

# Overview of Proposed Accountability Models

## THE COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nonpartisan, nationwide, nonprofit organization of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity, and five U.S. extra-state jurisdictions. CCSSO provides leadership, advocacy, and technical assistance on major educational issues. The Council seeks member consensus on major educational issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, federal agencies, Congress, and the public.

### Overview of Proposed Accountability Models

Author:

Ryan Reyna, Senior Associate at Education Strategy Group

### COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

Tony Evers (Wisconsin), President

Chris Minnich, Executive Director

With the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), states have wide authority to construct a school accountability model that can best advance college- and career-ready outcomes in their unique context. The law requires each state to meaningfully differentiate the performance of its schools on an annual basis, using a set of defined “academic” indicators (e.g., academic achievement, student growth, graduation rate, progress in achieving English language proficiency) and requiring at least one indicator of school quality or student success. In making the annual differentiations, the state must give “substantial weight” to each of the “academic” indicators, and in the aggregate, “much greater weight” than it provides to the school quality and student success indicator(s). The U.S. Department of Education’s proposed regulations<sup>1</sup> further require a single summative rating overall for the school and that each indicator receives a rating, with both the summative and indicator ratings each having at least three performance levels.<sup>2</sup>

The purpose of this resource is to provide state leaders with an overview of currently proposed accountability models that meet most ESSA requirements. The models presented are intended to support state leaders as they work through the trade-offs and priorities of their own accountability system. The framework for summarizing the proposed models is based off of CCSSO’s [Roadmap for Next-Generation State Accountability Systems](#), [Accountability Principles](#) and [Critical Area Outline for Accountability](#) in ESSA. Additionally, the recently released resource, [“Key Issues in Aggregating Indicators for Accountability Determinations,”](#) provides context for some of the key decisions reflected in these models and terms used in the chart.

The models summarized below are not exhaustive; rather, they represent a broad landscape of the options available to states through ESSA. The initial set of models was chosen to reflect differing approaches to address the key ESSA accountability requirements, and should be viewed as potential models that can be modified or expanded to meet each state’s unique context. Although numerous organizations have created lists of potential or recommended indicators, this summary document only includes full accountability models to provide a holistic vision of how a state could design its accountability system. This document should be considered “living,” as it will be updated when new models are proposed (either theoretically or in specific states) that provide unique approaches to meeting the requirements of ESSA.

State officials know that they must make a myriad of decisions when designing an accountability system, so it is important to recognize the inherent trade-offs in each model. Some of the key trade-offs that arise in the models presented below include:

---

1 References are made in this resource to the U.S. Department of Education’s proposed ESSA regulations. All references are contingent upon finalization of the regulations.

2 There are a number of additional accountability requirements in ESSA and the U.S. Department of Education’s proposed regulations that are not specifically discussed in this resource. States will need to consider the construction of their accountability system within the full context of the law and subsequent regulations.



## SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTABILITY MODELS

A short summary of accountability models (listed alphabetically) and a link to the full proposed or actual model is listed below. Additionally, an overview table is included at the end of this document to compare specific aspects of the models.

### BELLWETHER EDUCATION PARTNERS

The organization has proposed two models, one for elementary and middle schools (ES/MS) and one for high schools (HS), which are combined in this summary.<sup>3</sup> The ES/MS model proposes a two-part process to provide summative school ratings. In the first step, each school would receive an overall index score based on an equal weighting of assessment by performance level and growth performance. Those scores would be used to prioritize subsequent actions, starting with high-quality, professional, on-site school reviews. The school reviews would examine additional measures of school quality, further differentiate school designations, and offer suggestions for how a school could improve. The HS model was published prior to ESSA and would need to be slightly adapted to meet the law’s requirements. It proposes a new way for measuring high school success that is based largely on the extent to which the school exceeds expectations in college- and career-readiness and transitions beyond high school. It focuses accountability on the school effect on student performance, rather than individual student characteristics, and aims to reduce the variability of accountability ratings through the use of multi-year data. Many of the measures are

<sup>3</sup> Note that the HS model was released prior to passage of ESSA, so it would need slight changes to meet the ESSA requirements (i.e., progress in meeting English Learner proficiency). The ES/MS model was proposed after the passage of ESSA.

