Transitioning to Action

Vision  Development  Action
High School Indicators

- **End of Course Assessments**
  % of students proficient on Math I, Biology and English II assessments

- **ACT College Readiness Benchmarks**
  % of students who score well enough to have a 75% chance of getting a C or higher in their first credit-bearing college course

- **Graduation Rates**
  - 4-year: % of students who were freshmen in 2009-10 who graduated in 2012-13
  - 5-year: % of students who were freshmen in 2008-09 who graduated by 2012-13

- **Future-Ready Core Completion**
  % of graduates who take and pass higher-level math classes

- **WorkKeys**
  % of graduates achieving the Silver level on the three WorkKeys assessments

- **Graduation Project**
  Schools that complete the Graduation Project achieving the standards of quality established in the process

Elementary and Middle School Indicators

- **End of Grade Assessments**
  % of students proficient on 3-8 Mathematics assessments
  % of students proficient on 3-8 English Language Arts assessments
  % of students proficient on 5th and 8th grade Science assessments

3Draft Jan 3, 2012
Who we are hearing from:

- State Board of Education
- Title I Committee of Practioners
- Business Community (NCBCE)
- Superintendents
- Principals
- Teachers
- Schools of Education
- Educator Groups
  - NCAE (Dec 3)
  - Teacher Advisory
  - Principal Advisory
  - Principal Focus Group
  - RESAs (total of 24 visits over 2011 and 2012)
- Parent Groups
On Labeling of Schools

“The lowest category needs an identifiably negative label that forces change.”

“It is more important to designate numerical levels of performance {than give labels}.”

To the Question:

“Do you think that each school needs a status designation based on its performance?”

Trends in feedback about labeling were mixed; more often, stakeholders believe a label for every school is not necessary.
We want a hallmark of the new 2012-13 accountability model to be performance and growth data that is

- easy to understand
- useful, and
- easy to access

October 2008’s *Response to the Framework for Change* focused on Transparency.
Some specific design features we are considering

- A clean front interface that starts only with the indicators
- Scaffolding that helps the user understand the actual meaning of the data (the use of “hover-over” or “click-into” web design so that users can get the facts on what each indicator is)
- Inclusion of State (and District) Results on each report; additionally, the inclusion of targets (either state or federal)
- Intuitive navigation on the website that makes it obvious how to get to school performance data
High School Model Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Performance</th>
<th>Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Composite</td>
<td>Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Δ ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rates</td>
<td>Δ Graduation Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Course Rigor</td>
<td>Δ Math Course Rigor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkKeys</td>
<td>Δ WorkKeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample High School

For discussion purposes only. Data are not actual data from a school or the state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Achieved</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74%</td>
<td>End of Course Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>ACT College Readiness Benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>4-year Graduation Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td>5-year Graduation Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Future-Ready Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>WorkKeys Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Graduation Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of students proficient on Math I, Biology and English II assessments (the performance composite)
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Example  
For discussion purposes only. Data are not actual data from a school or the state.

End of Course Assessments  
% of students proficient on Math I, Biology and English II assessments

- 74%  
- 65%  
  State-wide result in 2012-13

We plan to include the state-wide result on each of the 6 indicators so that the user can immediately see where the school is relative to others.

Data tools might additionally allow for a user to see where this school is relative to similar schools.

Additionally, we are determining how to represent the new Annual Measurable Objectives (part of our ESEA Flexibility Request).
ESEA

- AMOs
- Subgroup (differentiated targets?)
- Priority, Focus and Reward
ESEA: AMO Issue 1

A
Reduction Not-Proficient by ½ in 6 years (by 2017)
Sets targets in a different way than NCLB
Target perceived as more achievable

B
100% Proficient by 2019-2020
Emphasizes goal of all students meeting proficiency
Allows more time to fulfill target
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ESEA: AMO Issue 2

A

Same Targets for All Subgroups

Same expectations

B

Different Targets for Each Subgroup

Recognizes different starting points for different subgroups
## ESEA: Priority, Focus, & Reward

### Priority
Determined by
- **Reading + Math Performance Composite**
  - \(< 50\%\) in 2010-11 school year and one of the two previous years (2008-09 or 2009-10)
- **Graduation rate**
  - \(< 60\%\)

### Focus
Determined by
- Schools with the **largest in-school gaps** for 2010-11 school year and one of the two previous years (2008-09 or 2009-10)
- Above state average 38.7%
- Title I schools with a subgroup with **proficiency score below 50\%** for 2010-11 school year and one of the two previous years

### Reward
Determined by
- Poverty rate above 50\% and gap between highest and lowest performing subgroups below state average **and**
- Schools made AYP and all subgroups have performance composite above state performance composite and graduation rate, if any, above state graduation rate **or**
- Schools in the highest 10\% performance composite progress and graduation rate progress, if any, for “all students” over a 2-year period.