

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Nevada Accountability Workgroup

---

Summary of the Accountability Workgroup  
Meetings and Recommendations

11/2/2016

**Contents**

Accountability Workgroup Purpose and Process..... 2

Accountability Workgroup Meeting #1 - Overview ..... 3

    Meeting Agenda..... 4

    Essential and Strategic Questions..... 4

    Meeting Notes ..... 5

Accountability Workgroup Meeting #2 - Overview ..... 7

    Meeting Agenda..... 7

    SWOT Comments ..... 8

    Meeting Notes ..... 11

Accountability Workgroup Meeting #3 - Overview ..... 13

    Meeting Agenda..... 14

    Meeting Notes ..... 14

    Indicator and Profile Activity Results ..... 17

    Write In Responses and Comments from the Indicator and Profile Activity ..... 18

    ES/MS Indicator Additions ..... 24

    HS Indicator Additions ..... 25

Accountability Workgroup Meeting #4 – Overview ..... 26

    Meeting Agenda..... 26

    Meeting Notes ..... 28

Workgroup Recommendations..... 31

    School Ratings and Measurements of Success ..... 31

    ES/MS Accountability System ..... 35

    HS Accountability System ..... 38

    District Accountability System ..... 41

    Other submitted recommendations ..... 46

Workgroup Members..... 50

## **Accountability Workgroup Purpose and Process**

The Accountability Workgroup will make recommendations to the Nevada Advisory Group on how to refine and improve Nevada's existing school and district rating system. Recommendations from five other workgroups will also be presented to the Advisory Group. These recommendations will ultimately inform the State's improvement plan and the plan the State will submit to the United States Department of Education.

By no later than September 2018, Nevada public and charter schools will be rated by a revised school and district accountability system. Annual ratings of school performance based on this system will be published. The work of revising the school rating system began with the Accountability Advisory Committee (AAC) in January 2015. The AAC was a broad-based group of Nevadans who represented a variety of constituent groups. In December 2015, the Technical Advisory Group (TAG), a group of measurement and accountability experts from Nevada school districts, met to discuss the AAC recommendations and determine the technical operation of the recommendations. Also in December 2015, President Obama signed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) into law. This new federal education law contains new provisions related to school accountability.

The Nevada Department of Education (NDE) views ESSA as an opportunity to ensure that the State education improvement plan and the Department's mission, vision and goals described therein are the guiding force behind improving education in our state. To this end, NDE convened six stakeholder workgroups to inform the state's plan. The Accountability Workgroup is one of these groups.

The new school and district rating system that will result from various stakeholder inputs and recommendations will be more meaningful and useful to Nevadans. In particular, the school accountability system will provide parents, educators and policy makers with the information needed to make education decisions for children, improve or adjust academic programs and supports for teachers, and empower Nevada families to vote with their feet.

The Accountability Workgroup will provide input and make recommendations to ensure that the Nevada school and district accountability system contains the right measures of school and district performance in order to drive improvements at the district, school and classroom level and to create incentives for quality college and/or career readiness programs.

The Accountability Workgroup meetings were held on July 1<sup>st</sup>, July 25<sup>th</sup>, August 24<sup>th</sup> and October 24<sup>th</sup>. Each meeting was held for two hours and was attended by interested stakeholders from around the State. An open invitation for participation on any of the six workgroups was sent out through local and state commissions, councils, and associations. An invitation to participate was also posted on the NDE homepage.

The accountability group's work began with an overview of NDE priorities, a review of the work of the AAC, a presentation highlighting key provisions and timelines for ESSA, and an activity in which the workgroup began to develop strategic and essential questions as well as a strength and weaknesses analysis for the school accountability system.

The second meeting began with a review of the strengths and weaknesses analysis and the strategic and essential questions from the previous meeting. The goals and design principles from the AAC were also reviewed and discussed. Then the workgroup engaged in small and large group discussions regarding school ratings in general and setting goals for the school rating system.

The third meeting began with a review of the accountability indicators within the school rating system, and involved a discussion around indicators for district accountability. The meeting then concluded by revisiting the essential and strategic questions from the first meeting. During this meeting, workgroup members reviewed and discussed consolidated feedback regarding the weights and priorities of indicators within the accountability system as well as consensus priorities for indicators.

A fourth meeting was held to review the discussions from the first three meetings and to have more in-depth conversations about topics that arose during the course of the workgroup. The first half of the meeting focused on district accountability practices around the county and an open discussion about district accountability in Nevada. The balance of the meeting consisted of open discussions regarding school indicators and graduation rate methodology. At the conclusion of the meeting, teams of participants formed to write recommendations for the Advisory Group.

The meetings were conducted via video conference and in person in the NDE board rooms in Carson City and Las Vegas. A telephone conference line was made available for attendees participating remotely. The structure of the meetings was generally presentation, followed by small group discussions, followed by large group discussion. Prior to the third meeting, participants were asked to complete a school accountability indicator activity and send the completed activity to NDE so that the summary could be presented and discussed during the last meeting. The fourth meeting served as a concluding meeting to allow for more discussion on the topics of the previous meetings.

## **Accountability Workgroup Meeting #1 - Overview**

The first meeting was held on July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016. During the meeting, participants heard about the meeting protocol and workgroup structure, the State's vision and the role of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in service to the State's vision. Additionally, the workgroup saw a draft of essential and strategic questions. In the end, the essential and strategic questions should be answerable through the accountability system that results from stakeholder input. Finally, the workgroup was asked to think through an organizing scheme aimed at identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the State's school and district accountability system (a SWOT analysis). At the end of the meeting, participants were asked

to share their revisions to the essential and strategic questions and their individual SWOT analyses. These revisions were then summarized and incorporated into the questions. The revisions were presented at the following meeting.

## Meeting Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Review State Vision/Mission/Theory of Action/Goals
  - Please review State Vision Mission Goals document in preparation for the meeting
- Purpose of Work Group
  - Review purpose of the work group
  - Highlights of Accountability Advisory Committee Recommendation (please pre-read the AAC report)
  - Review of ESSA accountability provisions (please pre-read the Accountability Provisions document)
- Understanding RAPID
  - Please review Rapid Decision Making document in preparation for the meeting
- Work Session on Essential and Strategic Questions (30 minutes)
  - Example of Essential Question:
    - What does an accountability system that results in summary school ratings, measures progress toward meeting the Department's goals, and provides meaningful and actionable information for educators, parents, and local and state level decision makers look like?
  - Examples of Strategic Question:
    - How can we present the state's accountability system so that it is both easy to understand and provides a full picture of a school or district's performance?
    - How can school accountability better align to or create incentives for schools to prepare students for college and/or careers? (i.e. how can school accountability align with Nevada's workforce development initiatives?)
  - Perform SWOT Analysis
- Public Comment (10 minutes)

## Essential and Strategic Questions

The following are the essential and strategic questions that came as a result of the received input from workgroup members.

## **Notes on revisions to questions (July 18th, 2016)**

After reviewing all of the feedback on the essential and strategic questions, the following adjustments were made:

1. Change in wording for the essential question (changed to a how question, included enduring and consistent)
2. Changed first question to equity. This signifies a focus on the desired state and was a recurrent theme in the edits.
3. Changed the order of the topics in strategic question #2 (full picture first, then easy to understand)
4. Removed indications of incentives from strategic question #3. The system will measure CCR.
5. Changed school climate in strategic question #4 to non-academic measures. This is in response to the several recommendations about measures beyond climate alone.
6. Removed the academic profile question as this will be a workgroup activity. Recommendations will be collected through the activity.

### **Essential Question:**

How does an enduring and consistent accountability system that results in summary school ratings, measures progress toward meeting the Department's goals, and provides meaningful and actionable information for educators, parents, and local and state level decision makers look?

### **Strategic Questions:**

1. How can the accountability system best measure equity?
2. How can we present the state's accountability system so that it provides a full picture of a school or district's performance and is easy to understand?
3. How can school accountability better measure schools' preparation of students for college and/or careers? (i.e. how can school accountability align with Nevada's workforce development initiatives?)
4. How should non-academic measures factor into a schools rating?

## **Meeting Notes**

The following meeting notes are in raw form. Each bullet reflects a captured comment or conversation by the note taker. This account of the discussion may not be complete, but is representative of the discussion held during the course of the first meeting.

- *Workgroup member* asks to consider the Civil Rights Guidelines in the work
- *Workgroup member* asks that there be a definite shift from federal to state to local control
- *Workgroup member* needs clarity on whether this group will get into the actual details of the school ratings –not the details but more policy level recommendations
- *Workgroup member* states that Nevada gets to define the unique outlier – hearing this from NEA – NEA also says that the Nevada will have the ability to determine what the dash board will look like – the State is empowered to make decisions –what is the public comment due by August 1st? – furthermore the focus needs to be what is right for Nevada –federal regulations might impact what is right for Nevada
- *Workgroup member* asks if schools will be rated on the 2016-17 data –intend to use the 2016-17 data and plan on 2017-18 as the target year
- *Workgroup member* thinks that the State can decide when the state is ready to have school ratings
- *Workgroup member* brings up the fact that the NSPF relies statistically on a bell curve to derive school ratings and in so doing schools with highly diverse student populations are low performing and at the bottom – *Workgroup member* indicates that this concern about equity was addressed through the ACC – *Workgroup member* agrees with *Workgroup member* and indicates the second design principle for the ACC addresses the concern about equity
- *Workgroup member* has concerns about the 95% participation requirement and asks what avenues are available to districts when schools are not able to meet this requirement due to more and more opt-out and refusals occurring
- Activity –comments on the essential question and the strategic questions
- *Workgroup member* indicates that the essential question needs to address and reflect the provisions of ESSA
- *Workgroup member* states that #4 school climate is very important but not as important as achievement
- *Workgroup member* asks that with #3 college and career readiness the 11th graders also be given the ACT Work Keys –and to not only consider school climate but also consider culture
- #3 college and career readiness needs to include a measure for a student accessibility to career programs -what is being seen is that there is an inability to access quality career programs at low performing schools –need to look at the school climate and culture a little bit more
- Comment on the essential question is to be cautious and that the State is to decide –add something about the accountability system becoming enduring and understanding –clarify that the information from the accountability system is what create incentives
- #3 college and career readiness needs CTE courses to be part of the accountability system -#4 school climate and concerns about how to fairly and accurately measure school climate
- Consider issues that rural counties are having
- Long-term and interim measures
- SWOT Analysis Worksheet –instructions
- July and August meetings

## Accountability Workgroup Meeting #2 - Overview

The focus of the second meeting was on long-term goal setting and school ratings in general. This meeting was held on July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016. The meeting began with a review of the edits to the strategic and essential questions and a continuation of the SWOT activity from the previous meeting.

