

State Accountability Systems: Working Notes

Presented June 16, 2008 to the

Select Committee on Public School Accountability

Compiled June 2008

Mary Fulton, policy analyst, Education Commission of the States

Kathy Christie, chief of staff, Education Commission of the States

First, know that you are not alone:

Minnesota H.F. No. 2245 (2007)

(a) To sustain equity and excellence in education, the Independent Office of
58.2 Educational Accountability under Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.31, subdivision 3,
58.3 must convene and facilitate an advisory group of curriculum and measurement experts
58.4 to consider and recommend how to structure school performance data and school
58.5 performance report cards under Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.36, subdivision 1, to
58.6 fully, fairly, and accurately report student achievement and emphasize school excellence
58.7 under Minnesota's system of educational accountability and public reporting. [The advisory](#)
[58.8](#) group at least must consider and recommend how to: evaluate student achievement using
[58.9](#) multiple measures of growth that take into account student demographic characteristics,
[58.10](#) consistent with Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.31, subdivision 4; and identify
[58.11](#) outstanding schools based on student achievement and achievement growth and using
[58.12](#) multiple performance measures that are objective and consistent with the highest standards
[58.13](#) in the field of educational measurements and accountability.

South Carolina:

Beginning in 2013, the Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of
Education and a broad-based group of stakeholders, selected by the Education Oversight
Committee, shall conduct a [comprehensive cyclical review of the accountability system at least every](#)
[five years and shall provide the General Assembly with a report on the findings and recommended actions](#)
[to improve the accountability system and to accelerate improvements in student and school performance.](#)
The stakeholders must include the State Superintendent of Education and the Governor, or the
Governor's designee. The other stakeholders include, but are not limited to, parents, business and
industry persons, community leaders, and educators.

Common drivers in the evolution of state accountability systems

The push for proficiency

- Postsecondary, work readiness
- High school graduation
- Transition points (elem-middle; middle-high school)
- Move toward use of end-of-course tests at high school level
- NCLB

Public reporting

- Love it, hate it
- Means for ensuring an even playing field
- Confusing contradictions when schools measured one way under NCLB and another way under state system

Pushback regarding measures or indicators

- Need for “rich body of evidence”
- Demand for less emphasis on test scores
- Lack of availability of reliable data attached to various indicators
- Use of absolute performance versus growth (or both)

NCLB influence

- Criticism of federal influence and control
- Dual systems (or dueling systems) vs. integration of state and NCLB; vs. simple adoption of NCLB model
- Move from improvement to growth

State data system development

- Capacity, cost, quality issues
- Necessary in order to use various measures
- Increasing # of states with longitudinal capacity (unique student identifiers)
- Development of single portal (schoolatadirect.com) for data reporting

Unintended consequences

- States compared one to another (apples to oranges)
- Issues of district and school comparability
- Pressure to look better by any means necessary
- Disjuncture between assessments and college readiness

District and school pushback

- “Not fair, not fair”
- Low performers no longer off the radar screen
- Traditionally high-performing districts complain under growth models where, for example, improvement plateaus and rating falls

States participating in federal growth model project (nine states):

| | | |
|----------|----------|----------------|
| Alaska | Delaware | North Carolina |
| Arizona | Florida | Ohio |
| Arkansas | Iowa | Tennessee |

Note: North Carolina and Tennessee growth models were approved for use during 2005-06; all other states began using their models during 2006-07.

Source: <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/growthmodel/index.html>

Other states using performance indexing under NCLB (and year approved)

- AL -- 2005
- LA -- 2003
- MA -- 2003
- MI -- 2006
- MN -- 2003
- MS -- 2003 and 2005 (revisions)
- NM -- 2005
- NY -- 2003 and 2006 (revisions)
- OK -- 2003 and 2004 (revisions)
- PA -- 2005
- RI -- 2003
- SC -- 2005
- VT -- 2003 and 2006 (revisions)
- WV -- 2006

Sources: Center on Education Policy, "States Test Limits of Federal AYP Flexibility," November, 2005
<http://www.cep-dc.org/document/docWindow.cfm?fuseaction=document.viewDocument&documentid=45&documentFormatId=680>

Measuring Absolute Performance and Growth

TWO STATE SNAPSHOTS

1. Florida
2. South Carolina

Florida

(upward trend on NAEP)

Mathematics – 4th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2003 | 234 | 234 | 76% | 31% | 4% |
| 2007 | 242 | 239 | 86% | 40% | 6% |
| Change | +8 | +5 | +10% | +9% | +2% |

Mathematics – 8th Grade (FL)

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2003 | 271 | 276 | 62% | 23% | 4% |
| 2007 | 277 | 280 | 68% | 27% | 5% |
| Change | +6 | +8 | +6% | +4% | +1% |

Reading – 4th Grade (FL)

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 214 | 217 | 60% | 27% | 5% |
| 2007 | 224 | 220 | 70% | 34% | 8% |
| Change | +10 | +3 | +10% | +7% | +3% |

Reading – 8th Grade (FL)

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 261 | 263 | 72% | 29% | 2% |
| 2007 | 260 | 261 | 71% | 28% | 2% |
| Change | +1 | -2 | -1% | -1% | 0% |

Performance measures (high school level)

A school's performance grade category designation is based on a combination of:

- Student achievement scores
- Student learning gains as measured by annual Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) assessments in grades 3 through 10
- Improvement of the lowest 25th percentile of students in the school in reading, math, or writing on the FCAT, unless these students are performing above satisfactory performance
- Graduation rate.

