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## Agenda

- Provide examples of current state approaches to accountability along relevant dimensions for committee recommendations:
- Framework or system domains
- Indicators or measures
- Performance categories
- Weights
- Time frame
- Other (alignment to other measures, systems, or policies; consistency with federal accountability requirements, reporting, distinctions)


## Framework or System Domains

## Framework or System Domains（State System）

|  | Texas | Colorado | Ohio | Florida | Virginia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student achievement | 『 | V | 『 | V | V |
| Student progress | V | V | V | $\nabla$ |  |
| Closing performance gaps | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ | 『 | $\square$ |  |
| Postsecondary readiness | 『 | 『 | 『 | 『 | 『 |
| Community and student engagement | 『 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Participation rate | Participation rate | Participation rate |  |

Every Student Succeeds Act（ESSA）requires：proficiency in English language arts（ELA）and math，graduation rate（high schools）OR growth or another＂valid and reliable＂statewide academic indicator（elementary and middle schools），English－ language proficiency progress，additional indicators of school quality or student success

## Indicators or Measures

## Domain 1: Student Achievement

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Texas } & \text { Colorado } & \text { Ohio } & \text { Florida } & \text { Virginia } \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { STAAR } \\ \text { - Percentage of students who } \\ \text { met performance standard } \\ \text { aggregated across grade } \\ \text { levels by subject area }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Percentage of all } \\ \text { students proficient } \\ \text { on state } \\ \text { assessments in } \\ \text { reading, math, } \\ \text { Percentage of students who } \\ \text { met college readiness } \\ \text { performance standard } \\ \text { aggregated across grade } \\ \text { levels by subject area }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Percentage of } \\ \text { assessments for } \\ \text { state-defined } \\ \text { which } 80 \% \text { of } \\ \text { students score } \\ \text { proficient or higher } \\ \text { (performance } \\ \text { indicators met) } \\ \text { across all grades } \\ \text { and subjects } \\ \text { (ELA, math, } \\ \text { science, social } \\ \text { studies) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Percentage of all } \\ \text { students } \\ \text { satisfactory or } \\ \text { higher on state } \\ \text { assessments in } \\ \text { ELA, math, } \\ \text { science, social } \\ \text { studies }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Percentage of all } \\ \text { students proficient } \\ \text { on state } \\ \text { assessments in }\end{array} \\ \text { ELA, math, } \\ \text { science, social } \\ \text { studies }\end{array}\right\}$

Ohio Performance Index

| Performance Index Points | State Test <br> Performance Level |  | Average Performance Index Score | Number of Students | Average Index Score x Number of Students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.3 points | Advanced Plus (Advanced score at higher grade level) | ELA | 0.80 | 20 | 16 |
| 1.2 points | Advanced | Math | 0.85 | 20 | 17 |
| 1.1 points | Accelerated | Science | 0.75 | 14 | 10.5 |
| 1.0 points | Proficient | Social Studies | 0.90 | 12 | 10.8 |
| 0.6 points | Basic | Total |  | 66 | 54.3 |
| 0.3 points | Limited | Weighted average |  | 54.3/66=0.82 |  |
| 0 points | Did not take test |  |  |  |  |

## Domain 2: Student Progress

| Texas | Colorado | Ohio | Florida |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STAAR <br> - Phase-in Level II-Percentage of students who met standard for annual improvement aggregated across grade levels by subject area <br> - College ReadinessPercentage of students who met standard for annual improvement aggregated across grade levels by subject area | Median growth percentile (math, reading, writing, English proficiency) (compared to state adequate growth percentile and state minimum median growth percentile) | Value-added progress across subjects from year to year on statewide assessment scores in math, ELA, science, and social studies or math and ELA (high schools) <br> Percentage of students who did not score on track on $\mathrm{K}-3$ reading diagnostic assessment or Grade 3 state reading assessment who score on track in current year or semester | Learning gains: percentage of students who scored at achievement level 1 or level 2 in previous year and advance from one sublevel to a higher level within the overall level; scored at achievement level 3 or level 4 in previous year and increase scale score by any amount; or scored at achievement level 5 in previous year and maintain |

## Domain 3: Closing Performance Gaps

| Texas | Colorado | Ohio | Florida |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Academic achievement <br> differentials among <br> students from different <br> racial and ethnic groups <br> and socioeconomic <br> backgrounds | Median growth <br> percentile (math, <br> reading, writing, English <br> proficiency) (compared <br> to state adequate growth <br> percentile and/or state <br> minimum median growth <br> percentile for minority, | Value-added progress <br> across subjects from <br> year to year on <br> statewide assessment <br> FRL, students with <br> disabilities, ELL, and <br> science, and social <br> students below <br> studies or math and ELA <br> (high schools) for gifted <br> students, students <br> with disabilities, lowest <br> 20\% | Learning gains for lowest <br> 25\% (math, ELA) |
|  | Graduation rates for <br> minority, FRL, students <br> with disabilities, ELL <br> students (against state <br> target) | Progress toward closing <br> gaps between <br> performance and annual <br> measurable objectives <br> for math proficiency, <br> reading proficiency, and <br> graduation rates |  |