The workgroup reviewed and discussed the design principles and goals developed by the Accountability Advisory Committee (AAC), then moved onto a discussion about school ratings in general and long-term goal setting.

### Meeting Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Review meeting norms and meeting process
  - Following the agenda will better enable the accurate capture of workgroup recommendations
- Review revised Essential Questions
- Perform SWOT analysis of the desired school accountability system
  - Suppose the next accountability system was in place, SWOT
- Review and comment on Accountability Advisory Committee Goals and Design Principles
- School ratings discussion – Small group/large group
  - If the NSPF defines excellent, then what does a summative rating look like?
- Goal setting discussion – Small group/large group
  - If the summative school ratings define excellence, then what are those rating based upon?
  - What is long-term and how should we set interim measures of progress
- Discuss pre-work for next time
  - Review the accountability indicators in the accountability chart from the July 1st meeting
  - What does excellence look like in the context of the ESSA indicators?
- Review plans for final meeting
  - Mid-August
- Public Comment

## SWOT Comments

The following list reflects the feedback from the workgroup with respect to the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of a school accountability system. Respondents were asked to consider the strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats of an approved school accountability system.

(Note: The responses below are recorded as they were submitted by the workgroup members. Although every effort was made to interpret the feedback, some responses were not legible)

### Strengths:

- ELP now counts across the board
- Multiple measures
- Science assessment included
- School climate
- Consistency with star rating makes it easier for stakeholders to understand
- Thoughts of AAC or basic principles already laid out
- Acceptance of focusing on growth, also equity
- Development of a robust system/direction in support of Nevada's system
- Focus on growth as an indicator
- Huge variety of participants
- Already trying to address climate/culture as result of prior advisory group work
- Parents, teachers, schools and state want the best for NV students
- We can start over and create something that works for all NV students
- Clear
- Multiple measures of success
- ACT – progress
- The process of our system
- Multiple measures or accountability from all school districts and charter schools
- The Star System is easy to understand
- There is a clear set of policies and practices that will be used to measure how Nevada's schools are performing and a clear expectation of the progress that schools must make with ALL groups of students. Required indicators will be weighted appropriately and used to rate schools on academic achievement, graduation rates, English-language proficiency, and school climate. Accountability measures will encompass the realities of Nevada's required future workforce.
- Strategies for improvement are in place for schools needing assistance as prescribed
- Additional support for professional development is realized
- Equity is the basis of all decision making- 95% of all students are assessed
- Stake holder input/process well rounded picture of each institution

- Transparency of school performance to all stakeholders (SS, TD, parents etc.)
- Growth (V. Cot)

**Weaknesses:**

- Lack of a strong research base on in a system truly identified school quality accurately
- 5<sup>th</sup> year grad rate
- SPED students dropouts
- ESSA is the 50% attendance
- Job skills not included for students interested in career
- Work credits not applied to CCR indicators
- AAC had different set of mandates, not ESSA
- Time
- ACT not broad enough for all students
- Too easy to just use old system with small tweaks
- Many priorities among many stakeholders
- Money can drive decisions not always best
- Damage morale
- Not properly funded
- Attainable?
- Gaps in skills across grade levels
- How will we measure whether a student has equal access to a well-rounded education?  
How will it be defined in Nevada?
- The term “non-academic” is nebulous and could lead to misunderstandings among Nevada’s districts. Some districts may not realize that music and arts, for example, have been listed as two of the seventeen subjects defined within the well-rounded education provision within the ESSA. Districts need to realize that federal resources are available to expend these types of programs thus benefitting additional students.
- Once accountability measures are set, is it fixed- that is, no opportunity for refinement?
- How will time frames be established for schools to report achievement?
- Everybody will not be happy no matter what
- Timeliness of data

**Opportunities:**

- Can we continue to teach and improve the system as new info/research indicates that we should?
- Will we use an appropriate N-size (10 or fewer) to ensure the most student groups are identified?

- Having a system that can accurately identify schools that should be identified for comprehensive or targeted support
- Credit sufficiency needs to account for students enrolled for the year. Currently, schools held accountable for students entering at any point in time
- ESSA is reset
- Broaden participation mandated by ESSA, than original AAC group
- Great opportunity to identify the accountability work to align ESSA
- Voice can be heard
- Changed emphasis of ESSA from federal to state level
- Can improve school achievement
- Reshape system into something functional now
- Fresh start to communicate with schools and communities
- Graduation rate adjustments
- Communicate what accountability is
- New aggressive yet achievable goals can be set that truly reflect the values and needs of ALL of Nevada's students.
- Indicators can be expanded to add to the "picture" of school performance based upon equity in providing students with a well-rounded education including a number of subjects. This would provide schools with the opportunity to expand those programs to engage more students.
- Needs assessments can be performed to help establish goals to meet the newly established targets with federal dollars being used to narrow the gaps.
- Start fresh; communicate plan to all involved get more buy in
- Adjust grad rates- more equitable- give credit for 5<sup>th</sup> year grad rate
- Make more actionable for teachers
- ACT work keys
- Align performance standards to NVACS so system is aligned across schools, staff, community

**Threats:**

- Groups or individuals that may find errors or inadequacy in the system
- Not identifying some sub groups, thus potentially leaving them behind
- Schools continue 67% grad rate difficult for at-risk populations, mostly credit deficient students and schools are "dumping" credit deficient students. The new accountability system needs to accommodate or provide a framework to prevent punitive system for students serving at risk
- Fragments/siloed thinking, accountability should be connected and it's essential connected to other subgroups

- Maintaining engagement will be a challenge
- Culture of embracing Nevada's failures
- Continual change environment making establishing a system difficult
- Time and money short
- Strings attached
- Can damage motivation
- Inequitable
- Not everyone will be pleased. Can't make everyone happy
- Definitions must be clearly stated. For example, what courses will be considered part of a well-rounded education and how can ALL Nevada's students truly be provided with EQUAL ACCESS? Where will this be articulated? How can Nevada ensure that well-rounded subjects are not left up to individual building principals to "interpret" what this means? Some may skirt the intention of this provision. For example, Nevada could miss out on funding allocations which may be provided (via Title IV) for the development of programs in music and the arts thus enhancing this opportunity to become engaged in these types of experiences which lead to a higher quality school climate.
- What appropriate interventions will be provided for our lowest performing schools? How will financial resources limit what can really be accomplished and even impact other initiatives?
- The people not happy= squeaky wheel
- Norming with magnet type schools- not equitable selective process to get in
- Confusing or unclear to parents

## Meeting Notes

The following meeting notes are in raw form. Each bullet reflects a captured comment or conversation by the note taker. This account of the discussion may not be complete, but is representative of the discussion held during the course of the meeting.

- (Vegas) Q: What are they to be writing the SWOT Analysis on?
- A: Look at what we have right now, what are the weaknesses what are the strengths? What are your opinions? Now here we are meeting that will result in changes in the accountability system. Why the system in place not working or how it is the strongest is that it could be. Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities & threats?
- Q: *Workgroup member*
- A: #3 concerned leaning towards college instead of careers, consideration of ACT Keys strengths but only focusing on one side.
- #4 Number of 10th grader Industry learning the certification programs
- Q: Current system or imaginary system

- Strength is the processes get a clear picture one of the opps are making it transparent. Op to see how grads are rated. Not accurate or fair way to make adjustments to paint a clearer picture. Threat is the squeaky wheel that does not speak up
- A: Strength is multiple measures
- Growth heavily on weights
- Actionable more actionable weaknesses star rating people schema, communication, Early lit, if HS grad is delayed by a year
- Op to communicate how view accountably what it is
- 'Op to refine the system to make the design better without change the fundamentals
- Strength is paying att to work keys and ACT keys
- Threat could be acc frame work but the schools that is normed.
- LV
- Q: Weaknesses, damaging moral Threats strings attached
- Q: take discussion: weaknesses
- Build system that provide meaningful results, measuring Grad rates, only shows rates does not show how to fix it. Needs to go one step further the measurements give the info that we need to help change the outcomes.
- Q: Grad rate, fifth year grad rate for schools, agrees that too much emphasis on grad rate.
- Special education that are not counted,
- The kids that come in from other schools, need to explore where the students are not trans to other schools then being counted as a non-grade.
- Consistency of keeping the stars helps the community see where their school is.
- Q: What is is the definition of at risk students
- Are we including EI & special Ed Leaving out reduced lunch, Egl learners
- What does it mean full range accountability Bullet point II
- Idea is different indicators that go into create some kind of design that wouldn't miss or over count students growth or disadvantage
- Thinks that he could not include elementary or middle schools that could not grad kids. Correct we do not issue measurements for them.
- School ratings discussion – Small group/large group
- If the NSPF defines excellent, then what does a summative rating look like?
- Comment: Focused on the measurements, wondering if those measurements and utilization of the measurements giving the practitioners the info what they need to practice. Is there any benefit of measurement that can help them at the school level? Telling them what they are doing to that the higher schools are doing? But it does not make the schools better across the board.
- Asked to clarify adult Ed Teacher attendance etc.

- Adult center measures if they are feeling valued and staying at school, helping the students achieving.
- 95% parents attended did we give them a clear picture of how their kids are doing? Is school recording positive environments are taking place, looking if students are excelling at ,
- Comment: What a five star school should have no gaps, any student should succeed there star rating, over simplifies schools success, maybe a rubric or slighting scale to see how schools did.
- Comment: Climate how to weigh it? Who's is filling out the surveys who is in charge of raw data?
- Growth and performance data what test to use? Are those measuring acct?
- Comment: Elementary school level: show science or social studies be success full as a whole child, is there a way to add that to the system. DID recommend us to look at science
- Comment: Acct. capture if we have certain schools that have used unique techniques that the administration can share what has worked for them. Unique programs, unique intervention.
- Goal setting discussion – Small group/large group
- Comment: what should be directed on student achievement every possibility
- Comment: Goal is for all kids, what that is and how they get there is the problem, need to use multiple ways to get on track.
- Comment: *Workgroup member*: Centered around growth and what steps are being taken to where they should be
- Comment: enrolled in the school all four years should be able to track differently than the students coming in with credit deficient unable to graduate.
- Comment: the schools that are not moving up are ones that need help, there needs to be a clear understanding of what works. Centralize not demoralize, be realistic but set aggressive goals
- Discuss pre-work for next time

### **Accountability Workgroup Meeting #3 - Overview**

The third meeting was held on August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2016 and focused on school level accountability indicators, district accountability, and an attempt to address the strategic and essential questions in the context of the workgroup meetings to date. During this meeting, the English Learner (EL) Workgroup leader, Karl Wilson, and EL experts from his office discussed the recommendations from the EL Workgroup regarding accountability.

