



2016 Charter School Annual Report

Table of Contents

- Introduction.....3
 - Mississippi Charter School Quick Facts.....3
- The Charter School Landscape in Mississippi.....4
 - Legislative History.....4
 - Charter Schools by the Numbers.....5
 - Student Demographics.....6
- Charter School Accountability.....8
 - Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework.....8
 - Charter School Outcomes: Academic Performance.....10
 - Charter School Outcomes: Financial Performance.....15
 - Charter School Outcomes: Organizational Performance.....16
 - Comparison Data.....17

Introduction

Each fall, the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board produces an annual report on charter schools operating in the state during the preceding school year. In compliance with Mississippi Code Annotated §37-28-31(2) and §37-28-37(1), the report provides information on charter school characteristics, charter school applications and approvals, and charter school outcomes and performance.

Additional information regarding Mississippi's public charter schools is available on the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board's website, including currently operating public charter schools, application and authorization materials, and answers to frequently asked questions.

Mississippi Charter School Quick Facts

- Currently, three charter schools operate in Mississippi. They are all located in Jackson, MS.
- Charter schools are free to students and receive the same per pupil funds that fund traditional public schools.
- Mississippi's law prohibits private schools from converting to charter schools.
- Mississippi's charter school law prohibits for-profit companies from opening and operating charter schools
- Charters schools are open to all students who live in the school district where the charter school is located or who reside in 'C', 'D', or 'F' rated districts.
- In Mississippi, charter schools must reflect the population of the traditional school district where they are located including the percentage of students with disabilities.
- Charter schools may not use admissions tests or criteria of any kind.
- If more students apply than there are seats, a lottery is conducted.
- Charter schools are granted an initial five-year contract.
- Charter schools are evaluated annually using the Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework.

The Charter School Landscape in Mississippi

Legislative History

In 2013, Governor Bryant signed the *Mississippi Charter Schools Act of 2013*. This legislation overhauled Mississippi's public charter school laws, which previously only permitted charter school conversions. It also created the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board, an independent state agency, to authorize charter schools across Mississippi.

The Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board consists of seven members (three Governor appointees, three Lt. Governor appointees, and one State Superintendent of Education appointee). The Authorizer Board is charged with the mission to increase access to excellent public schools by authorizing high-quality charter schools, particularly schools designed to expand opportunities for underserved students. The Authorizer Board may approve up to 15 charter schools per year and may approve charter schools in school districts rated 'D' or 'F' without local school board approval.

A charter school is a public school that is established and operates under the terms of a charter agreement and in accordance with the Mississippi Charter Schools Act of 2013 (Miss. Code Ann. 37-28-1 et. seq.). Charter schools operate as local education agencies and function as independent school districts. Governed by independent non-profit organizations, charter schools have greater autonomy over their budgets, personnel, curricula, and operations in exchange for heightened accountability. Charter schools are publically funded and are subject to the same standards, assessments, and accountability letter grades as traditional public schools. Charter schools may be closed if they demonstrate poor academic performance, violate their charter agreement, or engage in practices of fiscal mismanagement.

In 2016, the charter school law was revised to expand opportunities for Mississippi students. Students who reside in the school district where the charter school is located and students who reside in any school district that was rated 'C', 'D', or 'F' are eligible to attend a charter school. It also simplified the teacher certification requirements for charter schools and allowed charter schools, if interested, to participate in the Public Employees' Retirement System.

Charter Schools by the Numbers

Charter schools currently operate within the boundaries of one school district: the Jackson Public School District. In 2015-16, a total of two charter schools operated in Jackson serving 226 students. At capacity these two schools will serve 648 students. Charter school enrollment currently accounts for less than one percent of the total public school enrollment in the state and in the district where charter schools have been authorized. In 2016-17, an additional charter school opened serving 119 students in its first year.

Table 1. Charter School Enrollment by District, 2015-16

| | Number of Charter Schools | Charter Enrollment | District Enrollment | Percent Charter Enrollment |
|-------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Jackson, MS | 2 | 226 | 28,019 | <1% |
| Mississippi | 2 | 226 | 486,471 | <1% |

Each year, the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer board releases a Request for Proposals for new charter schools. The Authorizer Board has set a rigorous bar for charter school approval and contracts with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) to conduct independent evaluations of each charter school proposal. Table 2 documents the ratios of submitted versus approved applications by each Request for Proposals cycle since the Authorizer Board’s creation in 2013. To date, the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board has approved only 16 percent of charter school applications.

