Objectives

Come to consensus on:

- The **indicators** to be used in the new model and a non-technical definition of how we will measure them

- The **assessments** to be used to measure post-secondary readiness

- The use of **growth and absolute performance** in an indexing system

- The general **weighting** of indicators within the model
Additional Discussion Topics

- Revised reporting
- Gateways and 25% policy
- ESEA reauthorization
- Timeline, formal feedback and next steps
Process for Today

• Brief framing followed by more lengthy discussion

We hope to....

• Make significant progress on key topics

• Keep a parking lot for input and next steps
Agenda

10:00 – 12:00

• A New ABCs Model (20 min)

• Discussion and Consensus-Building on Indicators (90 min)
  → Post-Secondary Readiness
  → Absolute Achievement and Student Growth
  → Future-Ready Core and Graduation Rate

• Indexing System and Bonus Points (10 min)
A New ABCs Model
What’s New and Better in the New Model?

- Inclusion of Post-Secondary Readiness Measure
- Robust Growth Measures
- Increased Academic Course Rigor (Future-Ready Core)
- Graduation Rate Replaces Dropout Rate
- Incorporation of Index System
- Inclusion of LEA Accountability
- Revised Reporting
- Revised Student Accountability System
- Alignment with ESEA Reauthorization
Growth and Performance

We will use an **absolute performance** index and a **growth** index. *Each will have a separate formula.*
Elementary/Middle School Indicators

Absolute Performance Index

Student Achievement

End-of-Grade and (where appropriate) End-of-Course assessments built on new standards

**Current includes:**
3 – 8 Reading, 3 – 8 Math, 5 & 8 Science
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Elementary/Middle School Indicators

Growth Index

Student Growth

Student growth as measured by value-added system using EOGs and (where applicable) EOCs

Current includes:
4 – 8 Reading, 4 – 8 Math
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High School Indicators

Absolute Performance Index

- **Student Achievement**

- **Post-Secondary Readiness**
  - National Assessment(s) (ACT, SAT, WorkKeys, Compass, Accuplacer)

- **Academic Course Rigor**
  - Participation in the Future-Ready Core as evidenced by taking and scoring proficient in Algebra II (Math BC)

- **Graduation Rate**
  - 5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate
High School Indicators

**Growth Index**

**Student Growth** as measured by value-added system

**Post-Secondary Readiness**

*Change in National Assessments* (ACT, SAT, WorkKeys, Compass, Accuplacer)

**Academic Course Rigor**

*Change in Participation in the Future-Ready Core* as evidenced by taking and scoring proficient in Algebra II (Math BC)

**Graduation Rate**

*Change in 5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate*
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Initial Superintendents’ Feedback on Elementary/Middle School Indicators

- 95% of respondents agree with the components in the elementary model
- Some superintendents expressed a desire for expansion of accountability into K-3 and for inclusion of science and social studies
Initial Superintendents’ Feedback on High School Indicators

• 91% of respondents agreed with the components in the high school model

• One concern about perceived loss of career-focus

• One concern about FRC and high-income bias
Post-Secondary Readiness
Overview of Other States

- **8 states** currently use a *nationally* recognized post-secondary readiness test
- **5 states** currently administer the ACT to all their public high school students
- **6 states** measure the college and career readiness of students using a high school assessment developed in state or by the ADP Assessment Consortium
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Administered</th>
<th>Postsecondary use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENTS IN USE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>California Standards Test (CST)/Early Assessment Program (EAP) ACT</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Georgia High School Graduation Test (ELA)</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia High School Graduation Test (Mathematics)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>ADP Common Algebra II End-of-Course Exam</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>ACT/WorkKeys</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>ACT/WorkKeys</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End-of-Course Exam English III</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>ACT/WorkKeys</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Regents End-of-Course Exams</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End-of-Course Exam (Algebra II, English III)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas*</td>
<td>Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>WESTEST</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>ADP Common Algebra II End-of-Course Exam</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>ADP Common Algebra II End-of-Course Exam</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>TBD: ADP Algebra II End-of-Course Exam &amp; Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>ACT (Pilot)(^a)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>State Algebra II End-of-Course Exam</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Nationally standardized college admissions exam</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>End-of-Instruction Exams (Algebra II, English III)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS)(^n)</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Texas is developing state end-of-course assessments that will replace the TAKS.*
Assessments

