



**Accountability System
Board Member
Work Group Meeting #7**

May 11, 2022 | 1:00 pm

What is the purpose of school accountability?

- 1) improve student academic achievement - it should motivate adults in the building to focus on student academic growth & measurable outcomes
- 2) provide a fair assessment of performance for the purposes of:
 - a) communication
 - i) easy for parents and educators to understand
 - ii) communicating the right things
 - b) Allowing us to prioritize resources, energy, and interventions on schools in need of improvement

What are we trying to accomplish in assessing our current Accountability System?

- Strengthen the system's growth component so that real growth is incentivized and rewarded.
- Maintain our proficiency goals.
- That High School accountability reflects college and career readiness standards and is in alignment with 3-8.
- Ensure the results are clear and easy to understand.
- Ensure our expectations are consistent across K-12.
- Minimize double counting indicators as this only serves to magnify its weight and add complexity.

Topics to Discuss

- Potential approach from now to August
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Adoption timeline
- K-12 simulations, feedback and next steps
 - Student Growth
 - High Schools
 - K-2 Accountability
- Next steps

A potential approach to June & August BESE

- Next meeting: Discussion of report to be submitted by the chair
- June BESE: delivery of the report updating on the work group's progress
 - Problem statements, issues explored, & value statements
 - Proposals to address the concerns
 - Formal stakeholder feedback during June & July including a set of key areas to seek feedback from stakeholders on ahead of August BESE's discussion.
 - Implementation timeline and resources needed
 - Shortcomings of the proposal, positive features of the proposals
 - Areas of concern
 - Do the incentives & measures feel attainable?
- August BESE: draft set of Bulletin revisions are available and may be considered based on feedback & potentially additional work group meetings.



Student Growth

Concerns we initially sought to address in growth & what information helps inform the path forward.

- Awards points for non-growth (including students who declined).
 - *The LEAP lacks a vertical scale (which Florida & Mississippi have)*
 - *In some cases negative scale score change may be an artifact of the test design & scale.*
 - *We know where this is most prominent in our growth model (below the 40th percentile).*
- Step 1 does not value all growth equally & achievement is mixed into the growth index.
 - *Step 1 focuses on where students are and how far they need to move. It serves primarily as a signal and less a measure.*
- No matter how much growth a student below Basic has, the school will still earn an F in the calculation of the School Performance Score until they reach Basic.
 - *Increasing the rigor of our growth model & increasing the weight is one path to resolving this concern.*

Where less exemplary growth is rewarded

Student Percentile on VAM	Index points	% of scores that reflect a decrease
80-99th percentile	150	14%
60-79th percentile	115	35%
40-59th percentile	85	60%
20-39th percentile	25	81%
1-19th percentile	0	96%



Considerations on the Weight of Growth

- Previous modeling / examples weighted growth evenly with test achievement for most schools
- Other states weight growth in different ways.
- For example:
 - Mississippi has 415 / 700 points are based on growth (69%) divided across two groups: (all students, and lowest 25% of students)
 - Florida weights growth & achievement evenly with achievement divided across the same groups)

700-Point Elementary and Middle Schools

READING	MATH	SCIENCE	ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRESS
Proficiency 95 PTS	Proficiency 95 PTS	Proficiency 95 PTS	
Growth All Students 95 PTS	Growth All Students 95 PTS		
Growth Lowest 25% 95 PTS	Growth Lowest 25% 95 PTS		
			Progress to Proficiency 35 PTS



Student Growth Discussion

- The Expert from the Center for Assessments advice was to continue using our VAM model and create the conditions to make a shift in the future.
- What would your reaction be to significant improvement to Step 2 of our model model that would
 - minimize / eliminate non-student growth
 - calibrating the points awarded for different tiers of “exceeding their peers”
 - Ask our state’s Psychometric Advisors, assessment vendors, and future of assessment working group to explore how our test can be improved to accommodate a transition table approach in the future
- Thinking both short & long-term:
 - Should all schools be able to improve a letter grade for strong growth? 2 letter grades?
 - Should a school with a F in the achievement category be able to earn an A overall?



High Schools

Feedback since initial meeting

Concern	Considerations / potential solutions
Perceived devaluation of the diploma	Currently the diploma is weighted 50% this proposal serves to weight it at half and add value to experiences that complement the diploma.
Concern about <u>cost</u> of implementing AP/IB/CLEP/Dual Enrollment/JS Credentials	Some funds do exist to cover the cost of credentialing, and supporting systems would need to be part of a roll out plan. Should cost be the limiting factor in terms of measuring the school?
No assessment to assess quality of Dual Enrollment	Consider requiring some alignment requirements to certain pathways, or pairing with a CLEP exam. Other states (Florida) include Dual Enrollment with a grade of C-. Requiring a minimum ACT scores for credit.
The current formula & this proposal doesn't address work based experiences, preparation for military service adequately.	Leverage the existing "Work Based Learning" Experience to develop a high quality endorsement that can be paired with a Basic Credential for a small number of points. Explore the inclusion of a measure of service readiness (like Kentucky includes).