Table 2. Charter School Applications and Approvals

| RFP Process | Letters of Intent | Applications Submitted | Applications Approved |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 2014 – Cycle 1 | 31 | 12 | 1 |
| 2014 – Cycle 2* | 10 | 6 | 1 |
| 2015 Cycle | 3 | 1 | 1 (2 Schools) |
| 2016 Cycle | 9 | 4 | 0 |
| Totals | 44 | 19 | 3 |

*Starting with the 2014 – Cycle 2 process, applicants were able to submit one letter of intent and application for multiple schools.

Student Demographics

Charter schools are required to enroll a study body that reflects the population of the local school district where the charter school is located. The underserved student composition of a charter school shall be at least 80% of the local school district’s underserved student population. Underserved students are defined as students participating in the federal free lunch program who qualify for at-risk student funding under the Mississippi Adequate Education Program and students who are identified as having special education needs.

Charter schools must enroll all students who wish to attend unless the number of students exceeds the capacity of a program, class, grade level, or building. During the first year of charter school operation in Mississippi, neither charter school was required to conduct an admissions lottery to determine charter school enrollment. However, all charter schools were fully enrolled during the 2015-16 school year and soon had waitlists for enrollment after the school year began.

MCSAB expects charter school demand to increase significantly over time due to the following rationale: 1) applying for admission to charter schools on a specific timeline is a new process for families and many were unfamiliar with application window periods; 2) both charter schools started their schools with fifth grade which is a non-traditional middle school grade configuration; and 3) charter schools were new to Mississippi which lead to some hesitancy to leave the traditional school district system. At this time, the absence of charter school lotteries does not indicate lack of demand for charter schools.

Table 3. Charter School Student Demographics, 2015-16

| | Reimagine Prep | Midtown Public Charter School | Jackson Public Schools |
|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Male | 53.4% | 57% | 49.3% |
| Female | 46.6% | 43% | 50.7% |

| | Reimagine Prep | Midtown Public Charter School | Jackson Public Schools |
|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Special Education Percentage | 10.8% | 11.3% | 8.9% |

Table 3. Charter School Student Demographics, 2015-16 (Continued)

| | Reimagine Prep | Midtown Public Charter School | Jackson Public Schools |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| African-American | >95% | >95% | >95% |
| White | <5% | <5% | <5% |
| Asian-American | <5% | <5% | <5% |
| Hispanic | <5% | <5% | <5% |
| Other | <5% | <5% | <5% |

| | Reimagine Prep | Midtown Public Charter School | Jackson Public Schools |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Free/Reduced Lunch Percentage | >95% | >95% | >95% |

Charter School Accountability

The following sections provide information about the performance of charter schools during the 2015-16 school year. Charter schools are evaluated on the Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework. Charter school performance is also compared to the performance of academically, ethnically, and economically similar groups of students from the school district where charter schools are located.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

The Mississippi Charter School Authorizer board utilizes the Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework to annually evaluate and assess charter school performance. The objective of the Performance Framework is to provide charter school operators and boards with clear expectations, fact-based oversight, and timely feedback while ensuring charter autonomy. The Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework assesses schools on their ability to operate as sound, independent entities that successfully serve all students. The Performance Framework features three key components: 1) routine ongoing oversight and submissions; 2) 3 performance frameworks which measure the academic, financial, and organizational performance of schools; and 3) annual performance reports.

All Mississippi charter schools are issued an initial contract of five years. Over the course of this five-year contract term, charter schools are evaluated annually using the components of the Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework. Charter schools are then evaluated for renewal of their contract in the fall of their fifth year based on data and evidence collected over the school's contract term.