Sources:

Florida's Application for the NCLB Growth Model Pilot (September 15, 2006)
<http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/growthmodel/fl/flrevisions2006.doc>

2007-08 Annual Accountability Meeting/Manual
http://www.fldoe.org/evaluation/2007AnnualAccountabilityMeeting_files/textonly/Index.html

History of School Grades

School Grades were first issued in 1999 under Florida's A+ Plan for Education. Since then, school grading evolved in 2001 to include the FCAT results of students in Grades 3-10. In 2002, student learning gains were added to school grades and in 2005 all students with disabilities and English language learner students were included in the learning gains component. In 2007 school grades include student performance in FCAT Science, the learning gains of students scoring in the lowest 25% in mathematics, and the performance of 11th & 12th graders in retaking the FCAT.

Florida's accountability program is intended to accomplish the following:

- Assess annual learning gains of each student toward achieving state standards
- Provide data for making decisions regarding school accountability
- Identify educational strengths of students
- Identify readiness of students to be promoted to the next grade level or to graduate from high school
- Assess how well educational goals and performance standards are met at all levels
- Provide information to aid in evaluation and development of educational programs and policies
- Provide information on the performance of Florida students compared with others across the United States.

School Points for School Grades

- Four Performance Components: Reading, math, writing and science. Each subject is worth a maximum of 100 points, for a total of 400 points
- Four Learning Gains Components: Combined, contribute a maximum of 400 points.
- Total of points possible is 800

- High schools can earn 10 bonus points if 50% or more of their 11th and 12th grade retakers pass both the reading and math FCAT.

The point breakdown is as follows:

- A is greater than or equal to 525
- B is 495 to 524
- C is 435 to 494
- D is 395 to 434
- F is less than 395

Additional requirements applied AFTER a school's points are calculated:

- Adequate Progress for Lowest 25% of Students: Required to earn grade based on calculated points. If a school does not meet this requirement, the school's grade is lowered one letter grade.
- Participation Requirement (Percent Tested): Required to earn grade based on calculated points. Schools must test at least 95% of their students to earn an "A", at least 90% to earn any other grade.

Performance Component Criterion:

Are students achieving at or above grade level?

Meeting Performance Criteria:

- Grade level performance for math, reading and science = FCAT achievement level 3
- Grade level performance for writing (essay) = FCAT score of 3.5

One point is awarded for each percent of students scoring at or above grade level.

Learning Gains Criterion:

Are students making at least one year's worth of progress in a year's time?

Meeting the Learning Gains Criterion:

- Improving by one or more FCAT achievement levels - e.g., from 1-2, 2-3, 3-4, 4-5
- Maintaining FCAT achievement levels 3, 4, or 5
- For non-retained students at achievement levels 1 or 2: showing more than one year's growth on FCAT developmental scale scores (DSS).

Schools receive one point for each percent of students making learning gains.

Students Included in Learning Gains for the Lowest Performing 25% of Students. Of students included in the learning gains calculation, the count of the lowest 25% is based on prior-year FCAT developmental scale scores.

Developmental Scale Scores (DSS):

Florida's DSS, or the vertical scale scores, report student scores on a scale ranging from 0 to 3000. This continuous scale begins low in third grade and reaches its maximum in tenth grade. It allows student growth to be monitored from one tested grade to the next.

2007 School Grades Points Components, Total

| READING | MATH | WRITING | SCIENCE |
|---|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Performance 100 possible pts. | Performance 100 possible pts. | Performance 100 possible pts. | Performance 100 possible pts. |
| Learning Gains 100 possible pts. | Learning Gains 100 possible pts. | | |
| Learning Gains of Lowest 25% 100 possible pts. | Learning Gains of Lowest 25% 100 possible pts. | | |

PLUS 11th and 12th grade retakes for possible bonus points (10)

Florida’s Growth Model

Under Florida’s approved growth model, the state will maintain its current annual measurable objectives to reach universal proficiency by 2013-14. The growth model trajectory, along with the status model and safe harbor, will ensure that by 2014 all students will either be proficient or “on track to be proficient” within three years.

A subgroup with at least two years of FCAT data will be included in the denominator for the growth calculation. The numerator will include any student in the subgroup who is proficient or “on track to be proficient” in three years. A school or district will meet AYP for that subgroup if the percentage of students who are proficient or “on track to be proficient” using this calculation meets or exceeds the current state annual measurable objectives.