Between the second and third meetings, workgroup members were asked to complete a school indicator and profile activity through which group consensus was determined with respect to which of the required school indicators were valued most and which school indicators needed to be added. The results of the activity were shared and discussed with the group. Then the discussion focused on district accountability. Finally, the workgroup attempted to answer the strategic and essential questions agreed upon in the first meeting.

On October 17<sup>th</sup>, workgroup members were provided a draft copy of this document for comment and revision.

## Meeting Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Review meeting norms and meeting process
  - Following the agenda will better enable the accurate capture of workgroup recommendations
- Review ESSA indicators
- Discuss outcome of school indicator & profile activity
- Discuss measures appropriate for district accountability
- Revisit strategic questions
- Recommendations writing & review
- Public Comment

## Meeting Notes

The following meeting notes are in raw form. Each bullet reflects a captured comment or conversation by the note taker. This account of the discussion may not be complete, but is representative of the discussion held during the course of the meeting.

- Welcome
- Attendance
- Introduction
- PowerPoint Presentation
- Meeting Outcomes
- Review and comment on accountability indicators
- Share information regarding the academic profile activity
- Solicit recommendations regarding district accountability

- Answer essential and strategic questions
- Weather Radar Analogy: Design radar to see what's really going on
- Name that movie: Apollo 13
- We would really like to filter but federal law makes it be otherwise
- Terminology
- Index – the score or value associated with an indicator or the sum of indicators
- Indicator -
- Measure -
- ESSA School Accountability Indicators
- Status
- Growth
- Measure of School Quality
- English Language Proficiency
- Progress toward post-secondary readiness (additional for high school)
- ELL Workgroup Recommendations
- Carl Wilson - Measures of Accountability to specifically affect ELL
- How would we measure growth in English Language Proficiency?
  - Accountability of Zoom Schools
- Have districts annually report instead of every other year
  - Alternate Students
  - Access to Advanced Programs
  - Adjust for transiency and extend cohort
  - Include ELL up to 4 years after exiting program (*This is an EL recommendation impacting accountability*)
- Include K-2 in Accountability
- Include newly arrived students and test them in the 1st year but do not include results in accountability. (*This is an EL recommendation impacting accountability*)
- English Language Learner (as federally defined for accountability and participation in the English Language Proficiency Assessment)
- English Language Learner must be able to 1) Participate in English in the classroom
  - 2) Participate on assessments and 3) Participate in society
- The accountability may also need to prioritize language proficiency for African-American students
- School Indicator and Profile Activity
- ES and MS Survey Results
- Priority 1 Growth with 38% weight
- Priority 2 Test Scores 24%
- Priority 3 English Language Proficiency 13%
- Priority 4 School Quality 14%

- What about the additional 11% missing here?
- Need to know how to communicate this to the public
- What is the indicator that can be put forward for the 11%?
- Review the work of the accountability taskforce
- What about equity (achievement gap) and let this be the additional indicator
- HS Survey Results
- Priority 1 Graduation Rate 28%
- Priority 2 Test Scores 23%
- Priority 3 College and Career Readiness 18%
- Priority 4 English Language Proficiency 11%
- Priority 5 School Quality 11%
- There is a disparity among schools in offering college and career readiness
- Equal access and preparedness for college and career readiness is an issue
- AP, IB, CTE are value-added experiences
- NASS put in a request for consideration of the ACT Work Keys
- There needs to be college and career readiness and equity indicators
- There is a Bill Draft by Woodhouse to reduce assessment burden in schools
- The Technical Advisory Group or Accountability Taskforce does not recommend growth in HS
- How do college and career readiness and graduation rate overlap?
- Graduation rate is the credit earning and quality of diploma and has a lot more value whereas college and career readiness is more about a pathway
- How do you bring importance to both graduation rate and college and career readiness?
- There is an inequity with the accessibility of CTE programs not being offered at every HS. This will have an effect on the weights.
- To what degree is there flexibility to explore different weights based on student population and demography differences at a school?
- Keeping with school accountability but then add district accountability
- Attendance: African-American students are being expelled at 3 times the rate of other students
- District Accountability
- Good district accountability models go beyond data aggregation
- Meaningful measures may include innovations
- There are schools trying different initiatives and programs (innovations)
- Need to look at rural districts maybe separately from Urban districts
- There is a need for comparability at the school level but not so much at the district
- Districts set goals and priorities every year
- Is there a District Needs Assessment on-going right-now?

- Very hesitate to support stepping away from keeping rural and urban district comparable –we all have the same goal of graduating students and having students reading at grade level
- The growth measure may not actual benefit the smaller districts –suggesting going beyond the quantitative measure
- Essential Question and Strategic Questions exercise
- Clark County looks at percent of students who met their adequate growth percentiles to see if students are on track
- The utility of the NSPF for educators needs to be better so that information has an impact on professionals at the schools and the schools improve. Then what should be designed to give better information to educators.
- Information needs to be timely and easily explained and systematic in measuring equity especially for those students who are not proficient.
- School culture and climate can become an all-in-one indicator
- Something on the state website for parents to see more frequently through-out the year.
- Summary Report

### Indicator and Profile Activity Results

The following tables show the results of the school indicator and profile activity weights. The weights are expressed as the average weight assigned by each of the respondents to the activity. The priority column represents the mode priority rank associated with the indicator from each of the respondents.

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

Priority	HS Indicator	Weight
2	Test Scores (in addition to this, state may use student growth based on annual assessments)	23%
1	Four-year graduation rate (In addition to this states may use an extended-year graduation rate)	28%
4	English Language Proficiency	11%
5	At least one indicator of school quality or success that allows for meaningful differentiation among student performance	11%
3	<i>College and Career Readiness*</i>	18%

\*Note – College and Career Readiness is not an ESSA required measure, but was mentioned a majority number of times in the write in responses from the activity.

### Write In Responses and Comments from the Indicator and Profile Activity

Note: The responses below are recorded as they were submitted by the workgroup members.

#### ES/MS Comments

- Measure of growth is something that would apply to every school and also allow schools to be on an equal field for achievement. It would also create a need to have schools focus on ALL students versus some that need to be pushed up into the proficient (ie. approaching to meets category).
- This is very significant and would tie in the importance of the Student Learning Goals and create a sense of necessity of the whole student and also provide teachers with an opportunity to

reflect on students' work. It would also be an area that schools that excel in performing arts or superior achievements could be recognized for their value.

- English Language Proficiency is essential. It is an area that a lot of funds (ie. Title 3) are put into programs and resources but the return on investment hasn't been measured or addressed in a way that requires schools to make an immediate adjustment to make a change from what they have always done.
- Test Scores – Due to the limited availability of data that is accessible to all and the lack of timeliness this is rated lower. It is difficult to create a level of proficiency and improve on that when there have been 2 years with no information to move forward from at this time. Maybe in the future when cut scores are available and schools can see trends then this area would be considered higher in the weight category.
- Not only does this category support CCSD pledge of achievement but it is directly about how we are engaging our community into our business (ie. School). This is a great way to continue to have parents and community members involved in the process as stakeholders for all students. However, this should have an alternative to including student numbers (this is a huge reason that surveys are not completed by parents).
- ADA- Needs to have a time frame- previously it was the 100th day- so something that would be comparable
- We need to make sure that determinations of excellence are based on previous historical data that students/schools have been and will be able to achieve. If we set goals based on aspiration, like all students will achieve at 100% (NCLB), then we are not doing anything better than what was done before. It should be a system that is difficult to game, so that schools cannot manipulate scores. It needs to be fair regardless if the school is large or small. There should be bonus points available if you are able to close achievement gaps greater than 50% of the schools in the state, rather than penalizing schools for not being able to achieve something that is unreasonable. Our focus needs to be on student growth.
- [Re: School Quality] Perhaps this indicator could be the school climate indicator that could encompass student, parent, and staff perception data, average daily attendance, and other factors (discipline?, community involvement?, etc.). Non-academic skills measures may also fit in the school climate category.
- Proficiency % should be grounded in national data for "excellence"
- Consider using a point system (ex. Level 1 = 1, level 2 = 2, etc.) and calculating an average score for each school so that the student performance indicator doesn't simply value reaching proficiency but also values progress towards and maintenance of proficiency (ex. Level 2) and advanced proficiency (ex. Level 4)
- Suggest using an indicator here that measures student growth against a national scale (either use MGP within national analysis or use progress between proficiency bands that are set nationally – for this, you would give each proficiency band a point value and find the average for the school. The measure would be the change from year to year in the student average and so would account for positive and negative change)

- This measure would create a set of points that certain schools would not have access to due to the size of their ELL population. To create an equitable framework for all schools, all points should be equally accessible to all school types regardless of demographics of the community served
- In addition to attendance, consider including a measure of a school's ability to maximize educational time through low suspensions, expulsions and mitigation of chronic truancy
- Gap or subgroup measure
- Each school would be awarded points within this category for the largest non-white racial/ethnic or special population subgroup (FRL, ELL, SPED) that they serve that makes up less than 90% of the population.
- Measure: Difference in subgroup % meeting AGP to state average
- Need to determine how points are reallocated if N is not big enough to provide statistical significance
- I am an advocate for growth and plan to support efforts to keep growth the priority.
- The measure for school climate should be based entirely on the student perception survey
- Positive climate rating as measured by family, student and educator perception surveys
- SBAC testing is still not a reliable measure for student achievement. There are still many flaws in the program that have been logged and need to be repaired in order for the test to be a reliable measure. Furthermore, there is a process for norming test items, and there has not been enough time for that to take place.
- Additionally, if the first three accountability indicators improve, then test scores should also improve. Over emphasis on test scores have led to many of the flaws that we see in poor performing schools. In higher achieving schools, there is a greater push towards the first three indicators that I ranked; testing is not the emphasis.
- School climate should be rated through a variety of measures, such as teacher retention and teacher attendance, not only the school climate survey. Schools with positive climates maintain their teaching staff from year to year, and teachers are excited to come to work each day.
- Even though, I ranked the indicators from one-five in order of importance, I weighted each category equally. All five of these indicators are necessary in order for schools to be successful. I also believe it would lead to a more balanced look at school culture and success, not just testing.
- Students are evaluated on Social Emotional and progress is tracked
- Average scale scores not proficiency
- Nevada Accountability Committee
- Measuring a WELL-ROUNDED EDUCATION as defined by the EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT (ESSA)

In his Dear Colleague Letter dated July 13, 2016, Education Secretary, John B. King affirmed that "Ensuring that all students have access to a well-rounded education is central to our shared work to provide equitable educational opportunities for all students and prepare them to succeed in college, careers, and life." He further clarified that although the US Department of Education issued a Dear Colleague Letter on April 13, 2016, discussing how to maximize Federal funds to support and enhance STEM subjects, the letter dated July 13, 2016, was designed to

“assist SEAs, LEAs, schools, and their partners understand ways that Federal formula grant funds may support humanities-based educational strategies”

King further explains that, “The benefits of a holistic education demonstrate that, in addition to the core subjects of English/language arts and mathematics, access to a broad range of coursework is essential for students in today’s world.”