Oversight Process

During each school year, the annual oversight and accountability process for each school includes:

- Submission of required documents and data
- School Site Visits or School Tours (based on performance)
- Performance on the Academic, Financial, and Organizational Performance Frameworks

Site Visits and School Tours

All Mississippi charter schools receive at least one visit annually. School visits provide the ability to connect with school leaders and boards, collect supporting evidence outside of the data collected for the academic,

financial, and organizational performance frameworks, and give a more comprehensive picture of charter schools. The frequency and intensity of visits depends on the number of years in operation, a school's performance, and eligibility for a high-stakes decision like renewal. All full site visits feature: classroom visits, facility reviews, policies and procedures audits, interviews with leadership team members including school leaders, special education coordinators, and board members.

Intervention Ladder

Occasionally, routine oversight may result in adverse findings. When these situations occur, schools enter into the intervention process. All schools begin in Good Standing and can be moved to Level 1, Level 2, or Revocation Review depending on the severity of the issue or failure to remedy any concerns. Schools are issued Notices of Concern (Level 1) or Notices of Breach (Level 2) which detail specific concerns and due dates and steps to take to remedy any issue. Once schools remedy the specific issue, they move back to Good Standing. If a school does not take appropriate action, it proceeds further through the Intervention Ladder.

Renewal

The Performance Framework provides timely and accurate information for charter renewal decisions. The Authorizer Board reviews schools for their initial renewal in the fall of their fifth year of operation. The Authorizer board considers Performance Framework ratings, timely document submissions, site visit and school tours, annual performance reports, and other relevant information in its decisions. The Authorizer Board is charged with grounding its renewal decisions in evidence of school's performance over the term of the charter contract in accordance with the Performance Framework.

Charter School Outcomes: Academic Performance

The Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board uses the Academic Performance Framework within the Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework to evaluate a school’s academic performance. It includes indicators, measures, and metrics for student academic proficiency, student academic growth, performance of major student subgroups, and optional, additional school specific measures. For each measure, a school receives one of four ratings: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Approaches Expectations, or Fails to Meet Expectations. A school that receives a Fails to Meet Expectations in any category may receive increased oversight including but not limited to additional site visits and corrective action steps. A school that receives three of more consecutive Fails to Meet Expectations on Indicator 1: State Accountability Letter Grade may result in a recommendation of revocation of the charter.

Table 4. Academic Performance Framework, Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

| Academic Performance Framework – Academic Performance Rating: Grades K – 8 | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Measure | Rating | | | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Approaches Expectations | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| 1. State Accountability Letter Grade – Proficiency and Growth | A | B - C | D | F |
| 2. School-Specific Academic Goals | School exceeds school-specific annual goals. | School meets school-specific annual goals. | School did not meet school-specific academic goals. | School fell far below school-specific academic goals. |
| 3. Subgroup Performance – Growth [^] | 76 to 100% of subgroup students achieved growth target. | 51 to 75% of subgroup students achieved growth target. | 26 to 50% of subgroup students achieved growth target. | 0 to 25% of subgroup students achieved growth target. |
| 4. Subgroup Performance – Proficiency [^] | 76 to 100% of subgroup students achieved a score of proficient or higher. | 51 to 75% of subgroup students achieved a score of proficient or higher. | 26 to 50% of subgroup students achieved a score of proficient or higher. | 0 to 25% of subgroup students achieved a score of proficient or higher. |

Measure 1. State Accountability Letter Grade – Proficiency and Growth

In Mississippi, all charter schools are subject to the same student assessments and accountability letter grade system as traditional public schools. At the end of every school year, students in grades 3-8 participate in the Mississippi Assessment Program (MAP)’s English Language Arts and Mathematics assessments, which are based on Mississippi’s College- and Career-Readiness Standards. Students in grades five and eight also take the Mississippi Science Test, Second Edition (MST2). Schools without a 12th grade receive a score out of 700 points. The number of points each school receives then determines their letter grade.