calculated by comparing actual performance to predicted performance to minimize the influence of students' background characteristics. For more information on the proposed elementary and middle school model, see: <http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/ESSAAccountabilityProposal-Aldeman-BellwetherEducationPartners.docx>. For more information on the proposed high school model, see: [http://bellwethereducation.org/sites/default/files/Bellwether\\_HighSchoolQuality.pdf](http://bellwethereducation.org/sites/default/files/Bellwether_HighSchoolQuality.pdf). An updated version of the ES/MS model will be available shortly at: <http://bellwethereducation.org>.

## CALIFORNIA

This model provides a diverse set of data on school performance without a single summative rating to (1) support educators and administrators in continuous improvement, and (2) allow stakeholders to rely on their own values when judging performance. The model establishes a set of "state indicators" and provides information both on the status and change of performance. In addition to the "state indicators," California plans to report additional information aligned to its Local Control Funding Formula on aspects such as implementation of state standards and parent engagement. For each of the local measures, the state has proposed a common standard and suggested evidence for assessing progress in meeting that standard. It will be up to each district to determine whether the standard has been met, and that information will be displayed on the school report card. Because this model is still in the proposal stage, specific details about identification of schools as low-performing are not yet available. However, it is likely that the state will use a process that analyzes the number of measures by which a school demonstrates low-performance and no improvement (or declines in performance). This proposed model is currently under consideration by the State Board of Education. For more information, see: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/jul16item02.doc> and <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr16/documents/july16item2addendum.doc>.

## CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS

This proposed model makes school determinations based on separate performance ratings in three domains: achievement, growth, and culture and climate. The performance ratings are assigned relative to other schools in the state (i.e., green is the top 25% of schools in the state on that domain). Based on those ratings, schools are then differentiated using a matrix to determine an overall rating of green, yellow, or red. Green schools are those that maintain at least average culture and climate and demonstrate either (1) "high" growth or (2) high achievement and average growth. Schools with low growth, low achievement, and low culture and climate are identified as red schools, which would receive comprehensive support and improvement. In calculating the individual measures, schools receive bonus points for high performance from traditionally underserved student subgroups, and the performance of each subgroup is taken into account for each accountability indicator. To provide parents with additional data, this model proposes creating a website for school comparison that enables a user to select the attributes they most desire in a school. For more information, see: <http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/ESSAAccountabilityProposal-CAP.docx>.



## FOUNDATION FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION (EXCELINED)

This proposed model adapts ExcelinED’s signature A-F school grading model to meet the new requirements of ESSA. The model focuses on outcome measures, places additional emphasis on the lowest performing students in each school, and provides transparent information to parents and the public about school performance through a single summative rating on an A-F scale. In this model, the school grades are used to identify schools for recognition, support, and intervention. The model encourages states to set rigorous expectations for student proficiency, balance measures of growth and proficiency in the A-F rating, and set an aspirational yet attainable grading scale with automatic increases in performance expectations. For more information, see: <http://www.azed.gov/accountability/files/2016/07/essa-accountability-framework-for-used-june-2-2016.pdf>.

## POLIKOFF, DUQUE AND WRABEL

This proposed model reduces the potential negative consequences in school accountability by decreasing the use of performance levels and minimizing the role that demographics play in school accountability determinations. The model focuses on performance individually in four domains, without combining performance into a single summative rating: academic achievement, growth, progress toward English Learner Proficiency, and other measures of school quality. Each domain would be rated on a 0-100 scale, with which would average whole school and individual subgroup performance. Performance in the academic achievement and growth domains would determine the low performing schools, while the information collected in the other two domains would be used to diagnose problems and target interventions. The school success set of measures would include information on absenteeism, student engagement and happiness, equity, student preparation for future grades, and student access to a full curriculum. For more information, see: <http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/ESSAAccountabilityProposal-PolikoffDuqueAndWrabel-USCAndBaltimoreCountyPublicSchools.docx>.

