkansas River. She said a synthesis of research-based characteristics of quality schools included leadership and change, shared and communicated focus, teaching and learning, measures of success, resources, family and community, and culture and environment.

Dr. Airola explained the longitudinal student growth model. The model indicated if the school met, exceeded, or did not meet the expected growth in achievement. She said the data reported included only non-mobile students. Non-mobile students were enrolled October 1 through the testing date.

### **Consideration of the Little Rock School District Community Advisory Council Report**

A member requested the report be submitted for review and recognized the work of the council.

### **Consideration of State Board Committee Boundaries Study**

State Board of Education Vice-Chair Dr. Jay Barth said a special State Board committee was selected to consider a boundaries study for the Little Rock area south of the Arkansas River. He said a city divided into two school districts has presented problems for the city of Little Rock. He said there are three main components in the report including the belief that the healthiest school districts are those where communities of interest are in synchronicity with school district boundaries, that it is crucial that any district have the necessary tax base to appropriately serve its student population, and that district lines cannot be used to create racially identifiable school districts.

Dr. Barth said since the report was finalized, the Jacksonville North Pulaski School District has detached and the Pulaski County Special School District will be returned to local control upon election of a school board in November.

### **Consideration of Perceptions from District Superintendents**

Little Rock School District Superintendent Mr. Baker Kurrus said the group needed to take a larger viewpoint of the issues. He said there was a political view and a data driven view of next steps in the consideration of charter schools and traditional schools. He encouraged transparency for all schools.

Future Little Rock School District Superintendent Mr. Michael Poore said the 21<sup>st</sup> century deliverable is different than our past experience in education. He said the group should consider instructional leaders, creation of culture and climate, effective utilization of resources, and adult engagement when addressing the quality of schools. He said the Little Rock School District could utilize an education cooperative for better resource allocation. He said there is an opportunity to work across districts to meet the needs of students. He said it is important to understand the parents' voice in why they are choosing charter schools to educate their children.

Pulaski County Special School District Superintendent Dr. Jerry Guess said working at PCSSD has been his best years in education. He said accurate, responsible, and efficient use of resources is critical to successful schools. He said the last 30 years have resulted in a loss of trust in the districts in central Arkansas because of litigation and misuse of resources. He said the districts needed a time of stable and consistent operation. He said the detachment of JNPSD has been a very intensive process. He said detachment of other districts would be more expensive. He said the state takeover and management by the ADE has been important to the progress of PCSSD.

### **Charter School Overview**

Public School Program Coordinator Ms. Alexandra Boyd said the state has one public education system. She said charter schools are filling the needs of some students to meet success. She said students and parents could easily access charter school registration information. She said transportation to charter schools is an issue and needed to be considered.

Ms. Boyd said school choice has always been available to families with financial means. She said charter schools provide choice to families that may not have those means. She said charter schools also provide different delivery methods for students.

### **Consideration of Perceptions from Open Enrollment Charter School Directors**

Charter Directors submitted a request to present during the July 25 meeting.

### **Consideration of Public Comment**

No one signed up for public comment.

### **Consideration of Agenda for Next Meeting (July 11, 2016)**

The members requested a work session to develop research questions.

## **Adjournment**

Ms. Edwards moved, seconded by Mr. Phillips, to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