The three-year growth trajectory is built based on students’ previous test scores compared to proficiency at a later point in time. For a 3rd grade student (as an example), their baseline score on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Developmental Scale Score (DSS) will be used. The numeric difference between their 3rd grade score and the score to be proficient at the end of the 6th grade will be calculated. At the end of 4th grade, if their score has closed the distance from the 3rd grade baseline to proficient at the end of 6th grade by at least one-third (33.3%) the student would count in the calculations as being “on track to be proficient” in the growth model. Similarly, the same student could count in the 5th grade if the student’s (second year) score has closed the gap by at least two-thirds (66.67%). In the 6th grade (third year), the gap would be closed, meaning the student would need to be at the proficient level.

For students in high school, the end proficiency target is proficient on the grade 10 FCAT.

In addition to “on track to be proficient,” the other academic indicators, writing, graduation and participation targets, are still required. If a group misses one of these targets they cannot recover using growth calculations

The farther below proficiency that students initially score, the more they must improve in succeeding years in order to be on track to be proficient. Further, because the FCAT DSS required for a determination of proficiency, increases with each grade level, the standards for proficiency are more rigorous with each consecutive grade.

When Can a School Use the Growth Model Provision?

The Growth Model provision can be applied only if a school has met all four of the requirements below:

- At least 95% of students in total and in each subgroup have participated in testing
- The school has met the writing criteria
- The school has met the graduation rate criteria
- The school grade is not D or F.

What Are Requirements for the Growth Model?

The Growth Model requires that for each subgroup being evaluated:

- The percent of students "on track to be proficient" in three years or less is at least 51% in reading and 56% in math (2006-07)
- The group has met the writing criterion (the increase in writing proficiency is at least 1% or the school has a writing proficiency rate of 90% or better)
- The group has met the graduation rate criterion (the increase in graduation rate is at least 1% or the school has a graduation rate of 85% or better).

Calculation of Growth Model Trajectory Benchmarks

The trajectory benchmarks are built individually for students and separately for reading or mathematics. Therefore, a student will have a trajectory based on their baseline mathematics score and the proficiency cut score for mathematics which is separate from reading.

The following table displays the performance expected of students to be counted as on trajectory for inclusion in the proposed method of comparing school performance to AMO targets.

The Amount of Improvement in Terms of Decrease in the Distance Between Baseline Performance and Proficiency Benchmark in the Target Grade

| Year In State-Tested Grade | Decrease From Baseline Assessment In Performance Discrepancy |
|----------------------------|--|
| 1 | 33% of original gap |
| 2 | 66% of original gap |
| 3 | Student must be proficient |

This example is for a student who enters third grade and remains in Florida for the next three academic years. The student scores below proficient in the current school year in reading. This child’s known test scores are listed below.

| Grade | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--|------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Student's Actual Reading Developmental Score | 1001 | 1325 | 1450 | 1635 |
| Required DSS Score for Proficiency | 1198 | 1456 | 1510 | 1622 |
| Cut score needed to be "on track to be proficient" | NA | 33% of 621 | 66% of 621 | 100% of 621 |
| Is student "on track to be proficient" | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |

The student's first full year in the state is 3rd grade, the student will need to be on trajectory to be proficient by the end of the 6th grade, demonstrating proficient on the 6th grade FCAT for reading. The developmental score for 6th grade reading is 1622.

The 3rd grade score will be used as the baseline. The difference between the baseline and proficient on the 6th grade test is 621 points (take 1622 and minus 1001). For the current year (4th grade, the second year in the state), the student must perform well enough on the test to meet the trajectory benchmark, a student must, close the gap by 33.3% of the difference between the score for proficiency and his baseline (grade 3 FCAT) score (divide 621 by 3 = 207).

The student would need to score at least 1208 in grade 4 to be considered to be on track to be proficient (take 1001 plus 207). The student's actual score is 1325 which means the child met the standard to be deemed on trajectory for the current year and thus will be included in the growth model percentage for comparison to the AMO for the school as a whole and any subgroups the student may be a part of.

Source:

http://www.fldoe.org/evaluation/2007AnnualAccountabilityMeeting_files/textonly/slide21.html

South Carolina

(upward trends on NAEP, particularly in math)

Mathematics – 4th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2000 | 233 | 224 | 77% | 31% | 3% |
| 2007 | 252 | 239 | 93% | 58% | 11% |
| Change | +19 | +15 | +16% | +27% | +8% |

Mathematics – 8th Grade (SC)

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2000 | 279 | 272 | 70% | 30% | 5% |
| 2007 | 298 | 280 | 85% | 51% | 15% |
| Change | +19 | +8 | +15% | +21% | +10% |

Reading – 4th Grade (SC)

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 234 | 217 | 80% | 47% | 13% |
| 2007 | 236 | 220 | 81% | 49% | 16% |
| Change | +2 | +3 | +1% | +2% | +3% |

Reading – 8th Grade (SC)

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 271 | 263 | 81% | 39% | 3% |
| 2007 | 273 | 261 | 84% | 43% | 4% |
| Change | +2 | -2 | +3% | +4% | +1% |

Other achievement of note: 141 (16%) of the 882 elementary and middle schools studied were recognized for closing achievement gaps in ELA or math in 2007 for at least one historically underachieving demographic group (African-American students; Hispanic students; free- or reduced-price lunch students).

