Goal: Institute an accountability model that...

- improves student achievement
- increases graduation rates
- closes achievement gaps
Goal: Institute an accountability model that improves student achievement, increases graduation rates and closes achievement gaps.

**Essential Question:**

*How do we choose *indicators*, and determine how to *use* them and at what *level* to apply them so that...*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) We achieve desired outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed achievement gaps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) We minimize unintended consequences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Gaming the System”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect of non-tested subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional methods not aligned to true desired outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Post-Secondary Readiness
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Proposed Uses
(of indicators)

- Report
- Reward and Sanction
- Target Assistance
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Essential Questions and Recommendations for this month...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Secondary Readiness</strong></td>
<td>How should Post-Secondary Readiness be included in the model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Performance</strong></td>
<td>How and when should <strong>constructed response</strong> items be used on summative tests?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Accountability</strong></td>
<td>How should current student accountability measures be updated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Course Rigor</strong></td>
<td>How will <strong>Future-Ready Core</strong> be counted in the model?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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How should Post-Secondary Readiness be included in the model?

Recommendation:

Include a requirement that each student takes at least one of a select set of approved post-secondary readiness assessments to be included in the accountability model.

Possible list (not-exhaustive) of assessments:

- Accuplacer
- Compass
- ACT
- WorkKeys
- SAT
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How should Post-Secondary Readiness be included in the model?

Rationale:

• Used across state lines
• Meaningful to employers and colleges/universities
• Option allows students to choose the assessment that is right/meaningful for them
• Non-compulsory would not set a high enough standard
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How and when should constructed response items be used on summative tests?

Current Recommendation:

- **Optimize** inclusion of constructed response items by using where most needed to validly assess complex skills (e.g. objectives requiring students to *create*)

- **Split up** testing window (CR earlier; MC at end of year)

- **Phase-in** constructed response starting with
  - English 10; 2011-12
  - Biology; 2011-12
  - US History; 2012-13
  - Explore feasibility of implementing other subjects
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How and when should constructed response items be used on summative tests? (first discussion)

Implications

Increase in time and money

- To create
- To administer
- To score
- To report

Potential policy and procedure change

- Move from local to centralized scoring
- Change in the testing window
- Use of results for End-of-Grade or Course decision-making (e.g. gateways, retesting, 25% of final grade)
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Student Accountability

How should current student accountability measures be updated?

**Essential Question:**

*Should EOC and EOG assessment scores be **used** to make high-stakes decisions for **students** (the Gateways and the 25% policy)?*
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Recommendation:

Eliminate the Gateways

Pros:

• Local-control increased
• Ensures tests will not be used in isolation to make decisions for which they are not intended

Cons:

• Incentives for students to do well on the test may be lowered
• Requires policy change
• Non-proficient students not guaranteed intervention
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Should the state keep the 25% policy?

**Student Accountability**

**Option 1: Maintain current 25% of final grade policy**

**Pros:**
- Incentivizes students to do their best on the test
- Ensures that grades are, at least in part, a measure of learning outcomes

**Cons:**
- Not a standardized processes which may lead to questions about grading fairness and consistency
- Makes immediate score turn around non-negotiable

**Option 2: Eliminate state-level policy; Allow for local-control of % contribution to final grade**

**Pros:**
- Local-control increased and grades are given exclusively by those closest to the student
- More flexible testing window

**Cons:**
- Incentives for students to do well on the test may be lowered (local school districts would still have the option to include)
- Requires policy change
How will Future-Ready Core be counted in the model?

**Recommendation:**

Include the number of students that both pass Algebra II and score proficient on the Algebra II EOC.

Other possible measures that might be used?

- Inclusion of # or % of students taking AP Courses?
- Inclusion of # or % of students taking IB Courses?
- Concentrations? Or Completers?
- Credentialing?
- Measure taking into account rigor in all major subject areas?
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Planned Topics for January:

- Weighting of **indicators** and application of **rewards/sanctions** at different **levels** (including intended and unintended consequences)
- Setting ambitious and feasible student growth targets