*Minutes recorded by Deborah Coffman*

School LEA	SCHOOL NAME	School Abbreviation In Performance & Growth Charts	Subject	Public Charter Status	Number of Tested Students	Percent of Tested Students Hispanic	Percent of Tested Students African American	Percent of Tested Students FRLP	Percent of Tested Students Mobile	Percent of Tested Students with Disabilities (SWD)	Percent of Tested Students Gifted	Percent of Tested Students English Language Learners (ELL)	Grade Low	Grade High
6001006	BOOKER ARTS MAGNET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	BOOKER	ELA	N	284	16.2	58.1	87.0	5.6	14.4	29.2	15.8	K	5
6001017	BALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	BALE	ELA	N	160	12.5	72.5	95.0	3.8	16.3	18.1	15.0	K	5
6001018	BRADY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	BRADY	ELA	N	151	11.3	79.5	90.1	16.6	8.6	26.5	13.2	K	5
6001020	MCDERMOTT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MCDERMOTT	ELA	N	159	8.8	81.1	89.9	10.7	17.6	26.4	9.4	K	5
6001021	CARVER MAGNET ELEM. SCHOOL	CARVER	ELA	N	154	12.3	66.2	88.3	3.2	16.2	42.9	9.1	K	5
6001024	FOREST PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	FOREST	ELA	N	207	2.9	15.0	22.2	3.9	5.3	69.1	3.4	K	5
6001025	FRANKLIN INCENTIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	FRANKLIN	ELA	N	122	4.9	89.3	94.3	9.8	16.4	10.7	4.1	K	5
6001027	GIBBS MAGNET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	GIBBS	ELA	N	127	6.3	55.9	52.0	3.1	6.3	32.3	2.4	K	5
6001029	WESTERN HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	WESTERN	ELA	N	99	14.1	71.7	85.9	3.0	24.2	46.5	13.1	K	5
6001030	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	JEFFERSON	ELA	N	171	1.2	22.2	30.4	3.5	6.4	50.3	1.2	K	5
6001033	MEADOWCLIFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MEADOWCLIFF	ELA	N	133	15.0	82.7	97.0	15.0	10.5	27.8	12.8	K	5
6001035	M.L. KING MAGNET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	KING	ELA	N	215	<1.0	94.0	91.2	3.7	14.9	36.7	<1.0	K	5
6001038	PULASKI HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	PULASKI	ELA	N	166	1.2	47.6	56.6	3.0	12.7	50.6	3.0	K	5
6001040	ROMINE INTERDISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	ROMINE	ELA	N	142	15.5	78.2	85.9	12.0	28.2	12.0	16.2	K	5
6001041	STEPHENS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	STEPHENS	ELA	N	135	3.0	92.6	94.1	17.8	12.6	27.4	3.0	K	5
6001042	WASHINGTON MAGNET ELEM. SCHOOL	WASHINGTON	ELA	N	217	1.8	94.9	96.8	12.0	28.6	20.3	2.3	K	5
6001043	WILLIAMS MAGNET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	WILLIAMS	ELA	N	183	4.4	60.1	58.5	6.6	9.8	40.4	10.9	K	5
6001044	WILSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	WILSON	ELA	N	130	26.2	70.8	95.4	8.5	26.2	22.3	23.1	K	5
6001047	TERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	TERRY	ELA	N	151	18.5	67.5	86.1	11.9	12.6	30.5	19.2	K	5
6001048	FULBRIGHT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	FULBRIGHT	ELA	N	244	4.5	48.4	43.9	5.3	11.9	57.8	4.1	K	5
School LEA	SCHOOL NAME	School Abbreviation In Performance & Growth Charts	Subject	Public Charter Status	Number of Tested Students	Percent of Tested Students Hispanic	Percent of Tested Students African American	Percent of Tested Students FRLP	Percent of Tested Students Mobile	Percent of Tested Students with Disabilities (SWD)	Percent of Tested Students Gifted	Percent of Tested Students English Language Learners (ELL)	Grade Low	Grade High