Post-Secondary Readiness

ACT
SAT
WorkKeys
Accuplacer
Compass
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ACT
College Admissions Exam; Mandatory for 11th graders in five states

SAT
College Admissions Exam; Mandatory for 11th graders in one state

WorkKeys
Career Preparedness Exam; Includes three sections: 1) Applied Mathematics 2) Locating Information and 3) Reading for Information

COMPASS
Computer-Adaptive College Placement Test; COMPASS offers tests in reading, writing, math, writing essay, and English as a Second Language (ESL)

Accuplacer
College Placement Test; Includes Sentence Skills, Reading Comprehension, Arithmetic, Elementary Algebra, College-Level Math, Written Essay
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Governor’s Ready, Set, Go! and a Continuum of Diagnostic Assessments
Post-Secondary Readiness

Initial Superintendents’ Feedback

• 96% agreed generally with the proposed measures of post-secondary readiness

• More to come after April 25th
Post-Secondary Readiness

Discussion
Achievement and Growth
Student Achievement

- Maintain the Performance Composite of EOC and EOG assessments as the measure of school achievement
Student Growth

**School** Educational Value-Added

- Replace current growth model with *value-added* system using EOCs and EOGs data to determine school growth

**LEA** Longitudinal Growth

- Systematic reporting of *longitudinal growth* on reading and math scales
Extrapolated Growth Curve for Reading
with Median Postsecondary Text Measures

*Text measures taken from national sources
Measurement of Growth

1999-2004 Growth Curves for Three Groups of Students
Relative to Grade Level Text Demand

- Above (N=37,642)
- Typical (N=17,887)
- Below (N=12,579)
- Test (approx. IQR UB)
- Test (approx. IQR LB)

Grade
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Value-Added

- Allows use of more than two data points in calculating growth
- Federal measures may encourage use of a similar model to determine growth of students
Achievement and Growth

Discussion
Future-Ready Core and Graduation Rate
Superintendents’ Feedback

- **47% agreed with the Future-Ready Core** measured by Algebra II

- Some requested more than Algebra II (“should include English, Social Studies, Math, Science...”)

- Some expressed concern about whether Algebra II needs to be the standard for all students
Future-Ready Core

- Calculate as the % Algebra II (Math BC) completion and proficiency

Graduation Rate

- 5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate
Future-Ready Core and Graduation Rate

Discussion
## Elementary/Middle School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Performance Index</th>
<th>Growth Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement: The School Performance Composite</td>
<td>Student Growth as measured by Value-Added System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## High School

### Absolute Performance Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Index Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement: The School Performance Composite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Readiness as measured by ACT etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future-Ready Core Participation (a measure of the rigor of courses that students take)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Year Cohort Graduation Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Growth Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Index Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth as measured by Value-Added System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in</strong> Post-Secondary Readiness as measured by ACT etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in</strong> Future-Ready Core Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in</strong> 5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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An Index Model will allow us to keep the core model simple and focus on key outcomes
• Bonus Points may be awarded for additional indicators like the graduation project

• Simulations will be conducted to ensure the contribution of bonus points is done carefully to maintain focus on achievement and growth
Agenda

1:00 – 2:30

- Weighting of Indicators (30 min)
- Updated Reporting System (10 min)
- Gateways (30 min)
- ESEA Reauthorization and School Classification (10 min)
- Next Steps (10 min)
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Lunch Break
Weighting of Indicators
We asked the North Carolina Superintendents to fill out the two charts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Performance Index</th>
<th>Growth Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Index Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement: The School Performance Composite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Readiness as measured by ACT etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future-Ready Core Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-year Cohort Graduation Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Weighting of Indicators

Superintendents’ Feedback

• ¾ of the Superintendents recommended an identical weighting structure in both the Absolute Performance Index and the Growth Index

• The variance was small for those Superintendents who did suggest weighting differently between performance and growth

• We conclude that the Superintendents generally support using the same weighting within each index system

March 31, 2010
Weighting of **Student Achievement** in the Performance Index
Superintendents' Feedback

**AVERAGE ≈ 44%**

Most Frequently Occurring was 50% (23 out of 47)
Weighting of **Post-Secondary Readiness** in the Performance Index

