Accountability Working Group Summary

February 5, 2020

Presented by:
• Dale Winkler, SREB
• Ivy Alford, SREB
• Terry Holliday, Special Consultant for SREB
SREB

Support Action
in states and schools, policy and practice

Convene & Engage
decision-makers in education, government, business

Analyze & Publish
data, research, promising practices
Goals for the Accountability Study:

Gather shareholder feedback on:

1. Recommendations on possible changes to (i) the *weighting* of the school achievement score and the school growth score in calculation of the overall school performance score to best reflect performance and progress for each school and (ii) the *reporting methods* used to meaningfully differentiate schools on the State’s Annual Report Card(s).

2. Feasibility of including end-of-grade and end-of-course *retest* scores in both the achievement and growth calculations for schools and districts.

3. **Alignment** of the State’s Accountability System and School Report Cards with the North Carolina State Board of Education’s *Strategic Plan*.

4. **Alignment** of the State’s Accountability System and School Report Cards with the 1997 N.C. Supreme Court decision related to the constitutional guarantee of a “*sound, basic education.*”
Misalignment and Competing Messages

- WIOA
- Report Card
- ESSA
- My Future NC
- General Assembly
- Strategic Plan
- Sound, Basic Education
- Perkins V
Alignment Across Statutes

- ESSA
- Perkins V
- WIOA
Points to Consider:

• What is the profile of a North Carolina graduate?
• What are goals to communicate transition readiness for:
  • PK-3?
  • 4-8?
  • 9-12?
  • Postsecondary?
• What are the expectations for school climate and culture?
• What data communicates progress on closing gaps for NC students?
Accountability Work Group Participants

Representatives from:

• The Governor’s Office
• The Department of Public Instruction
• Districts—including teacher, principal and superintendent representatives
• Staff from the State Board of Education
• Other State Board of Education Partners
Work Group Agenda (1/31/2020)

1. Weighting and Reporting
2. Use of Retest Data
3. Alignment to the Strategic Plan
4. Alignment to “Sound, Basic Education”
Our Process

Overview → Review of Samples → Gather Feedback and Recommendations
Review of Feedback

1. Weighting and Reporting
2. Use of Retest Data
3. Alignment to the Strategic Plan
4. Alignment to “Sound, Basic Education”
Weighting Trends

Please review the weighting trends summary.

• What trends do you see?

• How does North Carolina compare to other states?
North Carolina and Vermont have the highest weighting of achievement.

Other states have included multiple measures to communicate progress towards state goals.
Trends in Accountability Reporting

- 12 States use A-F Grades
- 12 States use an Index
- 11 States use a Descriptive Format
- 5 States use 1-5 Stars
- 4 States use Summative Ratings
- 6 States use Tiers of Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Accountability Rating Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Tiers of Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>A-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>No summative rating (Performance levels for indicators: red, orange, yellow, green, blue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Tiers of Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1-5 Stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>A-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>No summative rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>A-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1-5 Stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>A-F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerned about the use of A-F designations, especially labeling any school as “failing”

Preferred stars or a dashboard visual to communicate current standing

Requested the addition of a descriptive component to communicate school context and use of innovative practices.
The work group reviewed sample report cards from Ohio.

Points to consider:

• The report card data aligns closely with Ohio’s State ESSA Plan.
• There is an overall report card grade and six sub-score areas.
• The on-line version of the report allows users to “dig deeper” into various layers of data.
School Overview

Districts and schools report information for the Ohio School Report Cards on specific marks of performance, called measures, within broad categories called components. They receive grades for up to ten measures and six components.

Achievement
The Achievement Component represents whether student performance on state tests met established thresholds and how well students performed on tests overall. A new indicator measures chronic absenteeism.

Progress
The Progress component looks closely at the growth that all students are making based on their past performances.

Gap Closing
The Gap Closing component shows how well schools are meeting the performance expectations for our most vulnerable students in English language arts, math, graduation, and English language proficiency.

Graduation Rate
The Graduation Rate component looks at the percent of students who are successfully finishing high school with a diploma in four or five years.

Improving At-Risk K-3 Readers
This component looks at how successful the school is at improving at-risk K-3 readers.

Prepared for Success
Whether training in a technical field or preparing for work or college, the Prepared for Success component looks at how well prepared Ohio’s students are for all future opportunities.
Alignment to ESSA

Academic Achievement
- Achievement

Other Academic Indicator
- Progress (K-12)
- Improving At-Risk K-3 Readers

Graduation Rate
- Graduation Rate

Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency
- Gap Closing

School Quality or Student Success Indicator
- Prepared for Success
Achievement

Performance Index
The Performance Index measures the test results of every student, not just those who score proficient or higher. There are seven levels on the index and schools receive points for every student who takes a test. The higher the achievement level, the more points awarded in the school's index. This rewards schools and districts for improving the performance of all students, regardless of achievement level.

