

Accountability Workgroup

Recommendations

Accountability Advisory Committee Overview

- 14 broad-based representatives
 - Superintendents, PTA, Principal, Charter School, NSHE, NSEA, Chamber of Commerce, Clark County Black Caucus, Special Education, English Mastery Council
- The purpose of the AAC was to refining the Nevada School Performance Framework in anticipation of Nevada's ESEA Waiver renewal
- 5 facilitated day-long meetings between January and September 2015

Accountability Advisory Committee Goals

- The system must provide clear, actionable information to help districts and schools evaluate and improve the effectiveness of their programs
- The system must accurately classify districts and schools with respect to performance standards in order to inform the public and policy makers
- Ratings should reflect and help promote
 - Improved academic achievement, especially with respect to growth and equity of outcomes
 - Progress toward and attainment of post-secondary readiness
 - Positive school climate

Accountability Advisory Committee Design Principles

- Growth should be weighted more heavily than status performance
- The full range of accountability performance should be accessible to schools of all types, including those that serve at risk students
- Outcomes should be consistent and comparable from school to school
- The outcomes should reflect and reward reduction in performance gaps
- Where reasonable and without sacrificing technical defensibility, the model should be as simple as possible to promote understanding
- Overall, indicators should be compensatory but incorporate established thresholds and weighting decisions

Accountability Workgroup Overview

- 4 Meetings
- 50 Participants
- 4 Key Activities
 - Essential and Strategic Questions
 - SWOT Analysis
 - School Indicator and Profile Activity
 - Recommendations Writing
 - 4 Teams of Writers
 - 2 Additional Submissions

Workgroup Recommendations 1

Priority	ES/MS Indicator	Weight	ESSA Req.
2	Test Scores {proficiency rates}	24%	Yes
1	A “measure of student growth” or other academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation among student groups	38%	Yes
3	English Language Proficiency	13%	Yes
4	At least one indicator of school quality or success that allows for meaningful differentiation among student performance	14%	Yes
	Total	89%	

Priority	HS Indicator	Weight	ESSA Req.
2	Test Scores (in addition to this, state may use student growth based on annual assessments) {proficiency rate}	23%	Yes
1	Four-year graduation rate (In addition to this states may use an extended-year graduation rate)	28%	Yes
4	English Language Proficiency	11%	Yes
5	At least one indicator of school quality or success that allows for meaningful differentiation among student performance	11%	Yes
3	College and Career Readiness*	18%	No
	Total	91%	

Workgroup Recommendations 2

- Accountability measures of workforce/college and career (CCR) readiness should only apply to high schools.
- Use the ACT and ACT Work Keys Assessment as a measure of CCR.
- Indicate the percentage of students taking the ACT and/or ACT Work Keys and the average score earned on the ACT and ACT Work Keys in the NSPF school rating.

Workgroup Recommendations 3

- Clarify/communicate the NSPF measures and meaning.

Workgroup Recommendations 4

- Revise the NSPF to include trends in accountability measures including reporting on subgroup measurements (ELL, FRPC, etc.).
- Ensure the rating system addresses the progress that *all* student groups make in order to provide an equitable picture and demonstrate school achievement.
- Measure school offerings of courses with supports and accommodations to *all* students.

Workgroup Recommendations 5

- Track the growth of students as individual learners.

Workgroup Recommendations 6

- Promote and track student access and participation in before and after school clubs, sports, enrichment, and/or activities.
- Compare percentage of clubs and capacity to the percentage of students enrolled. Schools allocate adequate funding and personnel for before and after school activities

Workgroup Recommendations 7

- Track staff attendance.
- Track staff continuity and transiency.

Workgroup Recommendations 8

- Use an N-size of 10 for all accountability determinations.

Workgroup Recommendations 9

- Calculation of 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR) should also include ESSA's Section 1111(c)(4)(F) "Partial Attendance" requirement.
- Identify "Comprehensive Intervention" high schools based on more than just the 4-year ACGR graduation rates.

Workgroup Recommendations 10

- At the District level, measure access to a Well-Rounded Education.
- Measure a District's collaborative communication plan.

Modeling Accountability

Overview

- Developed by the Nevada Department of Education Accountability group in consult with:
 - Research organizations
 - National Experts
 - Other State Departments of Education
 - Professional Organizations
- The following reports are for illustration only and do not reflect any actual student performance.

Modeling Accountability ES

Student Proficiency (Point Earning Indicator)

	Number of Students Tested	Number of Students Proficient	Percent of Students Proficient	State Comparison	Points
Math CRT	362	282	77.9%	75.0%	
ELA CRT	363	294	81.0%	77.0%	
Science CRT	115	73	63.5%	69.0%	
Subtotal	840	649	77.3%	73.6%	TBD
Total					TBD