Formula Weights

- **Academic Achievement / Other Academic Indicators (60%)**
 - EOC Index: 20%
 - Growth Index: 20%
 - Graduation Rate: 20%
- **School Quality Indicators (40%)**
 - Interests & Opportunities: 5%
 - ACT: 15%
 - Strength of Diploma: 20%

Strength of Diploma Overview

- This index now works in concert with the graduation rate index
 - The current formula double counts a graduate, which is the key driver of inflated high school scores as it gave 100 points for on-time graduation in the 4 year cohort grad rate and 100 points in the Strength of Diploma.
- We've modified the SOD to no longer award 100 points for a graduate, which significantly decreases the points generated by the SOD.

New HS formula provides alignment with 3-8 simulation.

	3-8	HS
A	11%	10%
B	34%	34%
C	26%	26%
D	20%	20%
F	9%	9%

****This table has been updated on the following slide****

New HS formula provides alignment with 3-8 simulation.

	3-8	HS	2019 Released HS	Total
A	11%	7%	37%	10%
B	34%	36%	33%	34%
C	26%	26%	22%	26%
D	20%	21%	5%	20%
F	9%	10%	3%	9%

****Updated Table***

Comparing the rigor of the current and proposed

Student Result	Current	Proposal
HS Diploma plus Associate's Degree	160	125
HS Diploma plus (a) AP score of 3 or higher, IB Score of 4 or higher, or CLEP score of 50 or higher OR (b) Advanced statewide Jump Start credential	150	75 100
HS Diploma plus (a) At least one passing course grade for TOPS core curriculum credit of the following type: AP**, college credit, dual enrollment, or IB** OR (b) Basic statewide Jump Start credential	110	50
Four-year graduate (includes Career Diploma student with a regional Jump Start credential)	100	0
...		0

Strength of Diploma Index from previous meeting

Points	
125	Fast Forward Aligned Associates Degree, 3 Passing AP/IB Exams, Advanced Level III/IV, or Fast Forward Aligned Full Apprenticeship.
100	Passing 2 AP/IB/CLEP Exams, 12 DE Credits (with a C+) that are TOPS CORE Aligned or Advanced Credential
75	TOPS CORE Aligned 1 Passing AP/IB/CLEP Exam, 9 DE Credits (with a C+)
50	TOPS CORE Aligned 1 Passing AP/IB Course (and took exam), 6 DE Credits (with a C+), or Basic JS Credential
0	Graduates who do not falling into one of the categories

Schools who are able to help students who arrive in high school lacking Basic Literacy and Numeracy skills graduate will receive additional points:

- Scored below Basic on ELA and Math in 8th grade (25 points)
- Were/are limited English proficient entering High School (25 points)
- Scored below Basic on ELA or Math in 8th grade (10 points)

Additional work will need to be done to

- Identify Basic credentials that should no longer be incentivized because of their value in the real world.
- Explore the creation of a credential between Basic and Advanced to fit into our 75 point category.
- Explore bundling & grouping Basic Credentials that combined have more value than individually.



K-2 Accountability

K-2 Accountability Status

In June of 2021, LDOE presented a sketch of K-2 accountability and sought and endorsement of direction. A full formula, and set of proposals cannot be made without access to multiple years of quality data.

In order to have modeling of these proposed performance scores

1. The K-2 Learning Year: Phase I needs to be completed (end of 2022-2023 SY)
2. Literacy assessment needs to be administered
 - a. Achievement scores will be available 2023-2024
 - b. Growth scores will be available 2024-2025

K-2 Accountability Priorities

Louisiana's accountability system (1) informs and focuses educators through clear expectations for student outcomes; and (2) provides objective information about school and site quality to parents and other community stakeholders.

In developing tools to measure K-2 performance, Louisiana seeks to:

- Define a cohesive set of expectations for teachers and school systems birth-grade 2
- Utilize a limited, coherent, and efficient set of tools to monitor outcomes across school systems and schools
- Provide maximum consistency across grade levels to support ease of use by educators
- Reflect the academic goals of K-2 in the way that schools are measured

Student Literacy Accountability Proposal

- Measure both **performance** and **growth**:
 - **Performance** will be measured in grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade based on results from the end-of-year literacy indicator
 - A composite score will be generated at the end of each year for grades K, 1, and 2 that would indicate the extent to which a child is on track for reading on grade level.
 - **Growth** will be measured in grades 1st through 2nd based on results from the end-of-year indicator literacy indicator
 - Growth scores will be based on progress made from the end-of-year indicator results from the prior year to the end-of-year indicator results in current year

Student Literacy Indicator Components

The literacy indicator will include multiple measures of literacy resulting in subscores and an overall composite score. Below is a sampling of the minimum literacy measure(s) to be included at each grade level.