## TENNESSEE

This model was approved as the state’s accountability system during the ESEA waiver renewal process, and applies explicitly to districts (though it could be recreated for schools). The model sets minimum expectations of performance for all districts, and provides districts with multiple opportunities to demonstrate success on academic achievement and gap closure. Districts receive a summative rating through a four-step process. Any district that does not meet minimum performance thresholds for improvement in proficiency or growth or decreases in the number of students “Below Basic” on the state assessment is automatically flagged as “In Need of Improvement”. Districts are then rated separately on measures of Achievement and Gap Closure, which are then combined to provide a final determination. For each category, the best score from each content area is averaged to provide an overall score. For Achievement, districts are evaluated on (1) meeting state established proficiency goals, (2) their relative performance, and (3)

growth. For Gap Closure, districts are evaluated on (1) change in proficiency rates by subgroup, (2) subgroup growth, and (3) reduction within subgroup of the percent below basic on state assessments. It should be noted that this model was developed prior to the passage of ESSA, so it does not address some of the requirements of the law (i.e., progress in achieving EL Proficiency). For more information, see: [https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/education/attachments/ESEA\\_flexibility\\_request\\_approval\\_summary\\_2015.pdf](https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/education/attachments/ESEA_flexibility_request_approval_summary_2015.pdf).

## TNTP

This proposed model<sup>4</sup> identifies the aspects of a “great” school and aligns that vision to the accountability measures. As such, it places significant emphasis on the school quality and student success measures in three areas: consistently great teaching, healthy school culture, and access to opportunity. Further, it encourages states to select measures that best advance the state’s vision. It does not provide details on methods for communication or identification of lowest performing schools. For more information, see: <http://tntp.org/publications/view/evaluation-and-development/accountability-under-essa-How-States-Can-Design-Systems-That-Advance-Equity>.

The following table provides a short comparison of each model on a number of domains. The purpose of the system describes the intended priorities in the system design. Alignment to goal reflects how the accountability indicators connect to ESSA’s requirement of long-term and interim progress goals. The aggregation method reflects how the indicators are combined; the communication method reflects how performance across the indicators is communicated; and the calculation method describes how performance is determined for each indicator, all of which are described in more detail here. The indicators for accountability detail the required ESSA “academic” and “school quality or student success” measures of performance, as well as any additional measures that are identified for reporting purposes. Information about the model’s approach to incorporating subgroup performance and identifying schools for the low-performing categories enumerated in ESSA is also presented. The table concludes with a short summary of the elements that make each model unique and some of the specific selections made from the numerous trade-offs available when designing an accountability system.

---

<sup>4</sup> Note that this is a “working paper” and as such may be updated based on additional feedback from the field. This summary is based on the draft as of August 25, 2016.

	Bellwether <sup>5</sup>	California <sup>6</sup>	Center for American Progress
<b>Intended school level(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES and MS</li> <li>HS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES, MS and HS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES and MS</li> </ul>
<b>Purpose(s) of system</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simplicity for parents and educators, with clear signals for which schools need to improve and how</li> <li>Hold schools accountable only for what they can control</li> <li>Incent college and career readiness and success through measurement of postsecondary/career outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a dashboard of multiple indicators to support continuous improvement</li> <li>Demonstrate both status and change of performance</li> <li>Align to Local Control Funding Formula</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear information for parents on inputs and outcomes</li> <li>Reward growth</li> <li>Provide educators with actionable information</li> </ul>
<b>Alignment to goal(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES/MS: State sets performance levels that are included in proficiency and growth indices</li> <li>HS: School level “expected” performance determined based on student enrollment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual performance goals set for each accountability indicator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School success in meeting interim targets for all students and each subgroup in Achievement calculation</li> </ul>
<b>Aggregation method</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi-year Index</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No summative aggregation</li> <li>Mix of matrix and goal (at the indicator level)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matrix</li> </ul>
<b>Communication of rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schools receive initial rating based on proficiency and growth indices</li> <li>Final ratings determined by school quality reviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dashboard, with no single summative rating</li> <li>Individual indicators rated on Status (Very Low, Low, Intermediate, High) and Change (Maintained, Improved, Improved Significantly)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colors (summative)</li> <li>High, average, and low (for each domain)</li> </ul>
<b>Indicators for accountability – Academic achievement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES/MS: Performance Index based on the number of students at each of 5 performance levels in ELA, math, and science</li> <li>HS: Predicted versus actual proficiency on college ready assessment in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o ELA (including writing)</li> <li>o Math</li> </ul> </li> <li>Science</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proficiency index (i.e., value multiple levels of performance) on:<sup>7</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o ELA</li> </ul> </li> <li>Math</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting or making progress toward state targets on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o ELA</li> <li>o Math</li> <li>o Science</li> <li>o Social Studies</li> </ul> </li> <li>Additional credit if low income, ELL or SPED students in top 25% in state</li> </ul>