Table 5. Accountability Score Calculation

| Component Measured | Reimagine Prep | Midtown Public Charter School | Total Possible Points |
|---|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Math: Proficiency | 14.2 | 6.9 | 100 |
| Math: Growth – All Students | 78.5 | 49.4 | 100 |
| Math: Growth – Lowest Performing Students | 94.8 | 63.7 | 100 |
| ELA: Proficiency | 18.9 | 13.7 | 100 |
| ELA: Growth – All Students | 37.6 | 37.7 | 100 |
| ELA: Growth – Lowest Performing Students | 39.3 | 38.3 | 100 |
| Science: Proficiency | 31.1 | 51 | 100 |
| Total Points | 314 | 261 | 700 |

Table 6. Accountability Letter Grade Cut Scores

| Grade | Cut Score |
|-------|-----------|
| A | 455 |
| B | 385 |
| C | 330 |
| D | 277 |
| F | <277 |

Table 7. 2015-16 Charter School Letter Grades

| School | Accountability Score | Letter Grade | Academic Performance Framework Rating |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|
| Reimagine Prep | 314 | D | Approaches Expectations |
| Midtown Public Charter School | 261 | F | Fails to Meet Expectations |

Measure 2. School-Specific Academic Goals

In order to capture additional academic performance outside the scope of the state’s assessment program and accountability system, the Performance Framework is required to feature school-selected performance indicators. School-specific academic goals were proposed by each charter school and ultimately approved by MCSAB. Each school’s additional specific goal is listed below. Both charter schools selected an indicator that focuses on performance with students performing below grade level.

2015-16 School-Specific Academic Goals

- Reimagine Prep: 100% of students who start the school year reading below grade level as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory will grow at least 1.5 grade levels over the course of the year
- Midtown Public Charter School: 100% of students who score basic or below basic at the beginning of the school year in reading and math will demonstrate 1.5 years of growth in reading and math as measured by the STAR assessment.

Table 8. 2015-16 School-Specific Academic Goal Performance

| School | School-Specific Performance | Academic Performance Framework Rating |
|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| Reimagine Prep | 46% of students who started the year reading below grade level made at least 1.5 years of reading growth over the year as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| Midtown Public Charter School | 20% of students who scored basic or below basic at the beginning of the school year in reading and math will demonstrate 1.5 years of growth in reading and math as measured by the STAR assessment | Fails to Meet Expectations |

Measures 3 and 4. Subgroup Growth and Proficiency

MCSAB evaluates the performance of subgroup growth and proficiency across a number of different subgroups of students who attend charter schools. Based on their performance in each area, schools receive a rating for each subgroup growth and proficiency category.

Table 9. Reimagine Prep: Subgroup Growth and Proficiency Performance[^]

| Subgroup | | Result | Rating | |
|--|------|------------------------|--------|----------------------------|
| Gender: Male | Math | % Achieved Growth | 76.5% | Exceeds Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 17.5% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | ELA | % Achieved Growth | 41.2% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 17.5% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| Gender: Female | Math | % Achieved Growth | 74.5% | Meets Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 10.2% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | ELA | % Achieved Growth | 31.9% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 20.4% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| Race: African-American* | Math | % Achieved Growth | 69.8% | Meets Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 14.2% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | ELA | % Achieved Growth | 36.7% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 18.9% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| Poverty Status: Economically Disadvantaged* | Math | % Achieved Growth | 69.8% | Meets Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 14.2% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | ELA | % Achieved Growth | 36.7% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 18.9% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| Special Education Status: Students with Disabilities | Math | % Achieved Growth | 63.6% | Meets Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | <5% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | ELA | % Achieved Growth | 27.3% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | <5% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| Special Education Status: Students without Disabilities | Math | % Achieved Growth | 77% | Exceeds Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 14.2% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | ELA | % Achieved Growth | 37.9% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 18.9% | Fails to Meet Expectations |

*Insufficient data to calculate any other comparable subgroups.

[^]Subgroups required but not calculated due to insufficient data: gifted education status and English language learner status.

Table 10. Midtown Public Charter School: Subgroup Growth and Proficiency Performance[^]

| Subgroup | | Result | Rating | |
|--|------|------------------------|--------|----------------------------|
| Gender: Male | Math | % Achieved Growth | 46% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 5.3% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | ELA | % Achieved Growth | 32.7% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 8.8% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| Gender: Female | Math | % Achieved Growth | 52.5% | Meets Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 8.9% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | ELA | % Achieved Growth | 42.5% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 20% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| Race: African-American* | Math | % Achieved Growth | 48.9% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 7.1% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | ELA | % Achieved Growth | 37.1% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 13.1% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| Poverty Status: Economically Disadvantaged* | Math | % Achieved Growth | 48.9% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 6.9% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | ELA | % Achieved Growth | 37% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 13.7% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| Special Education Status: Students with Disabilities | Math | % Achieved Growth | 33.3% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | <5% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | ELA | % Achieved Growth | 9.1% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | <5% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| Special Education Status: Students without Disabilities | Math | % Achieved Growth | 50.6% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 6.9% | Fails to Meet Expectations |
| | ELA | % Achieved Growth | 40.7% | Approaches Expectations |
| | | % Proficient or Higher | 13.7% | Fails to Meet Expectations |

* Insufficient data to calculate any other comparable subgroups.