- Kindergarten
 - Phonological Awareness (e.g., initial word fluency)
 - Letter Naming Fluency
 - Letter Sound Recognition
- First Grade
 - Phonological Awareness
 - Phonics (e.g., nonsense word fluency)
 - Oral Reading Fluency
- Second Grade
 - Oral Reading Fluency
 - Comprehension
- Third Grade
 - Comprehension

Instructional Quality

- Use the CLASS® or NIET tool to measure instructional quality in Kindergarten through 2nd Grade classrooms.
- Every K-2 classroom would be observed using the CLASS® or NIET tool once in the fall and once in the spring by a certified local observer.
- A certain percentage of classrooms would additionally be observed by a certified third-party CLASS® or NIET observer. Third-party observations that differ significantly from local observations would replace local observations at the domain level. Systems demonstrating irregular scoring patterns may additionally be observed by third party observers.



Research Background on CLASS®

The organizational structure for classroom interactions, as measured by CLASS®, have been validated in more than 3,000 classrooms from preschool to fifth grade (Hamre, Mashburn, Pianta, & Downer, 2006).

Research has found that students demonstrated stronger reading comprehension and literacy skills at the end of third grade if they had more years of better teaching. While all students benefited from access to more effective teachers, it was most critical for students who entered kindergarten with low literacy skills. (Vernon-Feagans et al., 2019)

Research has also found that first-grade children who experienced higher overall interaction quality in kindergarten were more likely to score well on tests of sight words and decoding skills than first-graders who were in classrooms with less effective interactions. (Lee, P., & Bierman, K.L., 2016)

Initial Findings from K-2 CLASS® Pilot Participants

- Collaboration between pre-K and kindergarten teachers increased significantly, with teachers sharing how they are using their curriculum to improve teacher-student interactions.
- For one school system, the percentage of incoming first grade students reading on or above grade level increased from 42% to 54% between Fall 2018 and Fall 2019 as measured by DIBELS.
- For one school system, within nine months of starting CLASS®, most kindergarten teachers achieved the LDOE's equivalent of "high proficient" on the tool according to both local and third party observations.

2022-2023 Learning Year: Phase I

The 2022-2023 school year will serve as a pilot year for school systems to participate in a large-scale learning year of the planned Quality of Instruction Index in K-2 classrooms.

Throughout this time, the LDOE will support school systems in securing and funding K-3 CLASS® observer certification and NIET observer certification.

It is optional for all schools and systems and schools and systems have the ability to join in the way that makes sense for them.

K-2 Accountability Next Steps

1. Under law K-2 literacy must be included in school accountability
2. We do not want the mere inclusion of a literacy screener to “improve” or “worsen” the performance of a school.

Discussion:

- Reliable modeling of K-2 SPS could not be done before 2024-25.
- There are two ways to consider this:
 - Separate indicator
 - Inclusion in existing indicators: Assessment Index, Growth Index, or other appropriate index
- As in June 2021, the department’s request is that BESE endorse the concept of K-2 accountability & studying the use of instructional quality measures alongside the Literacy Assessment.



Next steps now to adoption

Summary of Report Recommendations

Item	Recommendation
K-2	Continue collecting information to inform a future K-2 proposal
Scale	Shift to a 100 point scale with 25 incentive points in measures
High School - ACT & Strength of Diploma	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Remove points for the ACT WorkKeys for TOPS U students• Recognize the value of experiences beyond a high school diploma in this index. Engage further with stakeholders on adjustments to credential types & valuing work based experience
Growth	Augment our assessment and significantly address negative scale score change.
High School & elementary score misalignment	More rigorously measure attainment of post-secondary credentials, weight of LEAP 2025, ACT index, and value student growth in elementary schools higher.

A potential approach to June & August BESE

- Next meeting: Discussion of report to be submitted by the chair
- June BESE: delivery of the report updating on the work group's progress
 - Problem statements, issues explored, & value statements
 - Proposals to address the concerns
 - Formal stakeholder feedback during June & July including a set of key areas to seek feedback from stakeholders on ahead of August BESE's discussion.
 - Implementation timeline and resources needed
 - Shortcomings of the proposal, positive features of the proposals
 - Areas of concern
 - Do the incentives & measures feel attainable?
- August BESE: draft set of Bulletin revisions are available and may be considered based on feedback & potentially additional work group meetings.