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What are the big changes?

- New goal: halving proficiency gaps by 2017
- Accountability & assistance levels for all schools
- AYP replaced with progress & performance index (PPI)
- Included: science, growth, & dropout rates
- Data reported for new “high needs” subgroup
- School percentile reported
- Smaller N size for subgroups (30)

A summary of changes to the annual accountability determinations is available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/accountability
Why the high needs group?

- To avoid double- and triple counting students in accountability determinations, as was the case under AYP
- To hold more schools accountable for more students
- To narrow proficiency gaps
What has not changed?

- Report Cards
- Communicating information about the accountability and assistance level of the child's school and district
- Right-to-know requirements regarding the professional qualifications of the student's classroom teacher(s)

What is the new goal?

1. Subtract 2011 CPI from 100
2. Divide by 2
3. Divide by 6
What is the PPI?

- A partial credit model: schools and student groups are awarded points for making improvement
- Annual PPI: measures progress from one year to the next (e.g., 2011 to 2012)
- Cumulative PPI: weighted average of a group’s annual PPI over the last four years.
- Cumulative PPI of aggregate & high needs groups places 80% of schools into Levels 1-2
PPI = Total Points / # Indicators

**Indicators (7)**

0, 25, 50, 75, 100 Points

*(Up to 700 points)*

1. ELA Proficiency Gap Narrowing (CPI)
2. Math Proficiency Gap Narrowing (CPI)
3. Science Proficiency Gap Narrowing (CPI)
4. ELA Growth (SGP)
5. Math Growth (SGP)
6. Annual Dropout Rate
7. Cohort Graduation Rate

**Extra Credit**

25 Points awarded for each

*(Up to 150 points)*

- ELA Warning/Failing %
- ELA Advanced %
- Math Warning/Failing %
- Math Advanced %
- Science Warning/Failing %
- Science Advanced %
What are some key Level concepts?

★ **PPIs are criterion-referenced.** They measure the improvement of individual schools and groups toward specific targets.

★ **School percentiles (1-99) are norm-referenced.** They represent a school’s performance relative to other schools in the grade span, and are used to determine Level 3 schools (lowest-performing 20 percent).
How are schools classified?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ESE Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Chronically underperforming schools (subset of Level 4)</td>
<td>Extremely high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Lowest performing schools (subset of Level 3)</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Lowest performing 20% of schools (including lowest performing subgroups)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Not meeting gap closing goals (for aggregate &amp;/or high needs students)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Meeting gap closing goals (for aggregate &amp; high needs students)</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendation Schools</td>
<td>High achieving, high growth, gap narrowing schools (subset of Level 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity #1: Comparing systems

**AYP System**
- 100% Proficiency for all students
- No measure of student growth
- Based on one year of data
- “Single No” System
- Counted students multiple times for subgroup classification
- Proficient and Advanced treated the same
- Attendance as an indicator

**PPI System**
- Differentiated targets for schools and subgroups
- Uses Student Growth Percentiles
- Uses four years of data
- Partial credit model
- High needs subgroup for classification to avoid double counting
- Rewards movement beyond proficiency
- Attendance not included
Activity #2: Messaging

Questions for discussion:

★ What do you notice about the school’s level as compared to their percentile and PPI?

★ What seeming contradictions do you see in the data? How would you explain this to your constituents?

★ What is the measure over which you think schools have the most control, PPI or school percentile?

★ How would you explain the high needs group?

★ What is the overall message you would communicate about the school in your report?

(School and district accountability reports are available at http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/accountability.aspx)
Talking points

★ The goal of reducing proficiency gaps by half is ambitious, yet attainable

★ Every school’s percentile and PPI tells a different story.
  ★ Schools with lower percentiles but higher PPIs for all student groups are making steady improvement
  ★ Schools with higher percentiles but lower PPIs scores are high performing but have more work to do to support student success

(Flyer available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/accountability/default.html)
Talking points (continued)

★ We use percentiles to help focus supports on the state’s lowest performing schools; so can districts.
★ We use school grade spans to fairly compare the performance of schools serving the same or similar grades.
★ We are committed to monitoring the effectiveness of our new system. If we do not see continuous improvement across the spectrum of schools in the state, we will adjust the system as necessary.

(Flyer available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/accountability/default.html)
Questions?

http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/accountability
ESEA@doe.mass.edu
781-338-3550