[^]Subgroups required but not calculated due to insufficient data: gifted education status and English language learner status.

Charter School Outcomes: Financial Performance

The Financial Performance Framework measures the financial health and viability of schools through four indicators: 1) fund balance; 2) audit findings; 3) debt to asset ratio; and 4) timely reporting. These four indicators are evaluated on an annual basis. A school that receives three or more consecutive Fails to Meet Expectations may result in a recommendation of revocation of the charter. All information used to assess a school's Financial Performance Rating and Score comes from annually audited financial documents. Overall Financial Performance Framework ratings for all charter schools are listed below.

Table 11. Financial Performance Framework, Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

| Financial Performance Framework - Financial Performance Score Indicators | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| Indicators | Potential Points | Full Credit | Partial Credit | No Credit |
| Fund Balance | Full Credit – 30 Points Partial Credit – 15 Points No Credit – 0 Points | Y1: >2% Y2: >3% Y3: >4% Y4: >5% Y5: >6% +Y5: >7.5% | Y1: 1-2% Y2: 1.5-3% Y3: 2-4% Y4: 2.5-5% Y5: 3-6% +Y5: 3.75-7.5% | Y1: <1% Y2: <1.5% Y3: <2% Y4: <2.5% Y5: <3% +Y5: <3.75% |
| Audit Findings | Full Credit – 30 Points Partial Credit – 15 Points No Credit – 0 Points | -Unqualified Audit with No Findings | -Unqualified Audit with No Recurring or Material Findings | -Unqualified Audit with Recurring or Material Findings; Or -Qualified Audit |
| Debt to Asset Ratio | Full Credit – 20 Points No Credit – 0 Points | <0.9 | N/A | >0.9 |
| Timely Reporting | Full Credit – 20 Points Partial Credit – 15 Points Partial Credit – 10 Points No Credit – 0 Points | -Quarterly reports and Audit All Submitted Timely | 1 Late – 15 Points 2 Late – 10 Points | 3 – 5 Late |

Table 12. Financial Performance Framework Ratings

| | Reimagine Prep | Midtown Public Charter School |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Financial Performance Score | 95/100 | 100/100 |
| Financial Performance Rating | Meets Expectations | Meets Expectations |

Charter School Outcomes: Organizational Performance

The Organizational Performance Framework provides performance targets and compliance targets for the legal and contractual obligations that schools must meet. There are six areas of focus: 1) educational program requirements; 2) enrollment; 3) discipline; 4) special education and at-risk student populations; 5) school environment; and 6) governance. Schools begin with 100 points and provide assurances that they are following policies and procedures mandated by state law and MCSAB policy. A school loses points when it receives more than one Notice of Concern or one Notice of Breach per indicator. A school that receives three or more consecutive Fails to Meet Expectations may result in a recommendation of revocation of the charter. Schools must cure concerns in order to receive an Organizational Performance Framework score. Overall Organizational Performance Framework ratings for all charter schools are listed below.

Table 13. Organizational Performance Framework, Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

| Organizational Performance Framework – Organizational Performance Rating | | | |
|---|----------|---|-----------------|
| Rating | Score | Components | |
| Meets Expectations | 80 - 100 | Key Indicator | Points Possible |
| Approaches Expectations | 60 - 79 | Educational Program Requirements | 12 |
| Fails to Meet Expectations | 0 - 59 | Enrollment | 19 |
| | | Discipline | 11 |
| | | Special Education / At-Risk Student Populations | 28 |
| | | School Environment | 21 |
| | | Governance | 9 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All schools start with the full amount of points and assure that they follow these policies and procedures. A school loses points when more than 1 Notice of Concern is issued or a Notice of Breach is issued. Some indicators are based on data outcomes and schools must achieve specified outcomes in order to earn points. | | Total | 100 |

Table 14. Organizational Performance Framework Ratings

| | Reimagine Prep | Midtown Public Charter School |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Organizational Performance Score | 94/100 | 94/100 |
| Organizational Performance Rating | Meets Expectations | Meets Expectations |

Comparison Data

Charter school performance is compared to the performance of academically, ethnically, and economically similar groups of students from the school district where charter schools are located.