Source: <http://www.sceoc.com/NR/rdonlyres/9E56A9B6-D95E-4A76-8396-962BD0780299/16999/draftApr92008achievementgap.pdf>

Performance measures (high school level)

- Assessment in English/language arts, math, science and social studies
- Participation rate
- Graduation rate.

The System

South Carolina no longer creates a composite score that reflects both absolute performance and growth. Currently, there is an index for Absolute performance and an index for Growth.

The Absolute Rating is a value of the school's level of performance on measures of research-based factors associated with student success during the school year on which the report card is based.

The Growth Rating is a measure of a school's progress toward attaining and/or maintaining higher levels of performance.

Recent changes:

1. Changed language from "improvement" to "growth"
2. Added graduation rate as a measure
3. Defined categories of student performance: "Not Met, Met, and Exemplary. 'Not met' means that the student did not meet the grade level standard. 'Met' means the student met the grade level standard. 'Exemplary' means the student demonstrated exemplary performance in meeting the grade level standard. For purposes of reporting as required by federal statute, 'proficiency' shall include students performing at Met or Exemplary."
4. Approved proposal to:
 - Calculate Absolute Ratings using data from both Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests (PACT) and End of Course tests administered in middle schools.
 - Begin including End of Course test results in the middle school Absolute Ratings with the 2007-2008 school year for reporting on the November 2008 report card.
 - Continue calculating middle school Improvement Ratings based on PACT results only.

Highlighted Details: Absolute and Improvement Ratings

The standards-based assessment system used in the development of school ratings includes the grades 3-8 Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests (PACT) in mathematics, reading/English language arts (ELA), science, and social studies; the revised exit examination

(HSAP); and end-of-course assessments for selected high school courses.

For the November 2008 report cards, the following assessments are used in the calculation of school and district ratings:

- K-2 schools. Criteria other than assessment data (e.g., prime instructional time, pupil-teacher ratios, parent involvement, external accreditation, early-childhood professional development, percentage of teachers having advanced degrees, and percentage of teachers returning from the previous year) are used for the rating.
- Schools enrolling students in grades three through five (Elementary): 2007 and 2008 PACT ELA, math, science and social studies data for 2008 report card.
- Middle schools: 2007 and 2008 PACT ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies and 2007-2008 End of Course tests for high school credit courses.
- High schools: first attempt High School Assessment Program (HSAP) results, longitudinal HSAP results, percentages of end-of-course test scores of 70 or higher, and on-time graduation rates.
- Career and technology centers: Percentages of students mastering core competencies or certification requirements in center courses, along with graduation and placement rates.
- Special schools: Criteria appropriate for each school's mission.
- Districts: Assessments used for calculating the ratings for schools enrolling students in grades three through eight and high schools are used to calculate the district ratings. In addition to the assessments, the high school on-time graduation rate is included in the calculation of district ratings. (Note: Assessment results from students attending charter schools authorized by a local school district will be used for calculating ratings for the charter schools but not for the local school district.)

Calculation of Absolute Rating

Ratings are calculated using a mathematical formula that results in an index. The following point distribution is applied to each of the criteria for the calculation of the absolute index (the percentage weighting for each criterion is applied to the calculation of the index):

Criteria for High School Ratings

| Criterion | Points Assigned | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Longitudinal Exit Exam Passage Rate (30%) | 100% | 97.5–99.9% | 90.7–97.4% | 87.3–90.6% | Below 87.3% |
| First-attempt HSAP Passage Rate (20%) | 62.9% or more | 53.7–62.8% | 37.4–53.6% | 26.7–37.3% | Below 26.7% |
| % Scoring 70 or Above on End of Course Tests (20%) | 87.8% or more | 72.4–87.7% | 41.6–72.3% | 26.2–41.5% | Below 26.2% |
| On-time Graduation Rate (30%) | 88.3% or more | 79.6–88.2% | 62.2–79.5% | 53.5–62.1% | Below 53.5% |

The index is calculated using the following formula:

- (1) Match the school's data/performance to the points assigned to each rating criterion in the table above.
- (2) Add the weighted points for each criterion. Weighted points are calculated by multiplying the assigned points by the weighting factor assigned to each criterion.

The resulting index determines the school's Absolute rating as follows:

Index Values for Determining Absolute Ratings

| Year | Range of Indexes Corresponding to Absolute Rating | | | | |
|-----------------|---|----------|---------|---------------|----------------|
| | Excellent | Good | Average | Below Average | Unsatisfactory |
| 2007 | 3.8 and above* | 3.4–3.7* | 3.0–3.3 | 2.6–2.9 | Below 2.6 |
| 2008 | 3.9 and above* | 3.5–3.8* | 3.1–3.4 | 2.7–3.0 | Below 2.7 |
| 2009 | 4.0 and above* | 3.6–3.9* | 3.2–3.5 | 2.8–3.1 | Below 2.8 |
| 2010 and beyond | 4.1 and above* | 3.7–4.0* | 3.3–3.6 | 2.9–3.2 | Below 2.9 |

*School must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) objectives for the category "all students."

