Goal: Identify and recommend to the Missouri Commissioner of Education a plan for accreditation and assessment that emphasizes:

- local control;
- continuous improvement;
- individual student growth with continued attention to subgroup achievement;
- right test, right time;
- adaptability (flexible enough to meet current and future federal/state guidelines);
- clarity of purpose (can be explained by a third grader to an adult audience); and
- achieving Top 10 state status one student at a time.
## Task Force Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chairs</td>
<td>John Jungmann, Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Fulton, Pattonville (STL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Chris Wilson, Kennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Cook, Malden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Kent Medlin, Willard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doug Hayter, Branson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Aerin O’Dell, Orrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Mensching, E Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Jim Masters, Monroe City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andy Turgeon, Knox County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>Jenny Ulrich, Lonedell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aaron Zalis, Rolla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>Scott Downing, Warsaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Beth Scherer, Concordia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater KC</td>
<td>Dale Herl, Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allan Markley, Raytown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremy Tucker, Liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ralph Teran, Grandview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis Carpenter, Hickman Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater STL:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Marty, Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Riss, Webster Groves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pam Sloan, Francis Howell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Zeigler, Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joylynn Pruitt, University City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASA:</td>
<td>Roger Kurtz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Lodewegen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Luther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom:</td>
<td>Bob Bartman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Straub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESE:</td>
<td>Chris Neale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blaine Henningsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives:</td>
<td>Don Senti, Education Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gayden Carruth, CSD KC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Horton, SW Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis Cooper, Ozarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our process and timeline

- Group was established one year ago
- Monthly meetings of task force
- Collected feedback from membership through multiple avenues
- Research of other state practices
Recent Federal Shift

- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) put more emphasis on standardized test scores.
- Eventually created backlash from parents, educators and other stakeholders who want more balanced approach to measuring student learning and school performance.
- Every Child Succeeds Act (ESSA) restores control to the states to design accountability systems and move beyond academic measures as the sole measure of school effectiveness.
Accountability/Accreditation Systems

- All 50 states have accountability structures
- 26 of 50 states accredit school districts
- 24 states do not accredit (typically regional or national accreditation organizations are used)
- 11 of 26 states who accredit fold their accountability and accreditation system into one integrated system
- Only one top ten state (Virginia) integrates their accountability and accreditation system
Desired Future State System

- Support local differentiation that achieve statewide goals (e.g. One size does not fit all).
- Set high, attainable expectations for our students.
- Empower local improvement through collaboration and innovation.
- Balance accountability and support.
- Additional resources needed for DESE and school districts to meet goals
A New Model

- A multi-metric approach with district ownership and input.
- Mirrors the Teacher Evaluation Process developed by DESE including allowing local flexibility to best meet student learning needs.
New Generation Accreditation System

- Set high standards
- Be a quality assurance program
- Use multi-metric approach for inputs and outcomes
- Recognize academic and non-academic measures
- Empower local ownership of goals and measures
- Recognize that one size does not fit all
- Foster collaboration and innovation
Standards For Successful Students

System Inputs

- School Climate and Culture
- Effective Instructional Staff and Practices
- Stable and Effective Leadership and Governance

System Outcomes

- Academic Achievement
- Success-Ready Graduates
Accreditation Considerations

- Poverty
- Mobility/Stability
- Community Resources (investment)
District Evaluation

All Districts

- Academic Achievement
- Success-Ready graduates

District may select one of the following input standards

- School Climate and Culture
- Effective Instructional Staff and Practices
- Stable and Effective Leadership and Governance
Measuring Success

Academic Achievement

- Standardized Assessments
- Formative/Interim Assessments

District rankings on academic achievement would be similar to teacher evaluation rankings and factors in social context:

- Exceeds
- Meets
- Progressing
- Needs Improvement
Measuring Success

Success-Ready Graduates

- No more than five DESE identified measures
- Up to three additional locally-created measures
Measuring Success

Measuring Input Standards:

- DESE, in collaboration with the district, will identify one measurement of the selected input standard.
- District will identify one additional locally-developed measure.
- District will report progress annually to local board and DESE.
Reporting Success

- DESE will annually report district status on academic achievement and success-ready graduates at both the district level and building level.

- This is a status report and will not be used for accreditation purposes.

- Accreditation will be reviewed on a four-year cycle with a mid-cycle desk review.

- End-of-cycle review also will include a 2-3 day visit from a review team.
Review Team Visits

- Encourages feedback from practitioners
- Creates improved collaboration
- Identifies best practices and innovative practices
- Promotes sharing between districts
Accredited with Distinction

- MASA membership does not believe this classification is necessary.