6001050	ROCKEFELLER INCENTIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	ROCKEFELLER	ELA	N	119	3.4	90.8	97.5	9.2	17.6	13.4	3.4	K	5
6001052	BASELINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	BASELINE	ELA	N	119	42.0	49.6	96.6	6.7	19.3	13.4	42.0	K	5
6001055	DAVID O'DODD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	DAVID	ELA	N	127	35.4	57.5	90.6	4.7	10.2	19.7	33.9	K	5
6001056	GEYER SPRINGS GIFTED AND TALENTED ACADEMY	GEYER	ELA	N	128	7.0	82.8	89.1	2.3	6.3	63.3	7.8	1	5
6001057	MABELVALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MABELVALE	ELA	N	255	18.0	76.9	91.4	11.8	9.4	20.4	16.9	K	5
6001058	OTTER CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	OTTER	ELA	N	256	17.6	65.6	76.2	7.4	11.7	32.4	18.8	K	5
6001059	WAKEFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	WAKEFIELD	ELA	N	262	32.4	64.5	97.3	8.8	7.6	19.5	31.7	K	5
6001071	WATSON INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	WATSON	ELA	N	408	33.8	61.8	95.1	13.0	10.5	11.3	31.6	3	5
6001073	DON ROBERTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	DON	ELA	N	410	4.4	28.0	31.5	6.6	10.7	47.1	8.5	K	5
6003092	BAKER INTERDISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	BAKER	ELA	N	206	4.4	30.6	19.9	2.9	6.3	31.6	3.9	K	5
6003104	LANDMARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	LANDMARK	ELA	N	115	20.0	27.8	83.5	2.6	8.7	24.3	12.2	K	5
6003105	LAWSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	LAWSON	ELA	N	98	19.4	31.6	75.5	8.2	19.4	18.4	16.3	K	5
6003110	JOE T. ROBINSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	ROBINSON	ELA	N	75	8.0	20.0	66.7	6.7	17.3	13.3	6.7	K	5
6003135	COLLEGE STATION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	COLLEGE	ELA	N	119	5.9	63.0	80.7	5.9	1.7	49.6	3.4	K	5
6003146	BATES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	BATES	ELA	N	250	21.6	45.2	84.8	12.8	18.8	25.2	17.2	K	5
6003150	CHENAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	CHENAL	ELA	N	275	3.6	26.2	28.4	2.2	10.9	26.9	2.9	K	5
6047701	ESTEM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	ESTEM	ELA	Y	182	4.9	42.9	30.8	3.3	7.7	<1.0	1.6	K	4
6049701	LITTLE PREP ACADEMY ELEMENTARY	LITTLE	ELA	Y	88	9.1	90.9	96.6	9.1	10.2	<1.0	1.1	K	4

School LEA	SCHOOL NAME	School Abbreviation In Performance & Growth Charts	Subject	Public Charter Status	Number of Tested Students	Percent of Tested Students Hispanic	Percent of Tested Students African American	Percent of Tested Students FRLP	Percent of Tested Students Mobile	Percent of Tested Students with Disabilities (SMD)	Percent of Tested Students Gifted	Percent of Tested Students English Language Learners (ELL)	Grade Low	Grade High
6001003	MANN MAGNET MIDDLE SCHOOL	MANN	ELA	N	775	15.5	57.3	73.7	2.1	9.4	39.2	13.3	6	8
6001007	DUNBAR MAGNET MIDDLE SCHOOL	DUNBAR	ELA	N	716	8.2	85.2	88.1	1.5	11.0	44.4	7.1	6	8
6001010	PULASKI HEIGHTS MIDDLE SCHOOL	PULASKI	ELA	N	791	1.0	54.5	54.5	2.5	9.6	43.5	0.9	6	8
6001013	HENDERSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	HENDERSON	ELA	N	813	9.2	82.2	91.1	15.1	13.3	21.9	8.5	6	8
6001062	MABELVALE MIDDLE SCHOOL	MABELVALE	ELA	N	649	14.2	80.6	91.1	8.2	10.0	27.3	12.0	6	8
6001075	FOREST HEIGHTS STEM ACADEMY	FOREST	ELA	N	490	7.8	56.9	64.3	3.5	6.1	54.7	6.5	K	8
6001702	CLOVERDALE AEROSPACE TECH CHARTER	CLOVERDALE	ELA	Y	539	20.2	76.3	92.8	10.6	10.2	19.5	18.4	6	8
6003120	FULLER MIDDLE SCHOOL	FULLER	ELA	N	434	10.6	56.2	78.8	6.9	11.3	32.9	7.8	6	8
6003143	JOE T. ROBINSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	ROBINSON	ELA	N	429	6.8	34.3	43.4	3.7	10.3	20.7	3.0	6	8
6041702	LISA ACADEMY	LISA	ELA	Y	506	13.4	40.7	41.7	3.0	5.7	13.2	2.2	6	8
6044702	COVENANT KEEPERS CHARTER	COVENANT	ELA	Y	154	37.0	62.3	69.5	27.3	7.1	<1.0	27.3	6	8
6047702	ESTEM MIDDLE SCHOOL	ESTEM	ELA	Y	467	7.5	43.0	30.6	1.7	9.4	<1.0	1.5	5	8
6049702	LITTLE ROCK PREP ACADEMY	LITTLE	ELA	Y	128	7.8	89.8	98.4	5.5	7.8	<1.0	0.0	5	8