Improvement Rating

The Improvement ratings are calculated using a mathematical formula that results in an index. The index is calculated by subtracting the school's Absolute rating index from the prior year from the school's current year's Absolute rating index. The difference determines the rating as follows:

High School Improvement Performance Rating Criteria

| Rating | Improvement Index |
|----------------|-------------------|
| Excellent | 0.4 or greater |
| Good | 0.3 |
| Average | 0.1–0.2 |
| Below Average | 0.0 |
| Unsatisfactory | -0.1 or less |

Source: 2007-2008 Accountability Manual <http://www.eoc.sc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/E7E90A06-9CAC-4184-985A-F356DDF9A295/5427/Manualformattedforprinter.pdf>

South Carolina Schedule for Studies of and Changes to School and District Report Cards

| Report Card | 2004-2005 | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 |
|--------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Primary Schools | Advisory group reviews rating criteria to determine if criteria more sensitive to programmatic differences can be identified and implemented | Pilot new criteria and simulate results | Implement new criteria indicated from pilot study | | |
| Elementary Schools | <u>Absolute ratings:</u> Add PACT Social Studies and Science results (weighted 10% each) to ELA and Math results (weighted 40% each) <u>Improvement ratings:</u> Add PACT Social Studies and Science results (weighted 20% each) to ELA and Math results (weighted 30% each) | <u>Absolute ratings:</u> Increase PACT Social Studies and Science result weights to 15% each and decrease ELA and Math result weights to 35% each <u>Improvement ratings:</u> No change | <u>Absolute ratings:</u> Increase PACT Social Studies and Science result weights to 20% each and decrease ELA and Math result weights to 30% each <u>Improvement ratings:</u> No change Conduct studies of roles of PACT performance levels in accountability system and possible use of measures of persistently low student performance for accountability | Percentage of students who attended a preschool program studied for possible reporting | Percentage of students who attended a preschool program reported |
| Middle Schools | <u>Absolute ratings:</u> Add PACT Social Studies and Science results (weighted 15% each) to ELA and Math results (weighted 35% each) | <u>Absolute ratings:</u> Increase PACT Social Studies and Science result weights to 20% and decrease ELA and Math result weights to 30% each | <u>Absolute ratings:</u> Increase PACT Social Studies and Science result weights to 25% each and decrease ELA and Math result weights to 25% each | <u>Absolute ratings:</u> End of Course test results included along with PACT results for calculation of Absolute ratings | |

| Report Card | 2004-2005 | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 |
|----------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| Middle Schools | Improvement ratings: Add PACT Social Studies and Science results (weighted 25% each) to ELA and Math results (weighted 25% each) | Improvement ratings: No change | Improvement ratings: No change Conduct studies of roles of PACT performance levels in accountability system and possible use of measures of persistently low student performance for accountability | | |
| High Schools | No change from 2003-2004 | Replace longitudinal BSAP Exit Exam with longitudinal HSAP high school examination data | Replace LIFE Scholarship criteria with end-of-course test results Conduct study of possible use of measures of student attainment of credits toward diploma for accountability | End of Course test results from virtual high school courses and from courses providing dual high school and college credit reported with high school in which student is enrolled for use in calculating school and district ratings (through 2009-2010) Results from measure of foreign language program reported | End of Course test results from virtual high school courses and from courses providing dual high school and college credit reported with high school in which student is enrolled for use in calculating school and district ratings (through 2009-2010) |
| Districts | Add PACT Social Studies and Science results to ELA and Math results to elementary and middle school components of district ratings, applying same weightings for each test as used for elementary and middle schools in 2004-2005 | Increase weights for PACT Social Studies and Science results and decrease weights for ELA and Math results when calculating the elementary and middle school components of district ratings, applying same weightings for each test as used for elementary and middle school | Increase weights for PACT Social Studies and Science results and decrease weights for ELA and Math results when calculating the elementary and middle school components of district ratings, applying same weightings for each test as used for elementary | Report ratings of charter schools in district Report card for State Charter School District distributed | |

| Report Card | 2004-2005 | 2005-2006 | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| Districts | | ratings in 2005-2006 Replace LIFE Scholarship criteria with end-of-course test results for high school component of ratings Add district high school graduation rate to ratings criteria | and middle school ratings in 2006-2007 Plan for report card for State Charter School District | | |
| Career and Technology Centers | Advisory group reviews rating criteria to determine if criteria more sensitive to programmatic differences can be identified and implemented | Advisory group reviews rating criteria to determine if criteria more sensitive to programmatic differences can be identified and implemented | Advisory group reviews rating criteria to determine if criteria more sensitive to programmatic differences can be identified and implemented | Pilot new criteria and simulate results | Implement new criteria from pilot study |

Sources:

H 4662 (became law without governor's signature June 2008) http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/prever/4662_20080529.htm

<http://www.eoc.sc.gov/NR/ronlyres/E7E90A06-9CAC-4184-985A-F356DDF9A295/5427/Manualformattedforprinter.pdf>

<http://eoc.sc.gov/NR/ronlyres/6F5AB929-399C-4EC7-84ED-853B60A01B07/17326/EndofofCourseTestScoresinSchoolRatings.pdf>