King defines “humanities education” as including social studies (history, civics, government, economics and geography), literature, art, music, and philosophy “as well as other non-STEM subjects that are not generally covered by an English/language arts curriculum” then provides examples of how an SEA or LEA can use Title I funds to “provide students with the opportunity to engage in authentic humanities-focused content that aligns with their school day and to focus on hands-on, humanities-rich experiences.” A copy of this letter has been attached.

- INDICATOR: Equal access to all of the courses, activities, and programming enumerated in the ESSA definition of a well-rounded education is available to provide equitable educational opportunities and experiences for all students and to prepare them to succeed in college, careers, and life.
  - Nevada schools provide their “opportunity dashboard” data to report the specific courses, activities, and programming provided to all students and if inequities are found, schools would be required to come up with an improvement plan to address the deficiencies in order to provide equity.
- Equity is a big part of ESSA and should not be an option to measure, with the exception of schools where in fact student populations are uniform, which would be a small number of schools. Additionally, the issue of discipline disparity amongst African American students, IEP students, and other students of color should be an indicator of success with the growing population a watchful eye is a proactive eye.

#### **HS Comments**

- There are already tools and assessments in place to measure career readiness. In order to receive CTE College Credit from any of Nevada’s community colleges, students must maintain a 3.0 GPA in their CTE program of study, pass the program of study’s end of course assessment, and pass the state’s workplace readiness exam. These students are considered CTE Completers.
- ACT Work Keys and the National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC) could be an alternate assessment for Career Readiness. It is an assessment that is being recognized more nationally and could be used as a replacement for the state’s current workplace readiness exam.
- I realize this may be complicated, but maybe an adjusted graduation rate goal for students who are at a school for all four years? I know there are schools whose graduation rates of students who attend all four years are significantly better than the students who only attend the school for the last year or two of high school.
- Schools should be measured on students achieving a basic score on the ACT or Standardized Career Readiness exam. Not all students are college bound. Schools should have a measure and

points for preparing students for Post-Secondary education options – Not only college or AP. EOC's determine whether a student can graduate high school. EOC exams could be removed from this altogether as long as the ACT is considered the one testing measure under ESSA. Students with IEP's receiving Option 2 diplomas should not be considered drop outs to the school as long as they have completed all course work and attempted all exams. Schools should receive bonus points towards their grad rate if non 4-year students graduate during the 5th year.

- The NSPF should be a fair tool to evaluate schools. It cannot be something that we use because it is inexpensive to create or because we don't have the time to do it right. It needs to be applicable or have the ability to be modified if a school is small or large or if it has a unique student population. Schools are not all the same and this tool needs to acknowledge not punish schools that work to educate students differently or that have unique populations.
- Special education – Adjusted Diploma's should NOT count against a school's graduation rate.
- High School Equivalency Exams and students that move on to Adult Education should be calculated using a partial weight, instead of a drop out.
- Incarcerated students should not count as drop outs, this is beyond the control of the school.
- College and Career Readiness:
  - College Readiness:
  - CTE
  - IB
  - AP Proficiency
  - Career Readiness:
  - Internships
  - Work Credits Issued
  - CTE
  - Community Service Credits Issued
- [Re: School Quality] Perhaps this indicator could be the school climate indicator that could encompass student, parent, and staff perception data, average daily attendance, and other factors (discipline?, community involvement?, etc.). Non-academic skills measures may also fit in the school climate category.
- For EOC exams, consider using a point system (ex. Level 1 = 1, level 2 = 2, etc.) and calculating an average score for each school so that the student performance indicator doesn't simply value reaching proficiency but also values progress towards and maintenance of proficiency (ex. Level 2) and advanced proficiency (ex. Level 4)
- For a growth measure, consider using change in the average score as defined in bullet 2 above
- \*note, suggesting move of graduation gap measure to gap category below

- In addition to attendance, consider including a measure of a schools ability to maximize educational time through low suspensions, expulsions and mitigation of chronic truancy
- Gap or subgroup measure
- Each school would be awarded points within this category for the largest non-white racial/ethnic or special population subgroup (FRL, ELL, SPED) that they serve that makes up less than 90% of the population.
- Measure: Difference in subgroup EOC proficiency to state average
- Measure: Difference in subgroup graduation rate to state average
- Need to determine how points are reallocated if N is not big enough to provide statistical significance
- The NSPF rating should reflect excellence within the national landscape in addition to creating comparability among schools within the state. Therefore, where possible, excellence should be defined by national data points and data sets. Since the EOC exams are Nevada-specific, making it hard to measure excellence in a national landscape, consider re-allocating points by adding value to the college/career readiness measures.
- In addition to offering points for all students currently attending a school, consider an opportunity for schools to demonstrate the impact of serving students for their full high school career. This could be done by awarding a small number of points within the graduation indicator to schools based on the graduation rate for their 4-year cohort.
- I do not believe ADA should be an indicator as ED has written that there is little differentiation between schools and does not recommend usage in accountability frameworks. I believe habitual absence should be used instead.
- I do not believe that climate surveys should be used either as this data is very subjective and likely to be influenced by schools if used for accountability. It is important information that schools should have and use, but if it is used for accountability it is likely that schools will use manipulation tactics to influence responses, not only unfairly influencing accountability scores, but also making them less valid for use in school improvement efforts.
- Positive climate rating as measured by family, student and educator perception surveys.
- Students are evaluated on Social Emotional and progress is tracked
- Use average scale scores instead of proficiency rates.
- This will remove the incentive to focus on 'bubble kids' and put the focus on all kids. You can see evidence and support for this here:
- <https://edexcellence.net/articles/two-changes-to-the-department-of-educations-essa-implementation-rule>
- <https://morganpolikoff.com/2016/07/12/a-letter-to-the-u-s-department-of-education/>
- Instead of using average daily attendance for all students create a rate of students who miss a certain threshold (i.e. percent of students who are chronically absent).

- The reason for this is that average daily attendance can mask the chronic absenteeism. It is the chronic absenteeism that research has connected with lower academic achievement and higher dropout rates, not a school's overall ADA. See more here:
- <http://www.attendanceworks.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/Chronic-Absence-Research-Summary-1-pager-2.19.14withlinks.pdf>
- Support for IEP students should play a role in this framework. It is suggested to include a measure of time that IEP students spend in their least restrictive environment.
- Student learning is impacted when teachers switch positions. This could be measured by teacher transiency. Learn more here:
- [http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2016/08/teacher\\_churn\\_when\\_teachers\\_change\\_positions.html?cmp=soc-tw-shr](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2016/08/teacher_churn_when_teachers_change_positions.html?cmp=soc-tw-shr)
- Like college and career readiness, elementary and middle school should have a measure to show students are being prepared for the next level. This is the idea behind included accelerated coursework.
- Thresholds for excellence should be done based on an examination of existing evidence. Determine what is possible, how various socioeconomic and demographic groups are impacted, and establish what ambitious growth is. This should create a body of evidence that supports targets, goals, and cut scores.
- Equity is a big part of ESSA and should not be an option to measure, with the exception of schools where in fact student populations are uniform, which would be a small number of schools. Additionally, the issue of discipline disparity amongst African American students, IEP students, and other students of color should be an indicator of success with the growing population a watchful eye is a proactive eye.

## ES/MS Indicator Additions

The following list reflects the write-in responses from the indicator and profile activity.

- Culture Survey - students and parents
- Average Daily Attendance
- Test Participation
- Equal access to a well-rounded education including the humanities to provide equitable educational opportunities for all students and to prepare them to success in college, careers and life
- Access and participation rates are tracked with a "growth measurement" instrument
- Family Engagement
- Teacher quality as rated on the NEPF (rated using peer or external panels of teachers/admin from outside the school)
- Gap or subgroup measure
- Zero habitual absence
- Average Daily Attendance
- Reduction in Achievement Gaps
- Average Daily Attendance

- Measure Students Social Emotional Learning
- Average Daily Attendance
- Parental Engagement
- Licensed, well trained staff
- ES: Percent of students who go onto MS accelerated courses.
- MS: Algebra I and accelerated course enrollment
- % IEP students spending over 80% of time in least restrictive environment
- Teacher transiency rate
  - Average Daily Attendance
  - Equity, (measured by Test Scores indicated by subgroups)

## HS Indicator Additions

The following list reflects the write-in responses from the indicator and profile activity.

- College and Career Readiness – AP Proficiency, IB Testing, ACT Results, CTE End of Course Assessment Results or CTE student completers
- Average Daily Attendance
- Post-Secondary Options - Other college, career readiness like Dual Enrollment, College Enrollment, CTE, IB, AP.
- EOC Test Participation
- Equal access to a well-rounded education including the humanities to provide equitable educational opportunities for all students and to prepare them to success in college, careers and life
- Access and participation rates are tracked with a "growth measurement" instrument
- College and Career Readiness
- Credit Sufficiency (Earning 6 or more credits each school year, unless on-track senior)
- Teacher quality as rated on the NEPF (rated using peer or external panels of teachers/admin from outside the school)
- College and Career Readiness , CTE, IB, AP Proficiency ACT college benchmarks
- Reduction in achievement gaps-“measure of student growth”
- College and Career Readiness Measures
- Gap or subgroup measure
- College/career readiness, % of students who Score “College Ready” on ACT
- College and Career Readiness, CTE, IB, AP Proficiency
- Average Daily Attendance
- Reductions in Achievement Gaps
- College and Career Readiness
- College and Career Readiness, CTE, IB, AP Proficiency

- Graduation for Students with Disabilities
- Measure Students Social Emotional Learning
- College and Career Readiness
- Average Daily Attendance
- Parental Engagement
- Licensed, well trained staff
- College and Career Readiness, Eligible for college credit (CTE, IP, AP, Dual Credit)
- % IEP students spending over 80% of time in least restrictive environment
- Teacher transiency rate
- College and Career Readiness
- Average Daily Attendance
- Equity, (measured by Test Scores indicated by subgroups)

## **Accountability Workgroup Meeting #4 – Overview**

The fourth accountability workgroup meeting was held on October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2016. During this meeting, members discussed specific state’s district accountability systems and engaged in an unstructured accountability discussion. The goal of this meeting was to more deeply discuss district accountability and other accountability topics from the previous three meetings. At the end of the meeting, four groups of participants were established to draft recommendations for the Advisory Group. Workgroup members were asked to use the documented meeting notes and Accountability Advisory Committee’s recommendations document to draft at least three recommendations for each category. The four recommendation categories were school ratings and measures of success, ES/MS accountability system, HS accountability system and district accountability system. Additionally, the workgroup agreed that the school profile and indicator activity from the third meeting would go forward as a recommendation from this group.