School LEA	SCHOOL NAME	Academic Distress/Priority/Focus/NI/Achieving	2015 School Rating	Public Charter Status	ELA Number of Tested Students	ELA 2015 Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	ELA School Value-Added Score	Math Number of Tested Students	Math 2015 Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Math School Value-Added Score	Grade Range
6001071	WATSON INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	Focus	D	N	408	11.3	0.1862	417	6.2	0.0211	3 5
6001025	FRANKLIN INCENTIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Focus	D	N	122	12.3	-0.0389	121	5.8	-0.0755	K 5
6001033	MEADOWCLIFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	D	N	133	12.8	0.1165	135	10.4	0.097	K 5
6001052	BASELINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Priority	D	N	119	14.3	-0.0002	120	15.8	0.0845	K 5
6003146	BATES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Focus	D	N	250	16.8	-0.0499	251	11.6	0.0239	K 5
6001040	ROMINE INTERDISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Focus	D	N	142	16.9	0.1219	142	8.5	0.0379	K 5
6001020	MCDERMOTT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	D	N	159	17.0	0.0536	159	2.5	0.0289	K 5
6001055	DAVID O'DODD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	C	N	127	17.3	0.0232	127	18.1	0.0647	K 5
6001057	MABELVALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	D	N	255	19.2	-0.0407	255	8.6	-0.0424	K 5
6001042	WASHINGTON MAGNET ELEM. SCHOOL	Focus	D	N	217	19.4	0.0527	216	9.3	-0.0229	K 5
6001059	WAKEFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Focus	D	N	262	20.2	0.0468	262	11.8	0.0628	K 5
6001044	WILSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Focus	D	N	130	20.8	0.0361	130	10.8	0.0773	K 5
6001018	BRADY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	D	N	151	21.2	0.0103	151	11.3	-0.008	K 5
6001041	STEPHENS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Focus (Met 1st Year Exit Criteria based on 20th Ptile 2015)	C	N	135	21.5	-0.0433	135	16.3	0.0652	K 5
6001035	M.L. KING MAGNET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Focus (Met 1st Year Exit Criteria based on 20th Ptile 2015)	D	N	215	23.3	0.0498	215	11.6	-0.0822	K 5
6001050	ROCKEFELLER INCENTIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Focus	D	N	119	23.5	0.1019	119	8.4	-0.089	K 5
6001017	BALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Focus (Met 1st Year Exit Criteria based on 20th Ptile 2015)	C	N	160	25.0	0.1405	159	14.5	0.0283	K 5
6003105	LAWSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	C	N	98	27.6	0.04	98	21.4	0.1068	K 5
6001029	WESTERN HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Focus (Met 1st Year Exit Criteria based on 20th Ptile 2015)	C	N	99	28.3	0.0701	99	19.2	0.0384	K 5
6001047	TERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Achieving	B	N	151	30.5	0.1702	151	37.7	0.255	K 5
6001021	CARVER MAGNET ELEM. SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	C	N	154	31.8	0.0617	153	28.1	0.1364	K 5
6003110	JOE T. ROBINSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	C	N	75	32.0	-0.0393	75	29.3	0.0404	K 5
6001006	BOOKER ARTS MAGNET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	C	N	284	33.1	0.1961	284	14.4	-0.0017	K 5
6003104	LANDMARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	C	N	115	33.9	0.0453	115	16.5	0.0856	K 5
6003135	COLLEGE STATION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Achieving	C	N	119	38.7	0.0939	119	25.2	-0.0079	K 5
6001058	OTTER CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	C	N	256	39.1	0.1202	258	27.5	0.1245	K 5
6001056	GEYER SPRINGS GIFTED AND TALENTED ACADEMY	Priority (Met 1st Year Exit Criteria based on 20th Ptile)	B	N	128	41.4	0.2417	128	25.8	0.0068	1 5
6001048	FULBRIGHT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	C	N	244	43.9	0.0941	244	33.6	0.0424	K 5