Other Sample State Profiles

Arkansas

(upward trend on NAEP math, some improvement at 4th grade reading)

Mathematics – 4th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2000 | 216 | 224 | 55% | 14% | 1% |
| 2007 | 238 | 239 | 81% | 37% | 4% |
| Change | +22 | +15 | +26% | +23% | +3% |

Mathematics – 8th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2000 | 257 | 272 | 49% | 13% | 1% |
| 2007 | 274 | 280 | 65% | 24% | 4% |
| Change | +17 | +8 | +16% | +9% | +3% |

Reading – 4th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 213 | 217 | 58% | 26% | 5% |
| 2007 | 217 | 220 | 64% | 29% | 5% |
| Change | +4 | +3 | +6% | +3% | 0% |

Reading – 8th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 260 | 263 | 72% | 27% | 2% |
| 2007 | 258 | 261 | 70% | 25% | 1% |
| Change | -2 | -2 | -2% | -2% | -1% |

Performance measures, state accountability system (high school level)

- Performance on “End of Course Geometry”
- Performance on “End of Course Algebra 1”
- Literacy tests
- Graduation rate.

Growth Model: Growth model approved for 2006-07 under federal NCLB pilot program

Formula:

A school or district will make AYP if it meets the annual measurable objective under the status model, satisfies the "safe harbor" model tests, or meets the standards for individual growth. In addition, the school or district must meet participation rate requirements and the additional academic indicator used to determine AYP.

For example, under the status model, the proficiency target for grades K-5 math is that 64% of students should be proficient in 2007-08 in each school and subgroup. Under the growth model, 64% of the students must make assessment gains in math to be making AYP, or the percentage of such students must meet the safe harbor standard. Required growth is calculated for all students, including those currently below proficient and those at or above proficient.

Growth Goal: For students below Proficient, Arkansas will define the expected growth rate as requiring annual achievement gains that will make the student proficient by Grade 8. Each student will have an individual trajectory, based on how far he/she is from the proficiency level and his/her grade. Students who are further from proficiency will need to make larger annual gains to meet the growth expectation. The growth target for a student who is below proficient is not reset each year. Each student who is below proficient will have the same growth target – reaching the proficient level of performance by the 8th grade.

Source: Arkansas Growth Model Application, November 2006
<http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/growthmodel/ar/argmp.doc>

Massachusetts

(upward trends on NAEP)

Mathematics – 4th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2000 | 233 | 224 | 77% | 31% | 3% |
| 2007 | 252 | 239 | 93% | 58% | 11% |
| Change | +19 | +15 | +16% | +27% | +8% |

Mathematics – 8th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2000 | 279 | 272 | 70% | 30% | 5% |
| 2007 | 298 | 280 | 85% | 51% | 15% |
| Change | +19 | +8 | +15% | +21% | +10% |

Reading – 4th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 234 | 217 | 80% | 47% | 13% |
| 2007 | 236 | 220 | 81% | 49% | 16% |
| Change | +2 | +3 | +1% | +2% | +3% |

Reading – 8th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 271 | 263 | 81% | 39% | 3% |
| 2007 | 273 | 261 | 84% | 43% | 4% |
| Change | +2 | -2 | +3% | +4% | -1% |

Performance Measures (high school level):

State achievement tests

Alternative assessments in English language arts and math

High school graduation rate

Student attendance

Growth Model: Performance indexing approved in 2003 for use with NCLB accountability. Massachusetts has used its Achievement Performance Index (API) as part of the state accountability system since 2001.

Formula:

Massachusetts uses its model to set targets based on the growth that it expects from schools and their student groups. Schools can make AYP if they reach these targets, even if they fall short of reaching the statewide proficiency targets set with the state's status model.

Massachusetts used a model that measures growth for the school as a whole and for designated student groups. The state awards points to schools in 25-point increments for each student, depending on how students scored on the state test, toward the goal of 100% by 2014. Schools earn 100 points for each student who reaches proficiency, but fewer points for students below proficiency. The state averages the points to award a final score to schools. Growth in Massachusetts is calculated by taking the difference in the annual scores that a school earns between 2 years.

The Composite Performance Index (CPI) is a measure of the extent to which students have achieved or are progressing toward proficiency. Separate determinations are made for English language arts/reading and for mathematics. Assessment results for students in all grades within a school are combined to calculate the school's CPI for a given subject, group and time period. Since 2006, the state has issued district-level CPI calculations separately for the elementary, middle, and high school grade-spans (comprising grades 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12).

The CPI determinations, because they are based on increments that permit Massachusetts to measure more discrete gradients of performance and track movement toward proficiency as well as attainment of proficiency, appear to be more stable than findings based simply on the percent proficient and advanced.

