Goal: Institute an accountability model that...

- improves student achievement
- increases graduation rates
- closes achievement gaps
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Essential Questions and Recommendations for this month...

**Academic Course Rigor**

How will Future-Ready Core be counted in the model?

**Student Accountability**

How should current student accountability measures be updated?

- Gateways?
- 25% Policy?
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**Academic Course Rigor**

How will Future-Ready Core be counted in the model?

**Recommendation:**

Include the number of students that score proficient on Algebra II EOC (eventually Math BC assessment)

Other possible measures that might be used or reported?

- Inclusion of # or % of students taking AP Courses
- 4-unit concentration in a career cluster (Arts, CTE, etc.)
- Credentialing programs
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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:
Change the Gateway Policy for 3, 5, 8 and EOC assessments to require intervention *without* retesting
How should the Gateways system be updated?

**Pros:**

- Continues to reinforces “results matter” while allowing principals the ultimate decision
- Greater focus on new formative and interim assessments to make promotion decisions
- Reinforces the ultimate responsibility of educators for making the best promotion decision for students

**Cons:**

- Requires policy change
- Introduces a greater level of uncertainty from a state-level concerning promotion decisions
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Student Accountability

Should the state keep the 25% policy?

Option 1: Maintain current 25% of final grade policy

Pros:
- Provides incentives to 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
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Several high-level decisions that remain include:

1. Revise ABCs Classification System?
2. Recommend revision to ABCs financial awards?
3. Recommend revision to definition of low-performing schools?
4. Recommend revision to definition of continually low-performing schools?
5. Recommend changes to assistance teams?
6. Recommend legislation to identification of low-performing LEAs?