5 This represents a combination of models proposed by Bellwether. The HS model was released prior to passage of ESSA, so it would need slight changes to meet the ESSA requirements. The ES/MS model was proposed after the passage of ESSA.

6 Proposal as of August 1, 2016.



<b>Indicators for accountability – Academic progress</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES/MS: Growth Index based on whether students maintain or advance across the same 5 performance levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chronic absenteeism</li> <li>Growth (to be developed)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percent demonstrating at least one year of growth (or more if below grade level)</li> </ul>
<b>Indicators for accountability – Graduation rate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Predicted versus actual annual progression rate</li> <li>Predicted versus actual 4-year graduation rate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4-year graduation rate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Not specified</i> – ES/MS model only</li> </ul>
<b>Indicators for accountability – Progress in EL proficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth on state ELP exam using the same Growth Index specified above</li> <li>Used to flag targeted support and improvement schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TBD composite measure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of ELs who reach proficient on EL assessment or are on track to do so within 3 years of enrollment</li> </ul>
<b>Indicators for accountability – School quality/student success</b>	<p><u>ES/MS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Holistic, on-site School Quality reviews conducted by professionally trained inspectors</li> <li>Rubric based on observed student behaviors and student, parent, and faculty surveys and interviews</li> </ul> <p><u>HS<sup>8</sup></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Academic engagement</li> <li>Safe and supportive campus environment</li> <li>Advanced course passage rate</li> <li>Predicted versus actual college-going rate</li> <li>College remediation rate</li> <li>College credit accumulation</li> <li>FAFSA completion rate</li> <li>Employment rate</li> <li>Employment earnings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suspension rate</li> <li>College and career readiness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student, teacher and parent engagement surveys</li> <li>Chronic absenteeism</li> <li>Suspension and expulsion</li> </ul>
<b>Additional indicators (reported, non-scored)</b>	<i>Not specified</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local climate survey</li> <li>Basics (teachers, instructional materials, facilities)</li> <li>Implementation of academic standards</li> <li>Parent engagement</li> </ul>	<p>Dashboard of additional information, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of art and music</li> <li>Availability of recess, physical education, and healthy meals</li> <li>Resource allocations</li> <li>Staffing</li> <li>Curricular offerings</li> </ul>

7 For more information, see CA's comments to the proposed ESSA regulations: <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/3002952-ESSA-Regs-SBE-TT-let010116.html>

8 Correspondence with the author confirms that the proposed use of a school quality review would apply to all schools (ES, MS, and HS) if he updated the high school accountability proposal to meet the ESSA requirements. He proposes creating an index based on proficiency versus "expected" performance and graduation rates, and then embed the other listed college- and career-ready metrics into the school inspection process.

