Accountability Update

May 4, 2010
GCS 1 Discussion
Race to the Top – Part II Assessment Grants

Common Assessments
*$160m for 2 state consortia to develop common state assessments to measure student achievement on common core standards

High School Course Assessment
*$30m for 1 state consortium for development of rigorous course-specific assessments to demonstrate “on-track” to be college-and-career ready

Future Grants
Alternative assessments, assessment for English Language Learners, and science assessment
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Current Status

Common Assessments
North Carolina has signed on as a governing state on the Smarter Balance consortium to develop comprehensive assessment system

NC Participation
DPI representatives on consortium workgroups to develop proposal

Due Date
Grant proposal due June 23rd

Implementation
State will implement assessments in 2014 – 2015
Proposal Direction

Innovation
Ideas around innovation in assessment parallel those of ACRE

Performance/constructed response items
Inclusion of constructed response items in assessment (10/09 & 1/10 ACRE papers)

Online only assessment, with grace period
Implementing all assessments online, with paper/pencil for accommodations (4/2010 ACRE paper)

Computer Adaptive Testing
Considering CAT for all summative assessments. Like Graduate Record Exam (GRE), CAT adapts to students’ skill level (coming soon)
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Initial Stakeholder Feedback on Accountability
## High School

### Absolute Performance Index

#### Preliminary Feedback on Weighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement: The School Performance Composite</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Readiness as measured by ACT, etc.</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future-Ready Core Participation (a measure of the rigor of courses that students take)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# High School Growth Index

## Preliminary Feedback on Weighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendent Average</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instructional Leads Average</td>
<td>Principal and Teacher Advisory Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth as measured by Value-Added System</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Post-Secondary Readiness as measured by ACT, etc.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Future-Ready Core Participation</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in 5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Absolute Performance Index

Student Achievement: The School Performance Composite

- Post-Secondary Readiness as measured by ACT etc.
  - Superintendents
  - Curriculum & Instructional Leads
  - Principal and Teacher Advisory

Future-Ready Core Participation

5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate

Initial Feedback Only – Formal Feedback to Follow
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Growth Index

- Student Growth as measured by Value-Added System:
  - Superintendents: 48
  - Curriculum & Instructional Leads: 47
  - Principal and Teacher Advisory: 14.5

- Change in Post-Secondary Readiness as measured by ACT etc.:
  - Superintendents: 15
  - Curriculum & Instructional Leads: 14
  - Principal and Teacher Advisory: 19

- Change in Future-Ready Core Participation:
  - Superintendents: 12.5
  - Curriculum & Instructional Leads: 14
  - Principal and Teacher Advisory: 15

- Change in 5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate:
  - Superintendents: 24.5
  - Curriculum & Instructional Leads: 21.5
  - Principal and Teacher Advisory: 19

Initial Feedback Only – Formal Feedback to Follow
Key Learning From Initial Stakeholder Input

1. **Growth.** Focus on growth over absolute performance

2. **Weighting.** Generally, the weighting amongst the measures is fairly similar: EOCs and EOGs are the biggest portion; Future-Ready Core the smallest

3. **FRC Measure.** Using *only* Algebra II measure for Future-Ready Core has critics

4. **K-3 Assessments.** Some see a need for inclusion of appropriate K-3 measures

5. **Gateways.** Move to eliminate Gateways

6. **25% Policy.** Move to keep the 25% policy in High School; interest in expansion to 6-8
“Based on the need to measure Future-Ready Core, this model works.”

“Why are we focusing on one discipline area instead of looking at other disciplines as options or alternatives? Mathematics should not be the only measure. Why was Algebra II the chosen measure of Future-Ready Core?”

“Very high standard. I have mixed feelings on this. Could this be implemented gradually over time with the bar being gradually raised like % on graduation level for AYP?”
Future-Ready Core

Option #1 The original plan
Participation as the number and percentage of students who take Algebra II or Integrated Mathematics III and pass test

Option #2 Additional Courses
Allow for other measures to contribute to the measure of future-readiness in addition to Algebra II
Possible example: Algebra II performance + Lexile measurement
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Future-Ready Core

Discussion