Superintendents' Feedback

AVERAGE $\approx 17\%$

Most Frequently Occurring was 10% (31 of 47)
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Weighting of **Future-Ready Core Participation** in the Performance Index
Superintendents' Feedback

**AVERAGE ≈ 13%**

Most Frequently Occurring was 10% (26 of 47)
Weighting of **Graduation Rate** in the Performance Index

Superintendents' Feedback

AVERAGE $\approx 26\%$

Most Frequently Occurring was 20% and 30% (both 11 out of 47)
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Possible Superintendent Recommendation

1) The weighting is identical in absolute performance and growth
2) The weighting is as below...

### Absolute Performance Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Index Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement: The School Performance Composite</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Readiness as measured by ACT etc.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future-Ready Core Participation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-year cohort Graduation Rate</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Growth Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Index Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth as measured by Value-Added System</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in</strong> Post-Secondary Readiness as measured by ACT etc.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in</strong> Future-Ready Core Participation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in</strong> 5-year cohort Graduation Rate</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Weighting of Indicators

Discussion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Performance Index</th>
<th>Growth Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement: The School Performance Composite</td>
<td>Student Growth as measured by Value-Added System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Readiness as measured by ACT etc.</td>
<td>Change in Post-Secondary Readiness as measured by ACT etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future-Ready Core Participation</td>
<td>Change in Future-Ready Core Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Change in 5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Index Points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Updated Reporting
Suggestions for Reported Indicators not in High-Stakes Model

- Graduation Project
- Advanced Placement Courses (# and % of participants and scores)
- International Baccalaureate (# and % of participants and scores)
- Credentialing Programs (# and % credentials)
- Online Courses Taken (# and %)
- Higher-Level Foreign Language Courses Taken (# and %)
- Concentrations (# and %)
- Attendance of Teachers and Students
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New and Better Reporting

- Report measures that matter
- 2012-13: Updated School Report Card
- Align major reporting functions (ABCs, Report Cards, AYP)
- Make reporting easy to understand; Show comparable results
- Allow customization
Student Accountability Gateways
## Data

### % of Students Retained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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% of Students Who Scored Below Proficient on the EOC or EOG and Passed the Course/Grade (2008-09)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Below Proficient</th>
<th>Grade 3 Math</th>
<th>Below Proficient</th>
<th>Grade 5 Math</th>
<th>Grade 8 Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algebra I</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 3 Math</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 5 Math</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics &amp; Economics</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 8 Math</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English I</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 3 Reading</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 5 Reading</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 8 Reading</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These Results Reflect the Use of 1 SEM. No Retesting Included for EOC Assessments
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Superintendent Feedback

- Variability in responses
- Strong advocates to eliminate Gateways and strong advocates to keep
- More to come after April 25th
• ~80% said the End-of-Course policy should remain in place, most suggesting that it remain 20 or 25% of final grade

• No consensus on suggestion that 20% of the final grade come from EOGs
One Possible Proposal

- **Retain 25%** of final grade from the EOCs
- **20%** of final grade from the EOGs 
  *(Operational with new assessments)*
Student Accountability Gateways

Discussion
Impact of ESEA Reauthorization

First Classification Example  
(Similar Format; Fewer Categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Index</th>
<th>Growth Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making Expected or High Growth</td>
<td>Making Less than Expected Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 - 1000</td>
<td>School of Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 - 899</td>
<td>School of Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 - 799</td>
<td>School of Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 600</td>
<td>Low-Performing School*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Will require statutory change.

The categories and scales are not finalized. The performance index is different than the performance composite and therefore a new scale has been used.

DRAFT
Second Classification Example (Four-Quadrant)

Performance Index

Scale to be determined

Growth Index

Scale to be determined

Lower Performance
Higher Growth

Higher Performance
Higher Growth

Lower Performance
Lower Growth

Higher Performance
Lower Growth

DRAFT
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Points of Consensus

and

Parking Lot Issues
Timeline

• Phase-in parts of new model (e.g. Future-Ready Core in 2012-13)

• Fully operational target of 2013-14

• K-12 Math and Eng II standards suggested to be delayed one year
Key Next Steps

• Legislative Engagement
• Formal Field Feedback
• Cost Estimates