Connecticut’s Next Generation Accountability System

2014-15 Results

State Board of Education, March 2016
Accountability Evolution

ESEA ('65)
- Inputs

Standards ('84)
- A Nation at Risk

NCLB ('02)
- Test Proficiency
- Punitive

ESEA Flex ('12)
- Index
- Test Scores
- Differentiated

NextGen ('15)
- Balanced
- Growth Focused
- Differentiated
Next Generation Improvements

- Holistic, multifactor system that incorporates indicators beyond test scores
- Refines existing metrics
- Values academic growth over time
- Makes subgroup performance prominent
- Adjusts school classification methodology
What are the 12 Indicators?

1. Academic achievement (Performance Index) 
2. Academic growth 
3. Assessment participation rate 
4. Chronic absenteeism 
5. Preparation for postsecondary and career readiness – coursework 
6. Preparation for postsecondary and career readiness – exams 
7. Graduation – on track in ninth grade 
8. Graduation – four-year adjusted cohort 
9. Graduation – six-year adjusted cohort 
10. Postsecondary Entrance Rate 
11. Physical fitness 
12. Arts access

Separate set of points allotted for “High Needs” (students from low-income families, English learners (ELs), or students with disabilities)
A New Family of Index Scores

• “Performance index” (SPI/DPI) will continue to refer to the index scores derived from state assessment results (Indicator 1).
  – Subject-specific (ELA, Math, Science)

• The percentage of total possible points earned on all available indicators is the “Accountability Index”.
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The New Performance Index Approach

Grade 3 ELA Example

• A student with a scale score of 2380 (lower part of Level 2) will get 57.5 index score points while another student with a scale score of 2419 (upper part of Level 2) will get 65.9 index score points.

\[ \text{Index} = \frac{\text{Scale Score} - \text{LOSS}}{\text{Range}} \times 110 \]

Ultimate target for every Performance Index is 75
## State Accountability Report, 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Index/Rate</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>Max Points</th>
<th>% Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>ELA Performance Index – All Students</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>ELA Performance Index – High Needs Students</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Math Performance Index – All Students</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Math Performance Index – High Needs Students</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>Science Performance Index – All Students</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f</td>
<td>Science Performance Index – High Needs Students</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism – All Students</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>&lt;=5%</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism – High Needs Students</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>&lt;=5%</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preparation for CCR – % taking courses</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Preparation for CCR – % passing exams</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>On-track to High School Graduation</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4-year Graduation All Students (2014 Cohort)</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6-year Graduation - High Needs Students (2012 Cohort)</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Postsecondary Entrance (Class of 2014)</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Physical Fitness (estimated part rate = 87.6%)</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Arts Access</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>State Accountability Index</strong></td>
<td><strong>951.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1250</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>76.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Achievement and Graduation Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Non-High Needs</th>
<th>High Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Non-High Needs
- High Needs
Statewide Participation Rates *Exceed* 95%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>High Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supports for Districts/Schools

• Accountability
  – Individualized district and school report
  – Using Accountability Results to Guide Improvement: comprehensive documentation and supports
  – Two-page FAQ
  – Detailed presentation for staff
  – Sample district communication presentation

• Turnaround
  – Alliance District and Commissioner’s Network
  – Low-Performing Schools Bond Fund
Bright Spots

• Schools of Distinction (84 schools)
  (Top 10% and no gaps, high participation, special education compliance, and adequate English Learner growth)
  – Highest Performing Overall
  – Highest Performing Subgroup

• School High Needs performance index exceeds overall district index (83 schools)
An Improved School Classification System

**Turnaround Schools (40):**
Lowest performing based on Accountability Index. Includes SIG schools. High schools with All Students 6-yr. rate < 70% for two most recent cohorts.  
*Previous (25) and New (15)*

**Focus Schools (96):**
Lowest performing in Math, Science, or ELA based on High Needs index scores. High schools with High Needs 6-yr. rate < 70% for two most recent cohorts.  
*Previous (25) and New (71)*

**Categories 1, 2, and 3**
Accountability Pause

**Previously Identified SchoolsExiting (15)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Theory of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td>Accountability indicators should include more than test scores and graduation rates.</td>
<td>One-size doesn’t fit all. An inclusive set of indicators will: • provide a more complete picture of successes and challenges; • guard against narrowing of the curriculum to the tested subjects; • expand ownership of accountability to more staff; and • allow schools to demonstrate progress on “outcome pre-cursors.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>Results of accountability systems should inform decision-making at the local and state level.</td>
<td>An accountability system that provides useful information for decision-making at the state and local level will encourage leaders to view accountability results not as a “gotcha” but as a tool to guide and track improvement efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>Indicators and models should be developed with extensive input from district and school leaders.</td>
<td>Listening to local leaders in the development of an accountability system will ensure that the indicators selected and the model used will engender acceptance of the system as a fair reflection of practice and minimize gamesmanship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent</td>
<td>The system should tell it like it is and be easy to understand.</td>
<td>A system that presents results publically and makes them easily accessible to various stakeholders will gain credibility and invite engagement across the school community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transformations Underway

- **Indicators**: Test scores to whole child
- **Ownership**: Few staff to entire organization
- **Organization Culture**: Silos to collaboration
- **Data Quality**: Some to all domains
- **Stakes**: Sanctions to support (and recognition)
Model well-aligned to Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

- Requires a multiple indicator approach
- Encourages use of student growth
- Expects greater weight be assigned to achievement, growth, and graduation rates
- Emphasizes subgroup performance
• Best first attempt at multiple measures without adding new data collection burden for districts.

• For 2015-16, include growth and categorize remaining schools into 1, 2, and 3

• Continue to seek feedback and improve. Previously recommended enhancements include:
  – attainment of industry recognized credentials;
  – Postsecondary training/employment outcomes;
  – on-site quality reviews; and
  – school climate indicators (student/parent feedback?)

**Mission:**
Improve student outcomes through the use of data

**Goal 1:** Collect accurate data in a highly efficient, secure, and timely manner

**Goal 2:** Aggregate and deliver accurate information in a secure, timely, and transparent manner

**Goal 3:** Analyze and report data trends and insights to support informed decision-making and action by schools, districts, the CSDE and other stakeholders

**Goal 4:** Develop performance models and metrics, establish targets and publish reports that enable a suite of differentiated supports and interventions for schools and districts
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