Sources:

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06948t.pdf>

<http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/macsa.pdf>

Minnesota

(upward trend on NAEP math, reading)

Mathematics – 4th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2000 | 234 | 224 | 76% | 33% | 4% |
| 2007 | 247 | 239 | 87% | 51% | 9% |
| Change | +13 | +15 | +11% | +18% | +5% |

Mathematics – 8th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2000 | 287 | 272 | 80% | 39% | 6% |
| 2007 | 292 | 280 | 81% | 43% | 11% |
| Change | +5 | +8 | +1% | +4% | +5% |

Reading – 4th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 225 | 217 | 73% | 37% | 7% |
| 2007 | 225 | 220 | 73% | 37% | 7% |
| Change | 0 | +3 | 0% | 0% | 0% |

Reading – 8th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2003 | 268 | 261 | 76% | 37% | 3% |
| 2007 | 268 | 261 | 80% | 37% | 3% |
| Change | 0 | -2 | +4% | 0% | 0% |

Performance Measures (high school level)

- Academic achievement
- Academic opportunity
- School safety
- Student participation
- Staff characteristics
- Student demographics
- Attendance rate
- Graduation rate
- Parent satisfaction
- Report to taxpayers.

Growth Model: Performance indexing approved in 2003 for use with NCLB accountability.

Formula:

AYP Index Points

AYP Index Points are assigned using Achievement Level. Partially meeting the standard generates 0.5 index points while Meeting or Exceeding the standard generates 1.0 index points.

Achievement Levels:

Level 1- Does Not Meet the Standards

Level 2- Partially Meets the Standards

Level 3- Meets the Standards

Level 4- Exceeds the Standards

The goal of the AYP system is to have all students scoring at or above Level 3 by 2013-14, representing solid grade level work on all assessments.

AYP progress determinations will be made on the basis of performance index scores and annual measurable objectives for student achievement as defined by NCLB. All schools are expected to show improvement at a rate that will result in 100% of the students meeting state expectations in reading and mathematics by 2013-14.

The performance index will be used to determine whether schools, districts and the state are meeting annual measurable objectives.

Schools are awarded one full index point for each student who scores at or above Level 3. One-half index point is awarded for students who score within Level 2. No index points are awarded for students who score within Level 1. Annual measurable objectives are expressed as index targets that will be increased annually in equal increments beginning in 2007-08. All schools must reach the goal of 100 index points by the year 2013-14.

The performance index increases the number of data points used to make decisions about schools thereby increasing the stability and consistency of the decision. The performance index also increases the validity of the system since it gives schools credit for moving students from the lowest achievement level into higher levels. Schools receive credit for growth but are also held to achievement status requirements.

As some schools are very far away from reaching state expectations for student achievement, the performance index will allow schools to demonstrate success in the beginning of the new system while still allowing them to retain a focus on the ultimate state expectation of having 100% of all students score at or above Level 3 by school year 2013-14.

Minnesota will incorporate an additional growth calculation, subject to approval by the USDOE, once grades 3 – 8 reading and mathematics assessments have been implemented for at least two years.

Source:
<http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/mncsa.pdf>

Oklahoma
 (upward trend on NAEP math but not other subjects)

Mathematics – 4th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2000 | 224 | 224 | 67% | 16% | 1% |
| 2007 | 237 | 239 | 82% | 33% | 3% |
| Change | +13 | +15 | +15% | +17% | +2% |

Mathematics – 8th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2000 | 270 | 272 | 62% | 18% | 2% |
| 2007 | 275 | 280 | 66% | 21% | 3% |
| Change | +5 | +8 | +4% | +3% | +1% |

Reading – 4th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 213 | 217 | 60% | 26% | 4% |
| 2007 | 217 | 220 | 65% | 27% | 4% |
| Change | +4 | +3 | +5% | +1% | 0% |

Reading – 8th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 262 | 263 | 76 | 28 | 1 |
| 2007 | 260 | 261 | 72 | 26 | 1 |
| Change | -2 | -2 | -4% | -2% | 0% |

Performance measures (high school level)

- Oklahoma School Testing Program scores
- Attendance rate
- Graduation rate
- Dropout rate
- Advanced Placement participation
- ACT score and participation
- College remediation.

Growth Model: Performance indexing approved in 2003 for use with NCLB accountability.

Formula:

The API measures performance and progress of a school or district based on several factors that contribute to overall educational success. It is a numeric index or score, ranging from 0 to 1500, with 1000 as the 2001-02 state average. An overall API score, as well as subscores for individual indicators, are assigned to each school and district. Statewide targets for performance on reading and math have been set and will increase incrementally to promote continued improvement. Performance targets for additional indicators, including attendance rates and graduation rates, have also been set as goals for schools and districts.

The purpose of the API is to measure success and to initiate growth in school and district performance. The API gives a performance score for all students tested, as well as for individual student groups. Subscores of the API are also used to measure Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) toward 100% proficiency by 2014, as required under No Child Left Behind.