<b>Calculation method</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES/MS: indices used to flag schools for further support; ultimate rating dependent on school quality reviews</li> <li>HS: Peer-adjusted and numerical</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Numerical</li> <li>Performance against self</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weighted numerical</li> <li>Performance relative to peer (statewide)</li> <li>Bonus</li> </ul>
<b>"Weight" of growth</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES/MS: 50%</li> <li>HS: 0%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0% in first year, may increase later</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 50%</li> </ul>
<b>Subgroup performance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used for determination of targeted support and improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report each subgroup that performs in the bottom two categories for each indicator</li> <li>TBD on inclusion for purposes of accountability determinations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subgroup performance calculated for each indicator</li> <li>Bonus points awarded for students in top 25% in state on indicator</li> </ul>
<b>Identification of Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSI: Bottom 5% of index</li> <li>TSI: Over identify schools with any subgroup performing in the bottom 5% of the state</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Not specified</i> – proposal not finalized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSI: Schools who are in the bottom 25% of performance in achievement, growth and culture and climate</li> <li>TSI: any school with a low rating in the same area for 3 consecutive years</li> </ul>
<b>Unique elements</b>	<p><u>ES/MS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relies on performance levels for proficiency and growth calculations</li> <li>Final ratings determined by qualitative school quality reviews</li> </ul> <p><u>HS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>College- and career-ready focused</li> <li>Goals based on expected performance</li> <li>Postsecondary outcome measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No summative rating</li> <li>Proficiency index</li> <li>Rating for each indicator on both status and change</li> <li>Inclusion of locally-measured inputs for reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matrix model</li> <li>Mix of inputs and outcomes</li> <li>Online data dashboard</li> </ul>
<b>Trade-offs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi-year calculation for stability</li> <li>ES/MS: High-quality school quality reviews would require budget and staff to execute</li> <li>HS: Greater focus on relative rather than absolute performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on transparency at indicator rather than summative level</li> <li>Multiple performance targets and ratings</li> <li>Subgroup performance on each indicator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on relative rather than absolute performance</li> <li>Independent domains for measurement</li> </ul>

	Foundation for Excellence in Education	Polikoff et al
Intended school level(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES, MS and HS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES and MS</li> </ul>
Purpose(s) of system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public transparency</li> <li>Emphasize student outcomes</li> <li>Focus on lowest performing students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incent schools to improve both academic and nonacademic outcomes</li> <li>Fairness for teachers and schools</li> </ul>
Alignment to goal(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goals should be aligned with state’s status on nationally comparable assessments (NAEP/ACT/SAT) of college- and career-readiness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State sets performance targets in each of the four school rating domains</li> <li>Targets used to identify low performing schools</li> </ul>
Aggregation method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Index</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Index</li> </ul>
Communication method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A-F</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0-100 scale for each domain</li> <li>No summative rating</li> </ul>
Indicators for accountability – Academic achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weighted average proficiency in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o ELA</li> <li>o Math</li> <li>o Science</li> <li>o Social Studies (MS and HS only)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale scores converted to 0-100 range and weighted by number of grades tested in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o ELA</li> <li>o Math</li> <li>o Science</li> <li>o Social Studies</li> </ul> </li> <li>Overall and subgroup performance weighted equally</li> </ul>
Indicators for accountability – Academic progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth to Proficient/Advanced levels (ES/MS and optional in HS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two-step value add growth model</li> <li>Overall and subgroup performance weighted equally</li> </ul>
Indicators for Accountability – Graduation Rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4-year grad rate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Not specified</i> – ES/MS model only</li> </ul>
Indicators for accountability – Progress in EL proficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth or Proficiency on ELP exam</li> <li>+/- to school’s grade or equally weighted component if meet N-size for indicator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth in EL proficiency</li> <li>Regression adjusted reclassification rate</li> </ul>
Indicators for accountability – School quality/student success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth of lowest performing students in ELA and math</li> <li>College &amp; Career Ready</li> </ul>	<p>Average measures of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Absenteeism</li> <li>Student engagement survey</li> <li>Disproportionality in discipline</li> <li>On-time promotion</li> <li>Curricular opportunities</li> </ul>
Additional indicators (reported, non-scored)	<i>Not specified</i>	<i>Not specified</i>
Calculation method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Numerical</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Numerical conversion to 0-100 scale for all measures (overall and for subgroups)</li> </ul>
“Weight” of growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES: 57%</li> <li>MS: 50%</li> <li>HS: 0% or 40%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 50% for federal designations</li> </ul>
Subgroup performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weighted average proficiency</li> <li>Include growth of lowest performing students as separate indicator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each indicator would average performance of significant subgroups</li> <li>Subgroup average counts for 50% of school score in each domain</li> </ul>