68.7 of a possible 120.0

Indicators Met
Indicators Met measures the percent of students who have passed state tests. It also includes the gifted indicator and the chronic absenteeism indicator. Test results are reported for each student in a grade and subject. The passage rate for each test indicator is 80% and the End of Course (EOC) Improvement Indicator is 25%.

10.0%
1 out of 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Achievement Levels</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra I</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American US Government</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American US History</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts I</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts II</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC Improvement Indicator</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics I</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics II</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Test Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Indicator</td>
<td>View More Data</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback from the Work Group

• Group liked the communication of multiple measures (with separate scores for priority areas)
• Group appreciated the alignment of the data to state goals and the opportunity to dig deeper into the data
  – One-page overview with clearly defined measures
  – Dynamic data that allows for more in depth review, including three-year trend data
• Group focused on communication and clarity and expressed the desire to clearly define measures for all shareholders
Review of Feedback

1. Weighting and Reporting
2. Use of Retest Data
3. Alignment to the Strategic Plan
4. Alignment to “Sound, Basic Education”
The work group was asked to discuss:

• The current system for retesting students (timeline).

• Supports that are commonly provided to students who did not meet performance goals (and are designated as eligible to retest).

• The benefits of including retest data (monitoring or identifying next steps).
Feedback from the Work Group

• There are current limitations caused by the retesting window.
• Current “support” provides up to 10 days of re-engagement for identified students.
• “Support(s)” provided to students varies dramatically by district.
• A clear purpose of collecting the data would be needed; currently two purposes could be identified.
National Trends

- Retests are an option within two areas
  - High stakes assessments for students and
  - Accountability models for schools
- Research has shown that retests have little impact unless one of two conditions exits
  - Students are within 1-2 questions of passing an assessment
  - There is a significant remediation session (the equivalent of 20 days of support)
Review of Feedback

1. Weighting and Reporting
2. Use of Retest Data
3. Alignment to the Strategic Plan
4. Alignment to “Sound, Basic Education”
State Board’s Mission and Goals

Mission:
The mission of the North Carolina State Board of Education is to use its constitutional authority to guard and maintain the right of a sound, basic education for every child in North Carolina Public Schools.

Goal 1: Eliminate opportunity gaps by 2025
Goal 2: Improve school and district performance by 2025
Goal 3: Increase educator preparedness to meet the needs of every student by 2025
The work group was divided into three teams and asked to review one of the three goals within the state’s strategic plan. Team members were asked to identify data related to each goal and related objectives:

- Reported Data
- Data Used to Generate Accountability Scores/Designations
- Priority Rank Status (to assist with weighting)
Differentiating the Data

Reported Data (Communication)

Data Used for Accountability Calculations (Prioritized and Weighted)
## Feedback—Accountability Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1—Eliminate Opportunity Gaps</th>
<th>Goal 2—Improve School and District Performance</th>
<th>Goal 3—Increase Educator Preparedness to Meet the Needs of Every Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increase average composite score on college entrance exams</td>
<td>• Growth measures by subgroup</td>
<td>• No measures proposed for accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase access, readiness and attainment of early postsecondary opportunities</td>
<td>• Percent of students meeting ESSA yearly measures of interim progress (ELA and Math) for all grade levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Feedback—Proposed Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1—Eliminate Opportunity Gaps</th>
<th>Goal 2—Improve School and District Performance</th>
<th>Goal 3—Increase Educator Preparedness to Meet the Needs of Every Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 4-year olds in Pre-K</td>
<td>Science proficiency</td>
<td>Measures to communicate Advanced Teaching Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspensions and expulsions</td>
<td>Summary of students’ access to technology</td>
<td>Measures to communicate continued learning for educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to communicate school climate</td>
<td>Financial data dashboard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of educators of color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of Feedback

1. Weighting and Reporting
2. Use of Retest Data
3. Alignment to the Strategic Plan
4. Alignment to “Sound, Basic Education”
“Sound, Basic Education”

The work group was provided with the summary of findings and recommendations from the Leandro Study.

The group was asked to highlight/check recommendations that were already addressed (in components 1-3) and to identify any missing measures that would support the focus on a “sound, basic education.”
What’s Missing?