Meeting notes from the fourth meeting were provided to the recommendations teams on October 25<sup>th</sup>. The recommendations teams submitted their recommendations on October 28<sup>th</sup> and are included within this document.

## **Meeting Agenda**

- Welcome and Introductions
- Review meeting norms and meeting process
  - Following the agenda will better enable the accurate capture of workgroup recommendations
- Discussion of District Accountability Systems from around the county

- State Examples
- Texas
  - <http://tea.texas.gov/2016accountability.aspx>
  - <https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/account/2016/districtlist.pdf>
- Massachusetts
  - <http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/accountability/accountability-and-assistance-system-overview.html>
  - <http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/district-standards-indicators.pdf>
- Tennessee
  - <https://www.tn.gov/education/topic/accountability>
  - [https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/education/attachments/acct\\_overview\\_2015.pdf](https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/education/attachments/acct_overview_2015.pdf)
- Colorado
  - <https://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/performanceframeworksresources>
  - [https://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/annotated\\_dpf\\_2016](https://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/annotated_dpf_2016)
- Open discussion regarding accountability topics
- Revisit Essential and Strategic Questions
  - Essential Question
    - How does an enduring and consistent accountability system that results in summary school ratings, measures progress toward meeting the Department’s goals, and provides meaningful and actionable information for educators, parents, and local and state level decision makers look?
  - Strategic Questions
    - How can the accountability system best measure equity?
    - How can we present the state’s accountability system so that it provides a full picture of a school or district’s performance and is easy to understand?
    - How can school accountability better measure schools’ preparation of students for college and/or careers? (i.e. how can school accountability align with Nevada’s workforce development initiatives?)

- How should non-academic measures factor into a schools rating?
- Discuss draft workgroup meeting summary document
  - Please review the list of participants and ensure that your name is included, please also write to [sverdugo@doe.nv.gov](mailto:sverdugo@doe.nv.gov)
  - Please also send your edits or revisions to the meeting summary to [sverdugo@doe.nv.gov](mailto:sverdugo@doe.nv.gov)
- Public Comment

## Meeting Notes

The following meeting notes are in raw form. Each bullet reflects a captured comment or conversation by the note taker. This account of the discussion may not be complete, but is representative of the discussion held during the course of the meeting.

- Attendance
- Norms
- Meeting Objectives
- Recommendations Writing
- November 1st Advisory Group Presentation
- District Accountability
- Requesting an example of what data aggregation within a district accountability system would look like. Previous workgroup meetings identified the desire for a common accountability system for Districts, which goes beyond just data aggregation.
- Reviewed different state accountability systems:
  - District Accountability – Texas
  - District Accountability – Massachusetts
  - District Accountability – Tennessee
  - District Accountability – Colorado
- What is useful for Nevada?
- Workgroup member looked at Connecticut, Kentucky, and New Jersey. Show a rubric on how district is doing. Commonalities are around curriculum and instruction. What is good way of looking at the information. Texas was pretty cumbersome. A simple rubric was more easily understood.
- Workgroup member is wondering about what the purpose of the District Accountability model and Districts should be responsible for telling the citizens. This might be hard to do with simple measures all across the state.
- Workgroup lead indicates that district accountability is in statute, but the value in having a District Accountability system should be more than just to meet legislative requirements. Under our ESEA Waiver, there was no District Accountability system and so the waiver allowed us to not meet the NRS requirements. However a District Accountability system may be a better place for some of the indicators identified during the working group meetings and discussion and development of a school accountability system.

- Workgroup member: the design needs to be sensitive to equity.
- Workgroup member so suppose we come up with all the indicators and have a sliding scale of accountability because of resource differences between districts.
- Workgroup member is thinking today's meeting is about school accountability and how can we talk about district accountability before school accountability.
- Workgroup member is asking when and how did the need for a district accountability system come about. It needs to be thoughtful and to indicate what the State expects and so then Districts build their systems around what measurements are be directed by the State.
- Workgroup member is looking at districts in general and what is important is what are the changes in behavior due to the results of the accountability measures. Maybe we are putting the cart before the horse.
- Workgroup member brings up the fact that the emphasis with NCLB was on assessment and today we need to adjust these indicators.
- Workgroup member indicates that if the state would list expectations for district and then the district would then in turn list expectations for the school. The district accountability will have to define the role of the district.
- Workgroup lead asks what should we not do?
- Workgroup member agrees with what Workgroup member says. Workgroup member mentions the goals of the state and stresses that there is danger in developing a district accountability without showing sensitivity. We need to define the design principles.
- Workgroup lead reiterates what Workgroup member says and indicates that the state should push to align the district accountability to state goals.
- Workgroup member is asking for design principles to include supports and mention that Washoe has AP course when other rural districts.
- Nevada could use the term "or" when defining indicators. For example: dual credit or AP or etc. for instance Kentucky system indicated "experiences" that contribute to CCR.
- Workgroup member wants to work in groups and then report out.
- \*\*\*\*\*Break into individual group discussion
- On the phone, Workgroup member says it is difficult but it is important to get a baseline and how do get an equitable measure taking into account when a student enters a school being deficient.
- In Carson, Workgroup member says we talked about what can the state do to support a district and how is the district accountability work for empowerment schools (like in Clark County) and what is the role of the school board.
- In Las Vegas Workgroup member indicates that we launched from Ben's earlier comments but then turned to what is the appropriate role for the data indices and what is the value from these indices and should the value incentivize behaviors. The district leadership needs to know what they are accountable for and this then has to translate down to the schools. What is needed are tools to help practitioner's at the building level.
- Workgroup member comments that we need district expectations and school expectations and do we have a valid and reliable system.
- Do we need a data story at a District level to support students?

- Workgroup lead indicates that we are required to align the states accountability system to ESSA by 2018.
- Workgroup member asks what is going to be done afterwards and are these District ratings going to lead to supports or punishments.
- Workgroup lead draws from these comments and asks: Am I hearing a recommendation of “Don’t do a District Accountability System? or Do a District Accountability system but don’t put any of the same measures that are within a school accountability system?”
- Workgroup member indicated that the question should be first we need to figure out the purpose of a District Accountability system and what will be the result of the ratings: support or punishment.
- Workgroup lead suggestion to the group developing recommendations under District Accountability, that a possible recommendation would be in the form of “we need to determine why we are doing this, and what would we do with the results.” Then we could develop a system that supports the why and what.
- Essential and Strategic Questions
- Review these questions to help with writing recommendations
- Recommendations and Summary Report
- Open Discussion to ask questions about the Accountability system for Nevada.
- Open discussion to put forth parameters for moving forward
- For instance, during meetings we heard that you do not want to do Graduation Rates the way we do them? And the answer is we do them this way because of the Federal requirement to structure graduation rates in such a way. We can develop another way to measure graduation rates, but the Federal structure will need to a part or in addition to the new framework.
- How does this system help the practitioner’s to improve? And we have to be able to measure how to improve? What is best to suit the kids here when they are failing? Each school’s need needs to be evaluated. Each school/District should be able to decide how to spend the money locally, what is best for the kids in our District and schools.
- Do think the state should be able to prescribe what is necessary to improve a school.
- Need to use data to see what is working and make those responsible for implement change. This is where the district needs to be accountable.
- Should an Accountability System be Descriptive or Prescriptive? Answer - Descriptive
- There should be dedicated funding for instructional improvements. For instance, school needs to improve science scores. State to give money for teacher support/training for science curriculum. When test scores go up, there is student growth which shows the value of time and money spent on PD.
- Need to give schools, teachers, and students time to implement changes. Need to have a 5 year timeframe. Time needs to be factored in. Growth is not instant.
- The growth of the child is what we should measure, regardless of grade level. Growth within a year, measuring where they started and finished.
- Changing the culture and climate is needed at schools so that all students achieve.
- Workgroup lead says let’s talk about the indicators. We know we have to measure certain indicators under ESSA, but what do we value in respect to CCR?
- Any comments about the ACT and college and career readiness

- There is much greater thought on having students be college and career readiness, the graduation rate does not indicate if students are college and career readiness, and need offer ACT Work Keys and certification to show career readiness.
- Workgroup member asks that can this group recommend ACT Work Keys.
- Workgroup member can we take away the EOC and just have ACT and ACT Work Keys. The EOC's do not give CCR information.
- Workgroup member mentions that students with disabilities may not be able to take ACT Work Keys.
- Workgroup member asks about the ELL recommendations
- Workgroup lead indicates that the recommendation is to use WIDA and allow flexibility to keep students who have exited up to four years.
- Profile Activity
- Recommendations Activity
- Review
- Consideration's to communicate the strategy and identify issues for other workgroups
- Four Categories (with workgroups)
- School Ratings and Measures of Success and Goal Settings
- ES/MS Indicators and Accountability Systems
- HS Indicators and Accountability Systems
- District Accountability
- The task is to make three Recommendations per category to be e-mailed to the advisory group
- Add these questions to Recommendation Worksheet:
  - Why this strategy? If there are other rationales other than alignment with State goals or meeting Essential and Strategic Questions etc., please put this down.
  - What is the biggest reward from this recommendation?
  - What is the biggest risk with this recommendation?
  - What are the benefits of choosing this recommendation strategy over another?
  - How will results from this recommendation compare to results from other approaches?
  - What is the best way to communicate this strategy or recommendation?
  - Does this recommendation intersect with other work groups?