School LEA	SCHOOL NAME	Academic Distress/Priority/Focus/NI/Achieving	2015 School Rating	Public Charter Status	ELA Number of Tested Students	ELA 2015 Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	ELA School Value-Added Score	Math Number of Tested Students	Math 2015 Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Math School Value-Added Score	Grade Range
6001038	PULASKI HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Focus	C	N	166	49.4	0.2431	166	24.1	-0.0801	K 5
6001043	WILLIAMS MAGNET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	B	N	183	56.3	0.2591	183	44.3	0.1845	K 5
6001030	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	B	N	171	59.6	0.2511	171	40.9	0.0367	K 5
6003150	CHENAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	B	N	275	60.4	0.2032	276	42.0	0.1604	K 5
6001027	GIBBS MAGNET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	B	N	127	65.4	0.4398	127	35.4	0.124	K 5
6003092	BAKER INTERDISTRICT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	B	N	206	67.5	0.2611	206	62.1	0.2466	K 5
6001073	DON ROBERTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	B	N	410	72.7	0.3302	411	62.3	0.2073	K 5
6001024	FOREST PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	A	N	207	79.7	0.296	207	68.6	0.3037	K 5
6049701	LITTLE PREP ACADEMY ELEMENTARY	Needs Improvement	F	Y	88	3.4	-0.2153	88	1.1	-0.1785	K 4
6047701	ESTEM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	C	Y	182	36.8	-0.0079	182	41.2	0.1289	K 4

School LEA	SCHOOL NAME	Academic Distress/Priority/Focus/NI/Achieving	2015 School Rating	Public Charter Status	ELA Number of Tested Students	ELA 2015 Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	ELA School Value-Added Score	Math Number of Tested Students	Math 2015 Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Math School Value-Added Score	Grade low	Grade high
6003120	FULLER MIDDLE SCHOOL	Focus	D	N	434	15.0	-0.1423	435	9.7	-0.0975	6	8
6001013	HENDERSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	Academic Distress/Priority	C	N	813	17.1	0.146	811	6.2	0.0466	6	8
6001062	MABELVALE MIDDLE SCHOOL	Priority	C	N	649	20.8	0.1969	652	7.1	0.0245	6	8
6001007	DUNBAR MAGNET MIDDLE SCHOOL	Focus	D	N	716	25.6	0.1245	710	10.6	0.0028	6	8
6003143	JOE T. ROBINSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	C	N	429	32.6	-0.0586	428	22.9	0.0399	6	8
6001003	MANN MAGNET MIDDLE SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	C	N	775	40.8	0.2105	775	19.7	0.0656	6	8
6001010	PULASKI HEIGHTS MIDDLE SCHOOL	Focus (Met 1st Year Exit Criteria based on 20th Ptile 2015)	C	N	791	51.5	0.2587	790	31.3	0.1157	6	8
6001075	FOREST HEIGHTS STEM ACADEMY	Achieving (New School 20th Ptile target)	B	N	490	56.5	0.2004	490	39.6	0.1202	K	8
6044702	COVENANT KEEPERS CHARTER	Academic Distress/Priority	D	Y	154	9.1	-0.0354	159	5.7	-0.0972	6	8
6001702	CLOVERDALE AEROSPACE TECH CHARTER	Academic Distress/Priority	D	Y	539	13.0	0.2423	566	4.1	0.0054	6	8
6049702	LITTLE ROCK PREP ACADEMY	Academic Distress/Priority (Met 1st Year Exit Criteria based on 20th Ptile 2015)	D	Y	128	21.9	-0.0017	127	13.4	0.166	5	8
6047702	ESTEM MIDDLE SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	C	Y	467	34.3	-0.0286	420	15.7	-0.1219	5	8
6041702	LISA ACADEMY	Needs Improvement	C	Y	506	41.1	0.0425	334	24.0	0.0164	6	8

