

Regional Advisory Committee Accountability Design Meeting Small Group Activity #1

Given what you know about education accountability systems, what do you think should be the overarching goal of Missouri’s statewide accountability system? What are the intended outcomes? Please prioritize the list below, using a 1-3 rating, with 1 as the highest. Please provide additional comments to support your position.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify Lowest 5% and Provide Drastic Intervention and Assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure EVERY school is “Good Enough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure EVERY school Gets Better
2 1C 2 3 2 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 2 3 3 3 3	1 1 (meeting standards) 1B 3 2 3 2 1 3 3 3 2 3 3 2 2 2	Continuous improvement 3 (growth—continuous improvement) 1A 1 1 Continuous improvement 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

- Ensure continuous improvement:
 - Include baseline assessment of each school student start level.
 - Return more control to local level.

- What equals “ensure” or “good enough”—what do those look like?
- We don’t like the other 2 goals (column 1 and 2).
- We need to have a baseline for each district & use that to show growth.
- Possibly more than 1x yr.
- With improved language:
 - “Ensure every school system is meeting a high quality standard”.
- Implication of resources behind the goal.
- Given the wording, the rankings reflect the meaning of the chosen and how locals respond with state standards.
- Need to have better wording in the middle column.
- We believe DESE should develop and implement a statewide accountability system which ensures and/or requires continuous improvement for all Missouri schools.
- Whatever design is chosen must not lose sight of the need for a combined approach—all three aspects are important.
- “Good enough” sounds like a low expectation. The language on the slide read, “all schools achieve median or average performance”. That is literally impossible—by definition if the ranking is normative, there have to be some below & some above an average.
- Identifying the “lowest 5%” depends upon how those schools are identified.
- Ensure every school gets better—but measure & req. depends where you start.
- Overall comment/question: is there a transition plan for the move from MSIP 4 to MSIP 5?
- How will we define continuous improvement?
- All three indicators are needed across MO. Each district is unique & has unique needs.
- Feels like a very loaded question. All three have value.
- Does the state have the resources to ensure EVERY school Gets Better? There are multiple measures that can be used not just single test scores or single measures. Ensuring EVERY school Gets Better addresses ALL students. The turnaround method the state pursued to address the lowest districts has not been successful. Firing 50% of the staff and beginning over has not been effective.
- The above 3 goals depend on what the measurement is. There’s concern if test scores are only indicators.
- Lowest 5% goal tends to identify those districts with highest poverty rates & highest minority populations.
- Important to use multiple measurements regardless of goal.
- We did not reach consensus (on “Good Enough” and “Gets Better”)—they were both important—a change in wording is needed.
- Should be like a business, always room to improve—regardless of how “good” the school already is.
- Model to show how things are improving on the continuum.
- What is drastic intervention?—who’s going to do it?—who’s going to fund it?
- Common core—how does that effect this?
- What does it mean to “get better”? Statement on ensuring every school gets better is more positive but vague. Needs more specific wording to hold us to a higher standard. Just like students, schools need multi-tier system from state and neighboring districts.
- Goal should be—continuous improvement among all schools.
- “Good Enough”=measurable? Too vague of a statement; some schools may work towards achieving a level of “good enough” and not strive for a higher level of performance.

- Identify lowest 5% of schools not districts—if a poorly performing school improves but is still low how do you compare that to an excellent performing school that is already performing at such a high level that it is unable to show as much of a drastic increase? Careful not to penalize those higher performing schools.
- 2 (column 2)—needs to have an indicator “what is good enough?”
- 3 (column 1)—that group will not have a lot of gains—focus is too narrow—that group is probably not our future—already spending extra on them—the other 95% (we thought this was students not districts).
- 1 (column 3)—growth—continuous improvement.
- Need to use common sense!!
- Get away from 1 size fits all mentality!!
- Don’t re-package NCLB!!
- Get away from NEGATIVE consequences!!
- Focus on assistance, coaching, guidance...
- Difficult to reach a solid consensus because...the system needs to ensure that every school gets better but that a reasonable standard be set. High performing schools should be monitored but left alone (with the excessive paperwork and “jumping through hoops”). The lowest performing schools need a larger proportion of resources with growth status accountability standards. The focus should be on helping as many students as possible. Leave the schools that meet the “good enough” standard and quit harassing these schools.
- Quality Systems with clear targets rooted in strong core values gives strong assurance of success. The continuous improvement process should target high expectations for all students:
 - Leadership must be collaborative & mission driven & vision controlled.
 - The system should be strategies.
 - Feedback needs to be constant & natural.
 - Data must be aligned to the high expectations.
 - Quality staff with a continuous pool of ideas.
 - All processes must be effective & efficient in moving the system.
 - The results should naturally follow.
- Not everyone can be average.
- C.I. school be growth mark.
- Some benefit to knowing lowest 5% to give those a boost.
- 5% of what? District 5% looks different at different levels.
- The lowest 5% would be part of the continuous improvement.
- All schools should seek continuous improvement to avoid being content with a minimum standard. If that goal is pursued in a meaningful way, the other listed goals should be an integral part of that focus.
- We are concerned that these minimal choices inherently drive the conversation in a predetermined direction. Effective schools already seek continuous improvement, and the other choices are worded in negatively-tinted language. An open-ended conversation would yield other goal options.
- The third category encompasses the 1st two categories.
- Don’t want to be the minimum.
- Cont. imp. has no ceiling to avoid mediocrity.
- Focusing efforts on #2 would encompass #3.