## Domain 4: Postsecondary Readiness

| Texas |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts and High Schools <br> - Dropout rate <br> - Graduation rate <br> - Percentage of students who do at least one of the following: <br> - Complete requirements for FHSP distinguished level of achievement <br> - Complete the requirements for an endorsement <br> - Complete a coherent sequence of CTE courses <br> - Satisfy the TSI benchmark <br> - Earn at least 12 hours of postsecondary credit <br> - Complete an AP course <br> - Enlist in the armed forces <br> - Earn an industry certification | Middle and Junior High Schools <br> - Student attendance <br> - Dropout rate <br> - Percentage of seventh- and eighth-grade students who receive instruction in preparing for high school, college, and career | Elementary Schools <br> - Student attendance |
| Any additional indicators of student achievement not related to performance on standardized assessment, as determined by the commissioner |  |  |

## Domain 4: Postsecondary Readiness

| Colorado | Ohio | Florida | Virginia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Graduation rates (highest of four-, five-, six-, or seven-year) <br> Dropout rate <br> Average composite ACT score | Graduation rate (4-year) Graduation rate (5-year) <br> Percentage of students in graduating class who: <br> - Participated in ACT <br> - Participated in SAT <br> - Earned remediation-free score on ACT <br> - Earned remediation-free score on ACT <br> - Received an honors diploma <br> - Earned industryrecognized credential <br> - Earned credit in one or more AP courses <br> - Scored 3 or higher on at least one AP test <br> - Earned at least 3 dual enrollment or postsecondary credits | High School <br> Graduation rate (4-year) <br> Percentage of graduates: <br> - With AP, IB, or AICE results who earn college credit or <br> - Who earned a C or better in dual enrollment or <br> - Earned CAPE industry certification <br> Middle School <br> Percentage of eligible students: <br> - Who pass one or more EOC exams or <br> - Earn industry certification | Graduation and completion index based on average level of high school degree earned by students in 4year cohort (Boardrecognized diploma, GED, still in school, certificate of program completion, dropout) |

## Domain 5: Community and Student

 Engagement| Texas | ESSA |
| :---: | :---: |
| Three indicators from the following list, as chosen by each district and campus: <br> - Fine arts <br> - Wellness and physical education <br> - Community and parental involvement, such as opportunities for parents to assist students in preparing for assessments <br> - Tutoring programs that support students taking assessments <br> - Opportunities for students to participate in community service projects <br> - 21st Century Workforce Development program <br> - Second language acquisition program <br> - Digital learning environment <br> - Dropout prevention strategies <br> - Educational programs for gifted and talented students | School quality or success (additional indicators*) <br> "may" include the following: <br> - Student access to and completion of advanced coursework <br> - Postsecondary readiness <br> - School climate and safety <br> - Student engagement <br> - Educator engagement <br> Other reported data required under ESSA that might be used: <br> - Behavior data (for example, suspensions, expulsions) <br> - Participation in AP/IB coursework and tests <br> - Preschool participation <br> - College-going rates <br> - Chronic absenteeism (absent one month) |

*Note that ESSA requires indicators that can be disaggregated

## Performance Categories

## Performance Categories

|  | Texas | Colorado | Ohio | Florida | Virginia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 5 | 4 | 5* | 5** | 6 |
| Labels | A-F | Performance Plan, Improvement Plan, Priority Improvement Plan, Turnaround Plan | A-F* | A-F** | Fully Accredited, <br> Approaching <br> Benchmark, <br> Improving, <br> Warned, <br> Reconstituted, <br> Accreditation <br> Denied |
| Cut Points |  | $>60,47-59,37-47,<32$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & >=62,54-61, \\ & 41-53,32-40, \\ & <=31 \end{aligned}$ | Vary by measure and category |
| Other |  | Overall designation adjusted down based on participation rate |  |  |  |

*No overall rating—ratings provided for individual performance measures
**I or Incomplete rating assigned temporarily based on participation rate and replaced with A-F after investigation

## Weights

## Weights

|  | Texas | Colorado | Florida | Virginia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type |  | Compensatory | Compensatory | Conjunctive |
| Weights | Differential weighting across domains <br> Within-domain weighting may be differential or equal: Domains 1, 2, $3=$ $55 \%$, Domain 4 = 35\% (graduation rate 10\%, other 25\%), Domain 5 = 10\% | Individual performance measures weighted differentially (academic growth in math, reading, writing highest at 14.3\%) | Individual performance measures weighted equally | Equal weights for individual performance measures |

Compensatory: All measures considered together. Must meet overall performance threshold. Conjunctive: Measures considered separately. Must meet x condition AND x condition.

## Time Frame

## Time Frame for Data to Compute Rating

| Texas | Colorado | Florida | Virginia | Ohio |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TBD | One- or three- <br> year average- <br> use the one with <br> more indicators <br> available, or, if <br> equal, the method <br> that yields the <br> highest score | One year | One year, three- <br> or four-year <br> average for <br> achievement | One year |

Time frame also is relevant for reporting-can report accountability designations over time or can report single-year designations

## Other Dimensions

## Other Dimensions

- Alignment to other measures, systems, or policies
- Ohio performance index used for assessment reporting?
- Florida learning gains used for other policies such as teacher evaluation?
- Consistency with federal accountability requirements
- Florida use of same system for state and federal designations
- Other states: Additional indicators for state or federal (e.g., Colorado subgroup achievement for federal, Virginia dropout rate for state)
- Reporting
- Explanatory information


## Other Issues

- Relationship of school performance to student background
- Performance category scaling
- $N$ sizes: Ohio, 10; Virginia, 30
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