School LEA	SCHOOL NAME	Academic Distress/Priority/Focus/NI/Achieving	2015 School Rating	Public Charter Status	ELA Number of Tested Students	ELA 2015 Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	ELA School Value-Added Score	Math Number of Tested Students	Math 2015 Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards	Math School Value-Added Score	Grade Range
6001002	HALL HIGH SCHOOL	Academic Distress/Priority	D	N	500	11.0	0.0249	442	1.8	-0.1238	9 12
6001064	McCLELLAN MAGNET HIGH SCHOOL	Academic Distress/Priority	C	N	414	13.0	0.0496	364	2.7	0.0037	9 12
6001063	J.A. FAIR HIGH SCHOOL	Academic Distress/Priority	C	N	455	15.4	0.1231	378	6.3	0.0071	9 12
6003125	WILBUR D. MILLS HIGH SCHOOL	Academic Distress/Priority	D	N	353	16.7	-0.1367	315	2.2	-0.1073	9 12
6003127	JOE T. ROBINSON HIGH SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	D	N	292	23.3	-0.0142	242	8.3	-0.087	9 12
6001001	CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	Focus (Met 1st Year Exit Criteria based on 20th Ptile. 2015)	B	N	1262	46.3	0.1852	966	20.1	0.0723	9 12
6001005	PARKVIEW MAGNET HIGH SCHOOL	Needs Improvement	B	N	555	56.2	0.3603	456	23.0	0.0039	9 12
6052703	SIATECH HIGH CHARTER	ALE/Priority	NA	Y	22	0.0	NA	12	0.0	NA	9 12
6053703	PREMIER HIGH SCHOOL OF LITTLE ROCK	Needs Improvement	NA	Y	63	7.9	-0.0911	53	3.8	-0.083	9 12
6047703	ESTEM HIGH CHARTER	Achieving	B	Y	245	39.6	0.0088	163	6.1	0.0017	9 12
6041703	LISA ACADEMY HIGH	Needs Improvement	B	Y	159	51.6	0.1883	254	34.3	-0.0259	9 12