Academically Similar Groups

Academically similar groups of students are defined as students in the same grade levels as served in charter schools excluding students who attend academically selective elementary and middle school programs. For the 2015-16 school year, Reimagine Prep performance is compared to the performance of fifth grade students enrolled in Jackson Public Schools not attending selective admissions schools. Midtown Public Charter School performance is compared to the performance of fifth and sixth grade students enrolled in Jackson Public Schools not attending selective admissions schools.

Table 15. Academically Similar Groups Performance

| | Reimagine Prep | Jackson Public Schools – 5 th Grade Students Not Enrolled in Selective Admissions Schools |
|-------------------------------|----------------|--|
| Math - % Proficient or Higher | 14.2% | 10.3% |
| Math - % Achieved Growth | 69.8% | 52.9% |
| ELA - % Proficient or Higher | 18.9% | 18.5% |
| ELA - % Achieved Growth | 36.7% | 46.1% |

| | Midtown Public Charter School | Jackson Public Schools – 5 th & 6 th Grade Students Not Enrolled in Selective Admissions Schools |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Math - % Proficient or Higher | 6.9% | 9.9% |
| Math - % Achieved Growth | 48.9% | 51.7% |
| ELA - % Proficient or Higher | 13.7% | 12.9% |
| ELA - % Achieved Growth | 36.7% | 36.5% |

Ethnically Similar Groups

Ethnically similar groups of students are defined as students in the same grade levels as served in charter schools that meet the federal definitions for race and ethnicity. For the 2015-16 school year, Reimagine Prep performance is compared to the performance of African-American fifth grade students enrolled in Jackson Public Schools. Midtown Public Charter School performance is compared to the performance of

African-American fifth and sixth grade students enrolled in Jackson Public Schools. Additional race/ethnicity comparisons are not listed due to insufficient data for other groups.

Table 16. Ethnically Similar Groups Performance, African-American Students

| | Reimagine Prep | Jackson Public Schools - 5 th Grade | Midtown Public Charter School | Jackson Public Schools – 5 th and 6 th Grades |
|-------------------------------|----------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| Math - % Proficient or Higher | 14.2% | 13.3% | 7.1% | 13.5% |
| Math - % Achieved Growth | 69.8% | 54.2% | 48.9% | 52.5% |
| ELA - % Proficient or Higher | 18.9% | 21.5% | 13.1% | 17.5% |
| ELA - % Achieved Growth | 36.7% | 47.7% | 37.1% | 39.3% |

Economically Similar Groups

Economically similar groups of students are defined as students in the same grade levels as served in charter schools that qualify for free or reduced lunch status. For the 2015-16 school year, Reimagine Prep performance is compared to the performance of fifth grade students enrolled in Jackson Public Schools that qualify for free or reduced lunch. Midtown Public Charter School performance is compared to the performance of fifth and sixth grade students enrolled in Jackson Public Schools that qualify for free or reduced lunch. Additional economic group comparisons are not listed due to insufficient data for other groups.

Table 17. Economically Similar Groups Performance, Free and Reduced Lunch Students

| | Reimagine Prep | Jackson Public Schools - 5 th Grade | Midtown Public Charter School | Jackson Public Schools – 5 th and 6 th Grades |
|-------------------------------|----------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| Math - % Proficient or Higher | 14.2% | 13.6% | 6.9% | 13.9% |
| Math - % Achieved Growth | 69.8% | 54.6% | 48.9% | 52.8% |
| ELA - % Proficient or Higher | 18.9% | 21.8% | 13.7% | 17.9% |
| ELA - % Achieved Growth | 36.7% | 47.9% | 37% | 39.7% |