To spark the group’s discussion, SREB provided samples from other states (OH, FL and KY) and specifically questioned measures to communicate:

- K-3 Readiness
- College and Career Readiness
- Gap Closing
# K-3 Measures—Ohio Sample

## In your school...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Measure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>23 Students Moved to On Track</strong></td>
<td><strong>48 Students Started Off Track</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 RIMP Deductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grade Key

- A = 78.0 - 100.0%
- B = 55.9 - 77.9%
- C = 33.8 - 55.8%
- D = 11.7 - 33.7%
- F = <11.7%

## 3rd Grade Reading Guarantee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On Track by Grade Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many third graders met the Third Grade Reading Guarantee requirements for promotion to 4th grade?</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many third graders scored proficient on the state English language arts test?</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ohio's Third Grade Reading Guarantee ensures that students are successful in reading before moving on to fourth grade. Schools must provide supports for struggling readers in early grades. If a child appears to be falling behind in reading, the school will immediately start a Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plan. The program ensures that every struggling reader gets the support he or she needs to learn and achieve.

Students have multiple opportunities to meet promotion requirements including meeting a minimum promotion score on the reading portion of the state's third grade English language arts test given twice during the school year. Students have an additional opportunity to take the state assessment in the summer, as well as a district-determined alternative assessment.
K-3 Measures—Ohio Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your school...</th>
<th>Details of Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>83.3% 16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>67.5% 32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>63.3% 36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>10.0% 90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>47.5% 52.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Grade Reading Guarantee</th>
<th>On Track by Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Diagnostic</td>
<td>82.9 17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Grade Diagnostic</td>
<td>92.5 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Grade Diagnostic</td>
<td>78.3 21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Grade Diagnostic</td>
<td>85.7 14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Remained Off Track
- Moved to On Track
- Not On Track
- On Track
**Prepared for Success**

Whether training in a technical field or preparing for work or college, the Prepared for Success component looks at how well prepared Ohio's students are for all future opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students that earned a remediation free score on all parts of the ACT or SAT, earned an honors diploma, and/or earned an industry-recognized credential.</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of "bonus" students that count an additional 0.3 bonus points each, because they did the above and also earned a 3 or higher on at least one AP exam; earned a 4 or higher on at least one IB exam; and/or earned at least three college credits before leaving high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduates Ready**

**College Ready**

How Prepared were Your 2017 and 2018 Graduating Classes?

- **ACT: Participation**: 91.9
- **ACT: Remediation Free**: 17.3
- **SAT: Participation**: 0.0
- **SAT: Remediation Free**: 0.0
- **Honors Diploma**: 3.6
- **Industry-Recognized Credential**: 3.8
- **Advanced Placement Participation**: 7.2
- **AP: Exam Score of 3 or Better**: 1.9
- **Dual Enrollment Credit**: 23.5
- **International Baccalaureate**: 0.0
- **IB: Exam Score of 4 or Better**: 0.0

**Total Points**: 119.6

**Graduation Cohort**: 469

**Component Grade**: F 25.5%
CCR Measures--Kentucky

**Career Readiness Indicators**

**Total students: 46602**

- **Industry Certification:** 14.0%
- **CTE End-of-Program Assessment:** 16.4%
- **Apprenticeship:** 0.1%
- **Dual Credit:** 1.5%
- **Exceptional Work Experience:** 0%
- **More than One Indicator:** 7.4%
- **No Indicator:** 60.4%
Student Growth—Florida

Mathematics Learning Gains

Total Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Emerald Coast Middle School</th>
<th>Walton</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mathematics Low 25% Learning Gains

Total Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Emerald Coast Middle School</th>
<th>Walton</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of the existing Kindergarten Readiness Assessment and related assessment to show growth to 3rd grade.

Identify measures of College and Career Readiness (Kentucky example).

Determine how much growth has been achieved by the lowest quintile of students (Florida example).

Include EL indicator in places other than accountability.

Allow schools to include qualitative descriptors to express progress and the use of innovative programs.
Overall Feedback

• Reporting multiple measures separately would allow schools to identify progress and prioritize next steps.

• Labeling schools as “failing” does not communicate the context of the school or the progress made for students, especially those in low socioeconomic areas.
Points to Keep in Mind

• Required changes will take time.
  • ESSA timeline for revision of goals and/or monitored indicators will delay formal changes to potentially the 2021-2022 school year.
  • Short term changes would support schools to monitor both achievement and growth.
  • Collaboration with state shareholders will be essential to align the vision for all students.
Overarching Need

- State Board
- General Assembly
- ESSA
- WIOA
- Perkins V

Common Goal/Vision
Thank you!

Dale Winkler, Ed.D.
Vice President – School Improvement
dale.winkler@sreb.org

Ivy Alford
Director, State and District Partnerships
ivy.alford@sreb.org

Terry Holliday
Special Consultant for SREB
comhldy@gmail.com