## Potential Research/Data Questions by Issue

- 1. How every student can have access to a school that is achieving;**
  - a. What constitutes an achieving school? The extent to which students have access to an achieving school depends on how you define this term. See <https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicItemDownload.aspx?ik=38927664> and the section titled Measures of Success
    - i. Based on how you define an achieving school, which schools are or are not achieving schools within the south of the river Little Rock area?
    - ii. To what extent do all students have access to an achieving school?
      1. What factors impact access to an achieving school?
- 2. How schools can best meet the educational needs of a student population markedly diverse in terms of income levels, achievement levels, English-language learners, and students with disabilities;**
  - a. To what extent are the educational needs of the diverse student population being met or not met? Are there factors that might impact the degree to which students' needs are being met in all schools? Some schools?
    - i. Note: One concern was whether concentrations of students living in poverty within a school impact the ability to meet the needs of students to the same degree as in schools with lower poverty concentrations.
    - ii. Do all students have access to excellent teachers?
    - iii. Are human and fiscal resources allocated with equity given the diversity of student populations?
    - iv. Are there instructional models that are successful for diverse student populations that are occurring within schools south of the river? (Innovation, waivers, etc.—charter or traditional?)
- 3. How to be most cost effective and fiscally efficient in the delivery of education;**
  - a. What fiscal plans are in place that enable, replicate, and expand strong positive student outcomes?
    - i. This is usually answered in one way by a district and another (or several other ways) by the charter sector.
  - b. To what extent are funds allocated to and expended by schools based on student need?
    - i. For a district, this often raises the question of how much central office, rather than schools themselves, manages funds, whether funds are distributed equitably, and related to the equity question, to what extent funds are directed toward “legacy” or fixed costs.
    - ii. For a charter school, this often raises the question of whether funds are being spent on facilities, transportation, recruiting, food, and other expenses in education that are outside the classroom.
- 4. How to respond to patterns that students with certain characteristics (in terms of achievement levels, demographics, etc.) are more likely, at present, to seek out open-enrollment charter options;**
  - a. Which students/families are exercising choice into charter schools? What are their primary reasons for seeking charter enrollment?
  - b. For those who do not seek to choice into an open-enrollment charter school, what are the primary reasons for not doing so?
    - i. Are there services available within students' schools of residence that are not available in charter? Transportation, special education, etc.
    - ii. Are there preferences or perceptions that influence families' desire to opt out of traditional public schools into the charter schools or vice versa?

5. **How facilities should be modernized and spread across the area based on the current demographics of the area with an eye to future demographic patterns;**
  
6. **How collaboration between traditional public schools and open-enrollment charter educational offerings can maximize the achievement of students and fiscal efficiency of the system of public education south of the river.**
  - a. What are Little Rock's traditional public schools' and charter public schools' respective strengths and weaknesses?
    - i. What is the "low hanging fruit" where collaboration might allow for an early win?
      1. Practice-sharing
      2. Combining basic performance information in a user-friendly way for parents to help them make better schooling choices for their children;
      3. Aligning school enrollment dates;
      4. Combining school fairs, etc.
  - b. What are some successful models of collaboration from which we can learn?
    - i. What short term benefits have been experienced in other communities?
    - ii. What long term benefits have been experienced in other communities?
    - iii. What challenges and recommendations can be identified from the lessons learned from communities that have done this work previously?
  - c. What resources are needed to support this work?
  - d. What resources are available to support this work?

**Little Rock Area Education Stakeholders Group**  
**July 11, 2016**  
**Links to Reports, Research Studies, and Informational Articles**  
**for Background Information**

Center for Reinventing Public Education:

<http://www.crpe.org/publications/district-charter-collaboration-compact-interim-report>

Innovate Public Schools

<http://innovateschools.org/silicon-valley-school-data/district-charter-collaboration-in-san-jose/>

Education Next

<http://educationnext.org/inside-successful-district-charter-compacts/>

Progressive Policy Institute

<http://www.progressivepolicy.org>

San Diego State University

<http://go.sdsu.edu/education/schoolhouse/engage-community.aspx>

Kansas City IFF Quality Seats Study

[http://www.kauffman.org/~media/kauffman\\_org/research%20reports%20and%20covers/2010/10/quality\\_schools\\_report.pdf](http://www.kauffman.org/~media/kauffman_org/research%20reports%20and%20covers/2010/10/quality_schools_report.pdf)

Mathematica--Evaluation of Efforts

<https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/projects/gates-district-charter-collaboration>

Final Findings:

<https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/districtcharter-collaboration-grant-implementation-final-findings-from-interviews-and-site-visits>

Early Findings:

<https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/seeking-common-ground-early-lessons-in-districtcharter-school-collaboration>