## Workgroup Recommendations

### School Ratings and Measurements of Success

(This group broke down our recommendations into two broad categories: 1) specific accountability measures and 2) clarification of what measures mean to different audiences

<p><b>Proposed Recommendation 1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>These recommendations fall within the first category of 1) Specific Accountability Measures</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We recommend an accountability measure of Workforce/college and career (CCR) readiness. This should</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
---	---

	<p>only apply to high schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We recommend using the ACT Work Keys as this measure. Parents/Guardians could choose (opt in) to their child/student taking either the ACT or ACT Work Keys. We recognize this would require a change in statute. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To implement this recommendation at the school level, we recommend that schools be able to provide a testing day(s) for both the ACT and ACT Work Keys.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ We recommend that when schools report their NSPF score (star rating), they should also report the ACT and ACT Work Keys average score. This report should indicate the number and percentage of students taking each exam.</li> </ul>
<p><b>How does the recommendation address the Essential Question?</b></p>	<p><b>Essential Question: How does an enduring and consistent accountability system that results in summary school ratings, measures progress toward meeting the Department’s goals, and provides meaningful and actionable information for educators, parents, and local and state level decision makers look?</b></p> <p>By allowing students to take (and schools to then incorporate into accountability metrics) either the ACT or ACT Work Keys scores, we will obtain a more targeted measure of how Nevada students are moving toward being college and/or career ready. By using either the ACT or ACT Work Keys as an accountability measure, we give parents, educators, industry, higher education, and legislators more specific and nuanced information to make varying types of decisions and value judgments about the ability and likely ability of students exiting our public high schools. By incorporating the ACT Work Keys, we also empower students who do not want or need to take the ACT, an industry recognized certificate to take with them as they enter the workforce.</p>
<p><b>Which Strategic question(s) does the recommendation address?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation addresses Strategic Question 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How can school accountability better measure schools’ preparation of students for college and/or careers? (i.e. how can school</li> </ul>

	accountability align with Nevada’s workforce development initiatives?)	
<b>How does the recommendation support the State’s Vision, Mission and/or Goals?</b>	One of our state’s goals is that all students graduate college and career ready. The ACT alone is not a measure of likely career readiness. By incorporating this measure into our accountability system, we gain a more full picture of how Nevada is progressing toward this goal. Additionally, given that the vision of the Department of Education’s vision is that all Nevadans are ready for the 21 <sup>st</sup> century, incorporating measure’s that align with needs in a 21 <sup>st</sup> century workforce and economy allows Nevada to know if we are fulfilling this vision.	
<b>Does the recommendation meet the following ESSA constraints:</b>	<b>Allow for meaningful differentiation of schools or districts.</b>	<b>Result in a valid and reliable statewide measure.</b>
<b>Yes</b>	Yes, by allowing schools to offer both the ACT and ACT Work Keys as an assessment to be included in the NSPF, we better recognize and account for differentiation in our schools and student populations.	Yes, both the ACT and ACT Work Keys are recognized as reliable measures of student readiness/aptitude for college and career, respectively.
<b>No</b>		

<b>Proposed Recommendation 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We recommend the state clarify what the various NSPF measures mean to the different audiences that use the NSPF. The way we use the NSPF now (giving schools one score (via the star system) and not further explaining/differentiating each area the school is rated on would be like giving students one score for all classes. This does not help parents, teachers, students, or local industry know the areas of strengths and weaknesses in their local school(s).</li> <li>• We recommend that the NSPF be revamped (still using the star rating system) to include a reporting of areas of accountability and trends in those areas. This would make the NSPF be more of a true report card.</li> </ul>
----------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We also recommend that in this more nuanced reporting approach, we report on subgroup measurements as well (ELL, FRPC, etc.)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>How does the recommendation address the Essential Question?</b></p>	<p><b>Essential Question: How does an enduring and consistent accountability system that results in summary school ratings, measures progress toward meeting the Department’s goals, and provides meaningful and actionable information for educators, parents, and local and state level decision makers look?</b></p> <p>By including more meaningful information/contextualizing school ratings, Nevada as a whole (to include educators, parents, and other stakeholders) will be better able to see where the state collectively and individually (at school levels) have strengths and weaknesses. This will illuminate where and how we need to invest additional resources, which would ensure efficient and effective use of public funds, as well as ensure we are targeting resources where students need them most. This buttresses most of NVDOE’s goals.</p>	
<p><b>Which Strategic question(s) does the recommendation address?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation addresses Strategic Questions 1-3.</p>	
<p><b>How does the recommendation support the State’s Vision, Mission and/or Goals?</b></p>	<p>As stated above, this recommendation is in direct alignment with most of the state’s goals. That said, it also supports the state’s mission by providing parents, educator’s and other stakeholders information they need to ensure the appropriate opportunities for students to learn and teachers to improve are provided.</p>	
<p><b>Does the recommendation meet the following ESSA constraints:</b></p>	<p><b>Allow for meaningful differentiation of schools or districts.</b></p>	<p><b>Result in a valid and reliable statewide measure.</b></p>
<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>Yes, the core of this recommendation ensures that schools are understood based on more than a single star rating.</p>	<p>Unsure -</p>

<b>No</b>		

### ES/MS Accountability System

<b>Proposed Recommendation</b>	<p><b>ES/MS Accountability System:</b> Elementary and Middle schools must offer a path to graduation by offering courses with supports and accommodations to students with disabilities.</p> <p>All of our students deserve equal access to educational resources like academic and extracurricular programs, strong teaching, facilities, technology, and instructional materials, no matter their race, color, or national origin.</p> <p>A rating system that addresses the progress that all student groups have made provides an equitable picture and demonstrates school achievement.</p> <p>Schools must offer a path to graduation for all students by offering courses to all student groups including students with disabilities</p>
<b>How does the recommendation address the Essential Question?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nevada has to set goals for improving student performance on state assessments and graduation rates for all students and for each student group. These goals must require bigger gains for groups of students who are further behind. States must also set goals for progress toward English proficiency for English learners.</li> <li>• Nevada must then assign ratings to schools based on how they perform against these goals, as well as two other measures:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. another academic indicator for elementary and middle schools; and</li> <li>2. an additional indicator of school quality for all schools such as parent engagement, social emotional learning.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• School ratings have to be based on how schools are doing on each indicator for all students and for each student group. Moreover, if a school is consistently underperforming for any group of students, its rating has to reflect that.</li> <li>• Nevada must also identify three types of schools for support and improvement. These include:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Schools that are very low-performing (in the bottom 5 percent) for all students, or have low graduation rates;</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

	<p>2. Schools that are consistently underperforming for any group of students; and</p> <p>3. Schools that are very low-performing (in the bottom 5 percent) for one or more groups of students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each of these types of schools must take action to improve. Districts must work with these schools to develop and implement improvement plans. If the lowest performing schools do not improve after a number of years, the state has to take action as well.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Which Strategic question(s) does the recommendation address?</b></p>	<p>The recommendation addresses the strategic question in number 1.</p>	
<p><b>How does the recommendation support the State’s Vision, Mission and/or Goals?</b></p>	<p>Accountability systems are our main vehicle for communicating expectations and spurring action. They set expectations for what it means to be a good school.</p>	
<p><b>Does the recommendation meet the following ESSA constraints:</b></p>	<p><b>Allow for meaningful differentiation of schools or districts.</b></p>	<p><b>Result in a valid and reliable statewide measure.</b></p>
<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>Yes, all schools should be able to show progress based on where the student entered their system.</p>	<p>Yes in that it would provide a district by district analysis of how each school is meeting the target of school improvement.</p>
<p><b>No</b></p>		

<p><b>Proposed Recommendation</b></p>	<p><b>ES/MS Accountability System:</b> Track the growth of students as individual learners:  ***** 100% - 95% of the students make one year growth  **** 94% - 90% of the students make one year growth  *** 89% - 85% of the students make one year growth  ** 84% - 80% of the students make one year growth  * 79% - 75% of the students make one year growth</p>	
<p><b>How does the recommendation address the Essential Question?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation is an enduring and consistent accountability indicator that measures actual academic growth for each individual student. The individual growth for each student will be meaningful and actionable for all stakeholders</p>	
<p><b>Which Strategic question(s) does the recommendation address?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation address question 1 and 2. It takes into account the academic growth of each student as an individual.</p>	
<p><b>How does the recommendation support the State’s Vision, Mission and/or Goals?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation addresses the vision, mission, and goals by ensuring opportunities to measure the student’s academic progress.</p>	
<p><b>Does the recommendation meet the following ESSA constraints:</b></p>	<p><b>Allow for meaningful differentiation of schools or districts.</b></p>	<p><b>Result in a valid and reliable statewide measure.</b></p>
<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>The measurement of student growth is based on the need of the student and school population.</p>	<p>Tracking student growth data can be utilize state wide and allows for school and district comparison.</p>
<p><b>No</b></p>		

## HS Accountability System

<p><b>Proposed Recommendation</b></p>	<p>When identifying schools for “Comprehensive Intervention” based on a graduation rate of less than 2/3rds, Nevada should analyze graduation rate performance looking at factors that go beyond the 4-year ACGR metric.</p> <p>The statutory language of ESSA does not require that states use AGCR as the metric to compile this list. There is a good reason that it shouldn’t: it is entirely possible for a high school to be under 2/3rds in its graduation rate and be an exemplary school.</p> <p>This can happen if the school has a highly mobile population of students, and enrolls a high percentage of students who are overage and undercredited. A school that serves many newly enrolled students who are too far behind to graduate on time could be doing very well, but still end up below 2/3rds in the AGCR metric.</p> <p>Therefore we recommend that when Nevada compiles the list of high schools that are beneath the 2/3<sup>rds</sup> threshold, that it then analyze each of the schools further to ascertain if it is actually in need of comprehensive intervention, or if it is actually doing very well with the students but is below 2/3rds simply because it enrolls a significant number of credit deficient students.</p> <p>In conducting the additional analysis, it should consider the following data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many students were credit deficient when they enrolled in the school;</li> <li>• Rate of credit accumulation of students while enrolled;</li> <li>• Percentage of students who became credit deficient while enrolled in the school (as opposed to when enrolling in the school;)</li> <li>• The graduation rate of students who enrolled as freshmen and stayed in the school for four years.</li> </ul>
<p><b>How does the recommendation address the Essential Question?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation addresses the Essential Question of providing “meaningful and actionable information for educators, parents, and local and state level decision makers.”</p> <p>Scarce intervention resources should be carefully targeted to the schools that are actually in need of the comprehensive support. This requires that the state not simply use a single metric such as AGCR for this purpose; it should conduct a deeper analysis of school performance to ascertain whether the school is actually in need of intervention, not just a “victim” of high student mobility.</p>