- However, if it remains, DESE may want to consider distinction for districts that:
  - Earn “Met” or “Exceeds” levels in 90% of standards for academic achievement and success-ready graduates.
  - Add one additional input standard to be measured with an annual monitoring report submitted to local Board of Education and DESE.
Implementation Recommendation

- Use as the basis for next MSIP cycle.
- Undertake an input and engagement process for all stakeholder groups in Missouri.
- Allow 10% of Missouri districts to be “waiver” districts in 2016-17 and pilot new system in collaboration with DESE and other “waiver” districts.
Superintendents Support Change

MASA Accreditation and Assessment Task Force Feedback Indexes

I am comfortable with the belief statements presented.
I am comfortable with the five performance standards presented.
I am comfortable with the initial design implementation recommendations allowing increased local development of goals and measures based on identified needs.
I am comfortable with the two recommended next steps identified.
Changing the focus of MAP for ‘assessment of learning’ to ‘assessment for learning’ makes sense.
Current Reality

MAP Grades 3-8
• Adults primary audience
• Fuzzy, moving target

End of Course Exams
• Students primary audience
• Clear, fixed target
Better Reality

MAP Grades 3-8 (EOC-like)

Student is first audience

Clear, fixed learning targets
Timely, meaningful feedback
Multiple administration windows within a school year
Adaptive format measures growth over time toward high school course content readiness
In the students’ words ... 

https://youtu.be/3_Olp5bmdJw
Interim Assessments and MAP

- Research Question, “How well do interim assessments predict performance on the MAP?”
- From a Fall 2015 survey, the Assessment Subcommittee identified five interim assessments to study:
  - (Acuity Readiness/Acuity Readiness-Adaptive, eValuate, iReady, NWEA-MAP, Star)
- 24 districts provided data for the study
Sample ELA Interim Assessment Outcome

Comparing Percent Top Two (Proficient/Advanced) on MAP Vs. Predicted by interim

![Graph showing comparison between MAP and Interim assessments for English Language Arts, Top Two Levels Comparison, MAP vs. Interim.](chart)

- 3rd Grade: MAP 67.6, Interim 69.0 (Difference: 1.4)
- 4th Grade: MAP 70.8, Interim 74.0 (Difference: 3.2)
- 5th Grade: MAP 65.5, Interim 64.7 (Difference: -0.8)
- 6th Grade: MAP 57.4, Interim 57.9 (Difference: -0.5)
- 7th Grade: MAP 65.5, Interim 65.5 (Difference: 0.0)
- 8th Grade: MAP 60.9, Interim 63.2 (Difference: 2.3)
Why is changing MAP important?

- Students need timely, meaningful feedback that supports goal setting and tracking progress toward high school course content readiness.

- Educators need timely, meaningful data in order to use time, structure and teaching strategies in ways that lead to student mastery of important competencies.

- Communities need honest feedback and fair reporting, recognizing that in our reporting processes:
  - Family income/poverty impact the child;
  - Mobility/stability impact the child; and
  - Community resources (investment) impact the child.
Learning Ladder of Success

When learning is the constant and time is a variable, students of the same age progress when they’ve mastered important content.

Proficiency Based
- Level 12 -
- Level 11 -
- Level 10 -
- Level 9 -
- Level 8 -
- Level 7 -
- Level 6 -
- Level 5 -
- Level 4 -
- Level 3 -
- Level 2 -
- Level 1 -
- Level K -
- Level PreK -

Traditional
- Grade 12
- Grade 11
- Grade 10
- Grade 9
- Grade 8
- Grade 7
- Grade 6
- Grade 5
- Grade 4
- Grade 3
- Grade 2
- Grade 1
- Kindergarten
- PreKindergarten

Local Option Interim Assessments

College/Career Readiness (9-12)

High School Course Content Readiness

Foundational Readiness
Learning Ladder of Success

- Adaptive
  - Local Option Interim Assessments

- Proficiency Based
  - Defined by learning (Age≠Grade level), time is variable
  - Level 12 -
  - Level 11 -
  - Level 10 -
  - Level 9 -
  - Level 8 -
  - Level 7 -
  - Level 6 -
  - Level 5 -
  - Level 4 -
  - Level 3 -
  - Level 2 -
  - Level 1 -
  - Level K -
  - Level PreK -

- Traditional
  - Defined by time (Age=Grade level), learning is variable
  - Grade 12
  - Grade 11
  - Grade 10
  - Grade 9
  - Grade 8
  - Grade 7
  - Grade 6
  - Grade 5
  - Grade 4
  - Grade 3
  - Grade 2
  - Grade 1
  - Kindergarten
  - PreKindergarten

- College/Career Readiness (9-12)
- High School Course Content Readiness
- Foundational Readiness
# Learning Ladder of Success

