

A light gray silhouette of the state of Massachusetts is positioned on the left side of the slide, partially overlapping a dark blue vertical bar. The background features a pattern of overlapping, semi-transparent geometric shapes in shades of gray and white.

# Framework for a Next- Generation Accountability System

# AGENDA

- 01** Accountability design components
- 02** Relative component – accountability percentile
- 03** Criterion referenced component – target setting
- 04** Use of subgroup data for accountability
- 05** Categorization of schools

# Accountability system design components

- Which indicators will be included?
- How will the system incorporate both relative (school percentile) & criterion-referenced (targets) components?
- What subgroups will drive an accountability determination versus just having data reported?
- How will schools be considered to be meeting targets?
- How will schools be categorized?



# Accountability indicators to be included

Indicator	Measure(s)
Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ELA, math, &amp; science achievement values (based on scaled score)</li></ul>
Student Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Student growth percentile</li></ul>
High School Completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Four-year cohort graduation rate</li><li>• Extended engagement rate</li><li>• Annual dropout rate</li></ul>
English Language Proficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Progress made by students towards attaining English language proficiency</li></ul>
Additional Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Chronic absenteeism (all schools)</li><li>• Percentage of students passing all grade 9 courses (high schools)</li><li>• Percentage of students completing advanced coursework (high schools)</li></ul>

# Relative component – accountability percentile

- Accountability percentile calculated using all available indicators for a school
- Used to identify the lowest performing schools in the state, & same calculation used at the subgroup level to identify low-performing subgroups in need of targeted support

# Relative component – accountability percentile

- Next-Generation MCAS test allows us to compare all schools, regardless of grade configuration
  - Separate high school comparison category is transitional & will not be necessary once all schools are administering Next-Generation MCAS tests

# Criterion-referenced component

- Focus on closing the achievement gap by raising the “achievement floor”
  - Gap-closing can occur as a result of a decline in performance by the high-performing group
- In addition to meeting targets for the school as a whole, the performance of the lowest performing 25 percent of students in each school will be measured
  - Every school has a lowest 25 percent of performers
  - **Identified from cohort of students who were enrolled in the school for more than 1 year**
  - Schools will know who these students are



# Criterion-referenced component

- Targets set for each accountability indicator, for the school as a whole & for the lowest performing 25 percent of students in each school
- Points assigned based on progress toward target for each indicator, for both the aggregate & the lowest performing 25 percent of students

<b>Declined</b>	<b>No change</b>	<b>Improved</b>	<b>Met target</b>	<b>Exceeded target</b>
0	1	2	3	4



# Criterion-referenced component

## Example: Non-high school (weighting to be determined)

Indicator	Points assigned	
	All students	Lowest performing students
ELA scaled score	3	2
Math scaled score	2	2
Science achievement	2	1
ELA SGP	4	4
Math SGP	3	4
EL progress	2	4
Chronic absenteeism	3	4
Total	19	21
<b>Combined total points</b> (56 possible)	40	
<b>Percentage of possible points</b>	<b>71%</b>	

0 = Declined · 1 = No change · 2 = Improved · 3 = Met target · 4 = Exceeded target



# Categorization of schools

- Schools will no longer be placed in a vertical hierarchy of levels 1-5
- Number of schools that will be placed into a category based upon a relative standing will be cut in half from previous system
  - Approximately 90 percent of schools could be categorized based on their own performance against targets
- Most schools will have 50 percent of its categorization based on students that have been in the school for at least 2 years
- Category labels are primarily tied to the level of required assistance or intervention
- Stronger emphasis on schools commended for success

# Categorization of schools

## Schools without required assistance or intervention (approx. 85%)

## Schools requiring assistance or intervention (approx. 15%)

Schools without required assistance or intervention (approx. 85%)			Schools requiring assistance or intervention (approx. 15%)		
<p><b>Schools of recognition</b></p> <p>Schools demonstrating high achievement, significant improvement, or high growth</p>	<p><b>Meeting targets</b></p> <p>Criterion-referenced target percentage 75-100</p>	<p><b>Partially meeting targets</b></p> <p>Criterion-referenced target percentage 50-74</p>	<p><b>Not meeting targets</b></p> <p>Criterion-referenced target percentage 0-49</p>	<p><b>Focused/targeted support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-comprehensive support schools with percentiles 1-10</li> <li>• Schools with low graduation rate</li> <li>• Schools with low performing subgroups</li> <li>• Schools with low participation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Broad/comprehensive support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Underperforming schools</li> <li>• Chronically underperforming schools</li> </ul>

**Notes:**

- Category names not finalized
- School percentiles & performance against targets will be reported for all schools



# Other considerations & known issues

- ESE will redesign district & school report cards in 2018
  - Will include measures of performance/opportunity beyond assessment & accountability results (e.g., discipline rates, availability of art & other non-core courses, school culture/climate, etc.)
- 2019 high school assessment transition
- Middle/high & K-12 schools
  - Administering both legacy & Next-Generation MCAS tests
- District accountability
  - Administering both legacy & Next-Generation MCAS tests
  - Will not be based on designation of lowest performing school



# Next steps

## Upcoming discussions

- December 19 – Board discussion on system framework
- January 12 – Meeting with the Urban Superintendents Network
- January 17 – Meeting with the Superintendents Advisory Council
- January 23 – Board discussion on system refinements & weighting of indicators
- February 27 – Board discussion of proposed amendments to state accountability regulations