<p><b>Which Strategic question(s) does the recommendation address?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation addresses strategic question #2 – providing a “full picture” of school performance.</p> <p>Solitary performance metrics can never give a complete picture. Consider the following imaginary school: half its students enroll as freshmen, and 100% of them graduate in four years. The other half enroll as juniors, but are a full year behind in credit. All of these students graduate after their fifth year.</p> <p>This school would have a 50% ACGR, and would be identified for comprehensive intervention if the AGCR metric was used in isolation as the identification metric. Far from needing intervention, this school should be a model for the nation!</p> <p>Clearly, for such a school, the AGCR is not a “complete picture.” Intervention resources spent on this school would be a waste of scarce resources.</p> <p>This is why the state should conduct further analysis after the initial list is compiled, to determine if all schools identified by the AGCR metric are actually in need of intervention.</p>	
<p><b>How does the recommendation support the State’s Vision, Mission and/or Goals?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation supports the goal of “Efficient and effective use of public funds to achieve the highest return on educational investment.”</p> <p>As discussed above, it is important to devote scarce intervention resources only on the schools that are actually in need of them.</p>	
<p><b>Does the recommendation meet the following ESSA constraints:</b></p>	<p><b>Allow for meaningful differentiation of schools or districts.</b></p>	<p><b>Result in a valid and reliable statewide measure.</b></p>
<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>This recommendation enhances the state’s ability to differentiate between schools that have a low grad rate because of student mobility, and those where the students are not progressing academically.</p>	<p>This recommendation enhances the validity of the process for identifying low graduation rate schools for comprehensive intervention</p>
<p><b>No</b></p>		

<p><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p>Calculation of 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (AGCR) should</p>
------------------------	--

<p><b>Recommendation</b></p>	<p>follow the requirements of ESSA’s Section 1111(c)(4)(F), the “Partial Attendance” requirement.</p> <p>This requires students to have attended a high school for “at least half the school year” for them to be counted in the school’s graduation cohort. If they withdraw before such time, the student is to be reassigned to the cohort of a prior high school attended.</p>
<p><b>How does the recommendation address the Essential Question?</b></p>	<p>This addresses the aspect of the essential question that calls for a framework that provides “meaningful and actionable information.”</p> <p>Currently, it is possible for high schools to encourage students who are unlikely to graduate to enroll in different school rather than drop out. This removes the student from the school’s cohort, and results in the student being inappropriately counted in the new school’s cohort, distorting the actual performance of both schools.</p> <p>If the framework is going to give meaningful information to policymakers, then it should take care to minimize the effects of this obvious distortion. Complying with the “partial attendance” requirement would minimize this type of “counseling out” of students.</p>
<p><b>Which Strategic question(s) does the recommendation address?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation addresses strategic questions #2 and #3.</p> <p>It would result in a much more “full picture” of high school graduation rate performance, because schools would no longer be held accountable for students it had enrolled for a short time.</p> <p>In the explanation from the draft Federal Rules for ESSA on Accountability, the purpose of the provision is for <b>“promoting fairness in school accountability determinations by excluding students whose performance had little to do with a particular school because they were only enrolled for a short period of time.”</b></p>
<p><b>How does the recommendation support the State’s Vision, Mission and/or Goals?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation addresses the goal of “Ensuring all students graduate college and career ready.”</p> <p>The only way to determine if this goal is being met is to have accurate information about the how students are performing while they are enrolled in a school. Under the current AGCR calculation methodology, schools can escape accountability for students who become credit deficient while enrolled.</p> <p>Implementing the “partial attendance” requirement will minimize this problem.</p>

Does the recommendation meet the following ESSA constraints:	Allow for meaningful differentiation of schools or districts.	Result in a valid and reliable statewide measure.
Yes	For reasons discussed above, this recommendation allows more accurate measurement of graduation rate performance.	For reasons discussed above, this recommendation allows more accurate measurement of graduation rate performance.
No		

**District Accountability System**

The team that drafted these recommendations provided several supporting documents. These can be made available upon request.

<b>Proposed Recommendation</b>	<p><b>DISTRICTWIDE ACCOUNTABILITY RECOMMENDATION:</b>            Include measuring equal access to a Well-Rounded Education.</p> <p>Equal access to all of the courses, activities, and programming enumerated in the ESSA definition of a Well-Rounded Education is in place to provide equitable educational opportunities and experiences for all students and to prepare them to succeed in college, careers, and life. ESSA (Section 8002, p 807) defines the term “Well-Rounded Education” to mean “...English, reading or language arts, writing, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, geography, computer science, music, career and technical education, health, physical education, and any other subjects, as determined by the State or local education agency, with the purpose of providing all students access to an enriched curriculum and educational experience.”            (References to the Well-Rounded Education provisions and where they may be found within ESSA have been attached.)</p>
<b>How does the recommendation address the Essential Question?</b>	<p>Including the courses articulated in the Well-Rounded Education provision of ESSA also addresses the NDE’s goal of <u>all</u> students graduating college and career ready because <u>all</u> of Nevada’s students would have access to the same opportunities.</p> <p>Districts would perform a needs assessment and the outcome would thus provide documentation of equal access to the courses, activities and programming enumerated in ESSA’s Well-Rounded Education Provision as defined above.</p>

	<p>Data from an “opportunity dashboard” would report the specific courses, activities, and programming provided to <u>all</u> students and if inequities are found, districts would come up with an improvement plan to address the deficiencies in order to provide equity.</p> <p>Comprehensive arts education data dashboards are currently in place in New Jersey and California and each serves as a tool to show where (and how) arts education is offered across their respective states. New Jersey’s comprehensive “Interactive School Performance Dashboard” could serve a guide in preparing such a resource in Nevada.</p> <p><a href="http://artsednj.org/reports-and-data/interactive-school-performance-dashboard/">http://artsednj.org/reports-and-data/interactive-school-performance-dashboard/</a></p> <p>Although this particular data dashboard, referred to as the Arts Education Report Card for New Jersey Schools, provides information that measures equal access to arts education specifically, it is an effective model that provides meaningful information on a statewide level for viewing how all Well-Rounded Education subjects are offered across the state.</p> <p>The California Arts Education Data Project went live October 20, 2016, and serves as another viable model.</p> <p><a href="http://www.artsed411.org/blog/2016/10/california_arts_education_data_project_live">http://www.artsed411.org/blog/2016/10/california_arts_education_data_project_live</a></p> <p>If NDE could use such models to provide data for subjects within ESSA’s Well-Rounded Education provision for which there is no such data currently, a true profile that measures equity among Districts could be established and deficiencies could be remedied appropriately. District data dashboards like these, which would also indicate school data, provide an enduring and consistent accountability system that would result in summary school ratings as well. With Districts addressing deficiencies over the long term, actionable information would be provided that could be referenced at any time but especially when measuring for subsequent levels of achievement. A list of potential indicators related to ESSA and classified according to specific Title has also been provided.</p>
<p><b>Which Strategic question(s) does the recommendation address?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation addresses strategic question #1 in that equity would be reflected prominently as is also referenced in the Accountability Advisory Committee (AAC) Report which resulted from the meetings January-May, 2015.</p>

	<p>Strategic question #2 is also addressed in that a data dashboard system indeed “provides a full picture of a school or district’s performance and is easy to understand.” An effective data dashboard model like those in place in New Jersey and California provides a wealth of information and could be made available to be accessed according to preferences and sorted appropriately for ease of viewing the information being sought.</p> <p>This recommendation also addresses strategic question #3 in that it provides an additional accountability measure that districts/schools can use to better indicate their status in providing a Well-Rounded Education to guide their preparation of students for college and/or careers.</p> <p>Strategic question #4 (How should non-academic measures factor into a schools rating?) is specifically written for school accountability rather than district accountability. However, it is well worth considering the voluminous evidence indicating that the majority of students who participate in a variety of subjects from among those found within the definition of a Well-Rounded Education (e.g. Science, Technology, English, Arts and Math—STEAM), are more prone to graduate on time and are thus more well-prepared for college and careers.</p> <p>Music and arts programs particularly have the unique ability to engage at-risk students and improve their overall engagement in academics, ensuring that they have the essential 21<sup>st</sup> century skills to succeed. They also foster parent, family and community engagement.</p> <p>Findings from the “Prelude: Music Makes Us Baseline Research Report” <a href="http://musicmakesus.org/prelude-music-makes-us-baseline-research-report">http://musicmakesus.org/prelude-music-makes-us-baseline-research-report</a> have also been attached. This report, commissioned by the Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools, established a benchmark of the impact that music has on students enrolled in middle and high school music as well as the potential impact on student engagement and academic achievement. The value of this research is that it is the first of its kind that measures and compares non-academic achievements of students who self-identified in the four predominant ethnic groups: African American, White, Latino, and Asian. A copy of this report and its findings with regard to measuring attendance rates, discipline rates, grade point average, graduation rate, as well as ACT scores (English and Math) has been attached. This may also be of assistance in how Nevada might address strategic question #4.</p>
<p><b>How does the recommendation support the State’s Vision, Mission and/or Goals?</b></p>	<p>Not only does this address ESSA’s Well-Rounded Education Provision, it also addresses all of the state’s goals and supports the NDE’s mission of “ensuring opportunities” to improve student achievement thus leading Nevada’s students toward the vision of being ready for success in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.</p>

Does the recommendation meet the following ESSA constraints:	Allow for meaningful differentiation of schools or districts.	Result in a valid and reliable statewide measure.
Yes	Yes in that Nevada’s districts not only have a variety of course options that would meet this measure, but districts generally also offer a variety of levels (AP, IB) of these courses which supports the CCR Design referenced in the recommendations from the NV Accountability Advisory Committee (AAC) Report.	Yes in that it would provide a district by district analysis of how each is meeting the target of providing a Well-Rounded Education to <u>all</u> of Nevada’s students thus resulting in a reliable, statewide measure.
No		

<p><b>Proposed Recommendation</b></p>	<p><b>DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY RECOMMENDATION:</b></p> <p>According to the USDOE Proposed Regulations on Accountability, State Plans, and Data Reporting under ESSA 5/17/2016 The U.S. Department of Education (Department) is issuing a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to implement provisions of the new Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) .....The proposed <i>regulations recognize the critical role of stakeholders, including parents, educators, principals, and other school leaders, in supporting the development and implementation of school improvement activities by</i> requiring that each district notify parents of students at schools identified for support and improvement of how to be involved in the school improvement process, <i>so they can participate in developing a plan that fits its unique needs.....</i></p> <p>The following can be found on the current NDE website now:  <b>IMPORTANT MESSAGE: The Nevada Department of Education's website is in the process of being re-designed in order to better serve all our constituents in accordance to American with Disabilities Act (ADA). Thank you for your patience during this process.</b></p> <p>Communicating progress (or the lack of), ratings, and other data to our publics (business, community leaders, residents, etc.) would strengthen our efforts to bring about a more informed State. Nevada can</p>
---------------------------------------	---