## Proficiency Based

*Defined by learning (Age=Grade level), time is variable*

- Level 12 - Algebra
- Level 11 - Algebra
- Level 10 - Algebra
- Level 9 - Algebra
- Level 8 - Algebra
- Level 7 - Algebra
- Level 6 - Algebra
- Level 5 - Algebra
- Level 4 - Algebra
- Level 3 - Algebra
- Level 2 - Algebra
- Level 1 - Algebra
- Level K - Algebra
- Level PreK - Algebra

- Clear, fixed learning targets
- Power standards identified
- EOC-like assessments
- Timely feedback

## Traditional

*Defined by time (Age=Grade level), learning is variable*

- Grade 12  
- Grade 11  
- Grade 10  
- Grade 9  
- Grade 8  
- Grade 7  
- Grade 6  
- Grade 5  
- Grade 4  
- Grade 3  
- Grade 2  
- Grade 1  
- Kindergarten  
- PreKindergarten

## Lifetime of Learning

- College/Career Readiness (9-12)
- High School Course Content Readiness
- Foundational Readiness
Recommendation 1
Next Generation MAP Grades 3-8
Begins Fall 2017

Qualities
• Student as first and most important audience with immediate, meaningful feedback to the learner
• EOC-like
• Measures growth toward high school course content readiness

A third grader should be able to explain how MAP informs them where they are as a learner and, along with formative assessment, support them in setting personal learning goals
Recommendation 1 Continued

Next Generation MAP Grades 3-8
Begins Fall 2017

Design
- **Adaptive** with *embedded power standards* to provide clear fixed learning targets
- **Multiple Administration Opportunities within Year**
- **Achievable** grade level competency
- **Learning Level Progression** accurately reflecting a student’s starting point in the accountability process
- **MOSIS** captures learning progression by ELA, Math, Science allowing students to test when formative data say they are ready
Recommendation 2
MSIP 6 Innovation Pilot 2016-2017

- Apply for federal pilot to support innovative state assessments.

- 2016-2017 - Allow up to 10% of Missouri districts to be “waiver” districts in 2016-17 and pilot new assessment approaches linked to MSIP 6 student success standards. Research from this process will inform continued modification to MAP and MSIP 6. The districts will:
  ✓ Represent every DESE region;
  ✓ Support federal assessment innovation pilot process;
  ✓ Align local policy with practice;
  ✓ Test drive next generation MSIP 6 standards for student success measures; and
  ✓ Participate in and collaborate with other districts on research to determine effectiveness of pilot.
Overview

MSIP 6 Pilot Districts

Help create:

✓ Multiple-measures approach to accreditation for student achievement and success-ready graduates (e.g., MAP, EOCs, interim assessment, local performance tasks, extended learning opportunities, etc.)

✓ Metrics for input categories and peer review process (school climate/culture; effective instructional staff and practice; stable and effective leadership and governance)

✓ Next-generation accreditation reporting

MSIP 5 Districts

• Academic Achievement (MAP 3-8, EOCs)
• Subgroup Achievement (MAP 3-8, EOCs for African American, Hispanic, ELL, Free/reduced lunch, IEP)
• College/Career Readiness (ACT, AP, post-secondary placement, etc.)
• Attendance (90% attending 90% of the time)
• Graduation Rate (4-7 year)

All Districts

• Federal Accountability –
  ✓ MAP grade-level assessments 3-8, high school assessment (EOCs)
  ✓ Disaggregated data by student group
  ✓ Graduation rate (4-year)
• Variance allowed if Missouri awarded federal innovation grant
• Customized support from DESE for 5% lowest performing districts in state per ESSA requirements
Recommendation 2
MSIP 6 Innovation Pilot 2016-2017

- Multiple-measures approach
  - Use formative and interim assessment for learning strategies that hold promise to meet federal accountability guidelines
  - Measure student growth toward high school course content readiness
  - Use growth measures to demonstrate improvement across disaggregated groups with individual learning plans for students whose learning level is different than that typically associated with their age. Growth rates are primary score reported to the public.
  - MAP – 3rd grade baseline, 5th grade to benchmark learning level progression and 8th grade for status
  - District assessments for learning that are valid and reliable measures of growth predictive of learning level mastery. Assessment validity and reliability requires third party verification.
Conclusion

- MASA and the task force members appreciate the partnership of DESE and the State Board of Education in this discussion.
- Innovation in school districts should occur as a result of the accreditation system not in spite of the accreditation system.
- Local involvement will spur local buy-in to the standards, accountability and assessment system.
- We hope this report will be the beginning of a statewide conversation about school quality, accountability and assessments.