<b>Identification of Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSI: F schools and those with graduation rates below 67%</li> <li>TSI: D schools; A, B and C schools with subgroups performing at levels of F schools overall or subgroups in D schools</li> <li>Note: Schools earn lower letter grade if participation rate &lt;95% or automatic F if &lt;90%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSI: Bottom 5% on each achievement and growth. EL proficiency and school quality indicators used to diagnose problems and target interventions in CSI schools</li> <li>TSI: Subgroup in the bottom 10% on any domain for 2 consecutive years</li> </ul>
<b>Unique elements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weighted proficiency</li> <li>Performance expectations aligned to external benchmark(s)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standardize all measures</li> <li>Scale score for achievement</li> <li>Mix of inputs and outcomes</li> </ul>
<b>Trade-offs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simplicity in measures for ease of use by public</li> <li>Single rating for clear communications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multiple performance targets</li> <li>Independent domains for measurement</li> </ul>

	<b>Tennessee<sup>9</sup></b>	<b>TNTP</b>
<b>Intended school level(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES, MS and HS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ES, MS and HS</li> </ul>
<b>Purpose(s) of system</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish minimum performance expectations for all districts</li> <li>Focus on the importance of growth for all students</li> <li>Multiple pathways to excellence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Align system to definition of a “great” school</li> <li>Provide information to educators and administrators to guide improvement</li> </ul>
<b>Alignment to goal(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District determinations linked to annual performance targets and gap closure</li> </ul>	<i>Not specified</i> – model would need to add to meet ESSA requirements
<b>Aggregation method</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mix of goal and index</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Index</li> </ul>
<b>Communication method</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exemplary, Achieving, Progressing and In Need of Improvement</li> </ul>	<i>Not specified</i>
<b>Indicators for accountability – Academic achievement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proficiency overall and by subgroup on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o ELA</li> <li>o Math</li> </ul> </li> <li>Gap closure on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o ELA</li> <li>o Math</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proficiency overall and by subgroup on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o ELA</li> <li>o Math</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Indicators for accountability – Academic progress</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Value add growth (ES, MS and HS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in percent of students Proficient or above</li> </ul>
<b>Indicators for Accountability – Graduation Rate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4-year graduation rate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4-year graduation rate</li> </ul>
<b>Indicators for accountability – Progress in EL proficiency</b>	<i>Not specified</i> - model would need to add to meet ESSA requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth in proficiency among EL learners</li> </ul>
<b>Indicators for accountability – School quality/student success</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CCR score on ACT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Test participation</li> <li>Equitable distribution of effective teachers</li> <li>School culture survey</li> <li>Equitable discipline policies</li> <li>Equitable access to courses</li> </ul>

<sup>9</sup> Model released prior to passage of ESSA, so may require slight tweaks.

<b>Additional indicators (reported, non-scored)</b>	<i>Not specified</i>	<i>Not specified</i>
<b>Calculation method</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Numerical</li> <li>Distance to goal</li> <li>Performance against self</li> <li>Performance relative to peer</li> </ul>	<i>Not specified</i>
<b>"Weight" of growth</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 50%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15% in ES and MS</li> <li>0% in HS</li> </ul>
<b>Subgroup performance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in below basic percentages on ELA and Math for "super subgroup" to determine initial performance gate</li> <li>Thereafter, each district receives a Gap Closure status determination based on four main accountability subgroups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Included in calculation of proficiency, growth and test participation indicators</li> </ul>
<b>Identification of Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)</b>	<i>Not specified</i> – developed for ESEA waiver, model would need to add to meet ESSA requirements	<i>Not specified</i> – model would need to add to meet ESSA requirements
<b>Unique elements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District accountability</li> <li>Performance "gate"</li> <li>Combination of peer comparison and improvement</li> <li>Best performance provides multiple paths to high rating</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mix of inputs and outcomes</li> <li>Inputs count significantly in rating</li> <li>Focus on equity</li> </ul>
<b>Trade-offs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complex calculations behind the scenes</li> <li>Multiple performance targets and ratings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simplicity in measures for ease of use by public</li> <li>Weight of student success and school quality measures may result in large number of schools identified for TSI (to meet added requirements in USED proposed regulations)</li> </ul>



One Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20001-1431  
voice: 202.336.7000 | fax: 202.408.8072