	<p>moved forward to utilize different levels of communication using varying modalities by all Districts. Educational leaders have a unique opportunity to move beyond compliance regarding communications. The data displays and statistics used by educators to make decisions and change practices is only one level. Our schools, communities and state will benefit from educator leaders using various modalities, e.g. voice, video, billboards, signage at district offices, media including social media, TV, etc. Developing a collaborative communication plan that is measured and monitored would deepen our efforts at all levels.</p> <p>Data dashboards may be good for educators and some business people but perhaps not for our parents and community members that have other learning modalities. Varying the ways we communicate will heighten awareness and give others tools to use.</p> <p>Creating communication methods at varying levels and allowing our publics to subscribe to different levels would deepen our communication among our publics and educators. Greater and deeper conversations between our publics and educators (esp. administrators) might be enhanced as a direct result.</p>	
<p><b>How does the recommendation address the Essential Question?</b></p>	<p>How our educational system looks to our publics creates opportunities for more and deeper partnerships. When people clearly understand what Districts and schools need in order to strengthen performance, they often band together to provide support in varying ways that impact our students, teachers and administrators.</p>	
<p><b>Which Strategic question(s) does the recommendation address?</b></p>	<p>How can we present the state’s accountability system so that it provides a full picture of a school or district’s performance and is easy to understand? Varying modalities, medias, voices and individuals within communities will heighten awareness and trust in the system that is being developed. Giving individuals the opportunity to Subscribe to state and district websites such as Connecticut and other States will reduce confusion and misinformation.</p>	
<p><b>How does the recommendation support the State’s Vision, Mission and/or Goals?</b></p>	<p>The sixth bulleted goal– (having the state goals bulleted instead of numbers may be confusing for staff working on the goals and the publics that could/would support them if they could determine some prioritization with timelines have taken place.) Efficient and effective use of public funds to achieve the highest return on educational investment.</p>	
<p><b>Does the recommendation meet the following ESSA constraints:</b></p>	<p><b>Allow for meaningful differentiation of schools or districts.</b></p>	<p><b>Result in a valid and reliable statewide measure.</b></p>

<b>Yes</b>	Meaning differentiation can be aided by effective communications at varying levels, methodologies, and media.	Communication efforts can be measured, e.g., surveys and feedback mechanisms on social media and websites.
<b>No</b>		

**Other submitted recommendations**

<b>Proposed Recommendation</b>	<p><b>ES/MS Accountability System:</b> Promote and track staff attendance and participation.</p> <p><b>School Ratings &amp; Measurements of Success:</b>  ***** 100%-98% daily rate of attendance  **** 97%-95% daily rate of attendance  *** 94%-92% daily rate of attendance  ** 91%-89% daily rate of attendance  * 88% and below daily rate of attendance</p>
<b>How does the recommendation address the Essential Question?</b>	This recommendation is an enduring and consistent accountability indicator that ensures school continuity for all students and provides meaningful and actionable information for stakeholders.
<b>Which Strategic question(s) does the recommendation address?</b>	<p>This indicator addresses the first strategic question as a measure of equity in ensuring that students receive school continuity.</p> <p>This indicator also addresses the fourth strategic question as a non-academic measure.</p>
<b>How does the recommendation support the State’s Vision, Mission and/or Goals?</b>	This recommendation addresses the vision, mission, and goals by ensuring opportunities to maximize student’s time to learn from effective educators.

Does the recommendation meet the following ESSA constraints:	Allow for meaningful differentiation of schools or districts.	Result in a valid and reliable statewide measure.
Yes	Yes, the percentage can be adjusted by nation, state, and district level data to determine the star rating scale.	Yes, tracking teacher daily attendance can be tracked state wide. It is reliable, and it allows for comparability between schools.
No		

<b>Proposed Recommendation</b>	<p><b>ES/MS Accountability System:</b> Promote and track staff continuity and transiency. (Differentiate between legitimate changes - i.e. moving, retirement, promotions - and staff dissatisfaction.)</p> <p><b>School Ratings &amp; Measurements of Success:</b>  ***** 100%-95% rate of teacher turnover  **** 94%-90% rate of teacher turnover  *** 89%-85% rate of teacher turnover  ** 84%-80% rate of teacher turnover  * 79% or below rate of teacher turnover</p>
<b>How does the recommendation address the Essential Question?</b>	This recommendation is an enduring and consistent accountability indicator that ensures school continuity for all students and provides meaningful and actionable information for stakeholders.
<b>Which Strategic question(s) does the recommendation address?</b>	<p>This indicator addresses the first strategic question as a measure of equity in ensuring that students receive school continuity.</p> <p>This indicator also addresses the fourth strategic question as a non-academic measure.</p>
<b>How does the recommendation</b>	This recommendation addresses the vision, mission, and goals by ensuring

<b>support the State’s Vision, Mission and/or Goals?</b>	opportunities to maximize student’s time to learn from effective educators.	
<b>Does the recommendation meet the following ESSA constraints:</b>	<b>Allow for meaningful differentiation of schools or districts.</b>	<b>Result in a valid and reliable statewide measure.</b>
<b>Yes</b>	Yes, the percentage can be adjusted by nation, state, and district level data to determine the star rating scale.	Yes, tracking teacher transiency can be tracked state wide. It is reliable, and it allows for comparability between schools.
<b>No</b>		

<b>Proposed Recommendation</b>	<p><b>ES/MS Accountability System:</b> Promote and track student access participation in before and afterschool clubs, sports, enrichment, and/or activities.</p> <p><b>School Ratings &amp; Measurements of Success:</b> Compare percentage of clubs and capacity to the percentage of students enrolled. Schools allocate adequate funding and personnel for before and afterschool activities.</p>
<b>How does the recommendation address the Essential Question?</b>	This recommendation is an enduring and consistent accountability indicator that ensures schools provide a variety educationally enriched activities that support one or more of the NVDOE goals.
<b>Which Strategic question(s) does the recommendation address?</b>	<p>This indicator addresses the first strategic question as a measure of equity in ensuring that students receive equitable enrichment activities.</p> <p>This indicator also addresses the fourth strategic question as a non-academic measure.</p>

<b>How does the recommendation support the State's Vision, Mission and/or Goals?</b>	This recommendation addresses the vision, mission, and goals by ensuring a variety of opportunities and promoting excellence.	
<b>Does the recommendation meet the following ESSA constraints:</b>	<b>Allow for meaningful differentiation of schools or districts.</b>	<b>Result in a valid and reliable statewide measure.</b>
<b>Yes</b>	Yes, it can be differentiated by examining school funding allocations and school demographics.	Yes, it can be through standardized student and parent surveys.
<b>No</b>		

<b>Proposed Recommendation</b>	Nevada use an N-size of 10 for subgroups for accountability.
<b>How does the recommendation address the Essential Question?</b>	If subgroups of 10-20 students exist in schools and are not achieving at high standards under the current N-size this subgroup would not be counted and therefore meaningful, actionable information would be not be revealed.
<b>Which Strategic question(s) does the recommendation address?</b>	#1! If subgroups aren't counted then how can schools know and be held accountable for closing achievement gaps? You can only have equity of subgroups are actually identified and counted.
<b>How does the recommendation support the State's Vision, Mission and/or Goals?</b>	See above

Does the recommendation meet the following ESSA constraints:	Allow for meaningful differentiation of schools or districts.	Result in a valid and reliable statewide measure.
<b>Yes</b>	Yes! More so than the current N-size.	Yes!! If you would like some further information and research that supports this, please contact me, Chris McBride, Ph.D. at <a href="mailto:cmcbride@mariposaacademy.net">cmcbride@mariposaacademy.net</a> or 775-287-7440.
<b>No</b>		

## Workgroup Members

Name	Organization
Yvette Williams	Clark County Black Caucus
Patrick Leytham	Touro University Nevada
Lisa Calder	Sage Academy - Spring Creek, Nevada. Kindergarten
Torrey Palmer	TNTP
Sean Parker	Teach for America
Suzanne Lee	Communities in Schools of Nevada
Mike Liu	EDU 2000
Craig Statucki	Nevada ACTE Executive Director/CCSD Teacher
Dawn Miller	Music Educator, Washoe County School District
Nancy E Brune	Kenny Guinn Center for Policy Priorities
Ruben Murillo	NSEA
Dr. Salwa Zaki	Department of Professional Learning, Washoe County School District
Chris McBride	Director of Mariposa Academy

Dr. Leslie Murdock	ELM Educational Consulting LLC
Abbe Mattson	Superintendent, Explore Knowledge Academy
Dave Jensen	Humboldt County Superintendent
Kate Crist	Washoe County School District
Melissa Mackedon	Administrator, Oasis Academy
Carly Strauss	NWRPDP DCSD
Ben Hayes	Chief Accountability Officer, Washoe County School District
Laura Davidson	Director of Research and Evaluation, Washoe County School District
Denise Dufrene	Washoe County School District, Principal
Tambre Tondryk	Beacon Academy
Julie Suring	Beacon Academy
Miadora Neslon	CCSD Instructional Coach
Brent Husson	Nevada Succeeds
Robing Kincaid	Nevada Pep
Joan Jurgensen	State Public Charter School Authority
Nathan Trenholm	Director of Research and Evaluation, Clark County School District
John Barlow	Somerset Academy
Marcia Neel	Music Education Consultants, Inc
Sylvia Lazos	Educate Nevada Now, UNLV
Meredith Smith	Nevada Succeeds
Rebecca Feiden	NDE, Achievement School District
Kelsey Morrow	Clark County School District
Krista Donnelly	Clark County School District
Craig Sear	Clark County School District
Brian Mitchell	OSIT
Eric Eakin	DPBH

Carolyn Ross	Nevada Virtual Academy
Steve Werlein	Nevada Connections Academy School Leader
MaryannDemchk	SEAC
Angela Blair	State Public Charter School Authority
Patrick Gavin	Director, State Public Charter School Authority
Dr. Katie Dockweiler	Nevada School Psychologists Association
Michael Ferra	TFA/CCSD TEACHER
Reza Karamooz	GRADD-NVBAA
Dr. Tonia Holmes-Sutton	Nevada National Board Network (CCEA)