The seven indicators mandated by state legislation (Title 70 O.S. § 3-150) are divided into three categories, or components, as follows:

1. Oklahoma School Testing Program (OSTP): Reading/language arts and math results in grades 3 - 8, and upon completion of specific high school End-of-Instruction tests (EOI).
2. School Completion: Includes attendance, dropout and graduation rates
3. Academic Excellence: Utilizes ACT scores and percent of students participating, Advanced Placement (AP) credit, and college remediation rates in reading and math. *Dropout and graduation rates, as well as all indicators included in the Academic Excellence component, are used only for high school and K-12 district accountability.*

OTHER Highlights

Virginia's *Absolute* performance model – highlighted for proficiency levels, targets:
 (upward trend on NAEP math, reading, science)

Mathematics – 4th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2000 | 230 | 224 | 71% | 24% | 2% |
| 2007 | 244 | 239 | 87% | 42% | 7% |
| Change | +14 | +15 | +16% | +18% | +5% |

Mathematics – 8th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2000 | 275 | 272 | 65% | 25% | 5% |
| 2007 | 288 | 280 | 77% | 37% | 9% |
| Change | +13 | +8 | +12% | +12% | +4% |

Reading – 4th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 225 | 217 | 71% | 37% | 9% |
| 2007 | 227 | 220 | 74% | 38% | 9% |
| Change | +2 | +3 | +3% | +1% | 0% |

Reading – 8th Grade

| Year | State Scale Score (0 to 500) | National Avg. Scale Score | Percent at or Above Basic | Percent at or Above Proficient | Percent at or Above Advanced |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2002 | 269 | 263 | 80% | 37% | 3% |
| 2007 | 267 | 261 | 79% | 34% | 3% |
| Change | -2 | -2 | -1% | -3% | 0% |

State performance measures (high school level)

- Annual measurable objectives in reading (end-of-course tests; can include 2 + on AP)
- Annual measurable objectives in mathematics (end-of-course tests; includes 2 + on AP calculus or 3+ on IB)
- Graduation rate (objective = 61% for 07-08; will reset when longitudinal data avail.)
- Participation rate.

Accreditation Benchmarks (Adjusted Pass Rates)

| SUBJECT | Grade 3 | Grade 4-5 | Grades 6-12 |
|-------------|---------|-----------|-------------|
| English | 75% | 75% | 70% |
| Mathematics | 70% | 70% | 70% |
| Science | 50% | 70% | 70% |
| History | 50% | 70% | 70% |

AYP: Annual Measurable Objectives for Reading and Language Arts

| 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 | 2004-05 | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 |
|----------------|---------|---------|--------------|---------|---------|--------------|---------|---------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Starting Point | | | Initial Goal | | | Initial Goal | | | Initial Goal | | | Goal |
| 60.7 | 61.0 | 61.0 | 65.0 | 69.0 | 73.0 | 77.0 | 81.0 | 85.0 | 89.0 | 93.0 | 97.0 | 100% |

AYP: Annual Measurable Objectives for Mathematics

| 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 | 2004-05 | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 |
|----------------|---------|---------|--------------|---------|---------|--------------|---------|---------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Starting Point | | | Initial Goal | | | Initial Goal | | | Initial Goal | | | Goal |
| 58.4 | 59.0 | 59.0 | 63.0 | 67.0 | 71.0 | 75.0 | 79.0 | 83.0 | 87.0 | 91.0 | 95.0 | 100% |

Note: AYP ratings for the 2007-2008 school year are based on achievement on tests administered during 2006-2007 or on average achievement during the three most recent school years. Achievement must equal or exceed the Annual Measurable Objective shaded above.

Source: <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/src/vps-accountability.shtml>

OTHER State Variations in Performance Indicators or Measures

Connecticut

(upward trend on NAEP math)

Performance measures (high school level)

- State test results
- Types of supplemental instructional services provided to students who are not proficient in language arts and math
- Percent of students retained in grade
- Percent of students enrolled in bilingual or English as a second language programs
- Percent of students enrolled in special education
- Performance on Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT)
- Dropout rate
- Graduation rate
- Graduate follow-up data
- Any other qualitative or quantitative information that the school believes demonstrates progress in achieving success.

SOURCE: Education Commission of the States

Georgia

(upward trend on NAEP math, reading, smaller in science)

Performance measures (high school level)

The performance indicators of student achievement and school performance must be based on information that is disaggregated with respect to ethnicity, sex, disability, language proficiency, and socioeconomic status and must include:

- The results of assessment instruments aggregated by grade level and subject area
- Dropout rates
- Student attendance
- School completion rates
- The percentage of students who passed the Georgia high school graduation test
- The percentage of graduating students who meet the course requirements established for the recommended high school program by State Board of Education rule
- The percentage of students taking end-of-course assessment instruments
- The percentage of high school students who pass the end-of-course assessment instrument in core subjects
- The results of the Scholastic Assessment Test or the ACT Assessment
- The percentage of students taking alternate assessments

- The average time that a student placed in an early intervention program remains before attaining grade level status and returning to regular status
- Any other indicator the office of education adopts.

Wisconsin

(upward trend on NAEP math and writing – not reading, science)

Performance Measures (high school level)

- Performance of pupils on the administered tests
- Performance of pupils, by subject area, on the statewide assessment exams
- Graduation rate
- Dropout rate
- Attendance rate
- Retention rate
- Percentage of habitual truants
- Percentage of pupils participating in extracurricular or community activities
- Percentage of pupils participating in advanced placement courses
- Percentage of graduates enrolled in postsecondary programs
- Percentage of graduates entering workforce assessment scores
- Name of schools identified for school improvement.