Student Proficiency Reporting

	Percent of Students Proficient				Met Target	
	Math	Math State	ELA	ELA State	Math	ELA
American Indian/Alaska Native	**	83.1%	**	77.0%	n/a	n/a
Asian	**	81.2%	**	77.0%	n/a	n/a
Black/African American	34.3%	35.1%	38.9%	41.1%	Yes	Yes
Hispanic/Latino	48.5%	47.0%	43.2%	43.0%	No	Improving
Pacific Islander	**	79.0%	**	82.0%	n/a	n/s
Two or More Races	72.3%	81.5%	74.7%	76.0%	Yes	Improving
White/Caucasian	84.0%	82.3%	87.9%	82.0%	Yes	Yes
Special Education	23.0%	25.0%	27.0%	21.0%	Improving	No
English Learners (Current + Former)	34.2%	39.0%	41.0%	43.0%	Improving	No
• Current						
Economically Disadvantaged	70.2%	69.0%	78.2%	72.0%	Yes	Yes

Read by Three (Point Earning Indicator)

	Number of Student Records	Measure	Type	Points
1 st grade NWEA			Typical Growth	
2 nd grade NWEA			Greater than Typical Growth	
3 rd grade CRT			Typical Growth	
Total				TBD

Student Growth (Point Earning Indicator)

	Number of Student Records	Measure	Type	Points
Math CRT MGP	231	61	Typical Growth	TBD
ELA CRT MGP	229	67	Greater Than Typical Growth	TBD
Subtotal				
	Number of Students Meeting AGP	Number of Student Records	Percent of Student Meeting AGP	Points
Math CRT AGP	199	231	86.1%	TBD
ELA CRT AGP	181	229	79.0%	TBD
Subtotal				TBD
Total				TBD

Modeling Accountability MS

English Language Proficiency (Point Earning Indicator)

	Number of English Learners Assessed	Percentage of English Learners Meeting Growth Targets	State Comparison	Points
ELPA	75	68%	71.2%	
Total				<i>TBD</i>

Closing Opportunity Gaps/Equity (Point Earning Indicator)

	Number of Students In Need of Improvement	Percent of Students Meeting AGP	State Comparison	Points		
Math CRT	80	42.5%	45.6%	<i>TBD</i>		
ELA CRT	69	29.0%	41.2%	<i>TBD</i>		
			Total	<i>TBD</i>		
– Closing Opportunity Gaps/Equity Reporting						
Membership of Students in Need of Improvement	Number of Students In Need of Improvement		Percentage of Students in Need of Improvement			
	Math	ELA	Math	Math State	ELA	ELA State
Students Receiving Special Education	63	67	78.8%	69.7%	97.1%	77.2%
English Learners (Current + Former)	30	27	37.5%	43.6%	39.1%	42.1%
• Current						
Students who are Economically Disadvantaged	24	31	30.0%	40.1%	44.9%	41.9%
American Indian/Alaska Native	**	**	**	33.1%	**	39.7%
Asian	**	**	**	32.5%	**	30.0%
Black/African American	19	17	23.8%	30.9%	24.6%	29.2%
Hispanic/Latino	21	18	26.3%	27.3%	26.0%	25.8%
Pacific Islander	**	**	**	23.2%	**	27.7%
Two or More Races	**	10	**	20.3%	14.5%	19.8%
White/Caucasian	35	22	43.8%	30.2%	31.9%	31.1%

High School Readiness (Point Earning Indicator)

	Percent of students	State Comparison	Points
Student passing Core Math courses	65%	54%	
Students passing Core English courses	78%	63%	
Student Engagement/ Students missing less than 18 days during the school year	84%	80%	
Students attaining EOC achievement level 3 or higher	8%	5%	
			<i>TBD</i>

Modeling Accountability HS

College and Career Readiness (*Point Earning Indicator*)

	Number of Students Tested	Average Composite Scores	State Comparison	Points	
<i>ACT</i>	347	19.2	21.6	<i>TBD</i>	
Readiness Outcome Options					
	Number of 12 th Grade Students	Number Participated	Number Passed	Percent Passed	Points
<i>AP, IB, CTE or Dual Credit</i>	134	98	73	74.5%	<i>TBD</i>
-College and Career Readiness Reporting					
		Number Participated	Number Passed	Percent Passed	
	<i>Advanced Placement Proficiency</i>	57	43	75.4%	
	<i>International Baccalaureate Proficiency</i>	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	<i>CTE Skills Attainment Test Proficiency</i>	26	24	92.3%	
	<i>Earned Dual Credit</i>	25	15	60.0%	
	Number of 9 th and 10 th Graders	Number of 9 th and 10 Graders who are Credit Sufficient	Percent of Credit Sufficient 9 th and 10 Graders	State Comparison	Points
<i>9th and 10th Grade Credit Sufficiency</i>	303	286	94.4%	92.1%	<i>TBD</i>
	Number of Students	Number of students who have an Academic Learning Plan	Percent of Students who have an Academic Learning Plan	State Comparison	Points
<i>Academic Learning Plans</i>	1034	987	95.5%	78.9%	<i>TBD</i>
				Points	<i>TBD</i>
	Number of Students	Number of students with a 3 or higher Achievement Level	Percent of students with a 3 or high Achievement Level	State Comparison	Points
<i>EOC Math</i>	1034	150	14.5%	32%	<i>TBD</i>
<i>EOCELA</i>	980	95	9.6%	45%	<i>TBD</i>
<i>EOC Science</i>	400	86	21.5/5	40%	<i>TBD</i>
				Total	<i>TBD</i>

Leveraging Reporting