- A model is needed for this (column 3). Most teachers/admin./school boards want this to happen, but don't have a system in place to make it work.
- Our #1 choice (column 3) is the most inclusive of all students in the state of Missouri—it allows for districts to identify/assess their own needs.
- Our #3 choice (column 1) was chosen because it assumes a homogenous curriculum across the state and allows the state to funnel money to only a few select districts.

**Regional Advisory Committee
Accountability System Design Meeting
Small Group Activity #2**

<u>Consequences of Status</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Growth</u>	<u>Consequences of Growth</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize districts that are consistently high performing. • Must accommodate the statewide variety of achievement levels. Currently, high performing schools have little room for growth. • Either status or growth are a limited measure of school effectiveness because one is only measuring approximately half of the student body in 2 subjects (grades 3-8 in math & communication arts). • Doesn't reflect gains demonstrated by lower-achieving districts—how do you get credit when low start? Based upon where you start. Norm-ref. assess=balance. • Status is important to allow school districts to have a gauge how they compare to other districts. • Schools that could never attain status. What is the threshold to achieve status? • It will stretch some districts to focus on growth. • AYP, Bubble kids, Snap shot. • Systems separate districts along socio-economic lines. 	<p style="text-align: center;">15% 40% 40% 50% 20% 50% 50% 40% 40% 50% 60% 70% 50% 60% 40%</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">85% 60% 60% 50% 80% 50% 50% 60% 60% 50% 40% 30% 50% 40% 60% 100%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth works well for consistent cohort measures like MAP; not as well for things like ACT. • We believe “growth” should receive greater emphasis than status. However, both status and growth should be used in combination. • While low status schools will struggle to meet purely status based metrics. • In either status or growth, how do we recognize the arts, PE, CTE—the whole child? • High achieving districts, less room for growth—now TRULY vert. aligned assess.—can't measure G at high school or K-3. • Growth hits all children. This is a wonderful example of our #1 goal of all students continue to improve. • Is this the new growth model or will we take progress into account as measured under the current system? • How would 9-12 buildings implement growth model? Could the school be on the growth model until status is achieved?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It depends on where your community is <u>now</u> as to how you view this—one size does not fit all! • Should qualify one or the other. • Difficult to make a determination. • Definitions & contexts are unclear. • + progress—use all 3, but differentiate based upon baseline results (i.e., start high, more credit for status, start low, more credit for G & Prog.). 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low socioeconomic—highly diverse student body schools would have difficulty meeting standards highly based on status measurements. • Some may never reach the high level of status. • Already doing good difficult to make higher. • Doesn't include individual student potential for learning set a <u>reasonable level</u> of proficiency. • Status is important but growth is slightly more. • Acknowledge districts that meet a standard. • Could cause districts to be content with "good enough". • Limits learning. • Diminishes inspiration & teaching. • Limits teacher learning. • Treats every child the same no matter the individual backgrounds, interests or abilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We want a combination that takes progress as currently measured into account. • Common core—could be interconnected to Differentiated Accountability. • Oppositional. • Until you reach a point of status (high level) where it begins to change to 70-30 and then 80-20. If you fall back below high status you go back to 60-40. Growth should also be judged in these terms on the lower end. • Key point: is this an "or" or an "and"? Can a district meet by doing either or must they show both? As a practical matter, it is impossible to indefinitely do both. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will reward some districts that are working to grow student by student. Explaining results to stakeholders because it would be different than it is currently. • Multiple Data Points—multiple measures. • Example—Graduation Rate—most important overall—how to compare 10-30 ____ and 90-94 improvement—overall—both important. Tiering system based on school district size—rural—urban. • Districts that continually perform well will be penalized for not meeting a growth "standard" if growth is more important than status. • High performing schools have less of an area to grow. • Higher you are the harder it is to grow. • Need to measure a variety of growth other than test score such as course offerings. • Growth. • Can't have growth without a status.. • Acknowledge districts that don't meet a standard, yet show improvement. • Allow "met" without actually meeting a minimum standard. • Difficult to maintain growth if a high standard is met. • What happens at the end of high school when the low student has grown but not grown enough to be prepared for life after high school.
--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• High performing schools smaller increments.• Can a high achieving school remain high achieving without growth?• Doesn't match the proposed assessment program.• Must include diagnostic testing at the beginning of the year to provide individual teachers the data needed to teach towards a growth model.
--	--	---

<u>Consequences of Differentiated Accountability</u>	<u>Differentiated</u>	<u>Standardized</u>	<u>Consequences of Standardized Accountability</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will include free & reduced? SPED? ELL? Ethic group? • End of H.S. exam—if testing all through H.S. then why another one? • Expensive to manage. • High expectations for all, but flexibility in pathways to achieve those expectations. • It would be useful, at least for information purposes, to provide districts comparative data based on peer group comparison. • Do we really want to establish expect. based upon student demog.? Sending wrong message. • Differentiated accountability allows for student growth. ELL assessments of their needs. Specl to their needs. Important to meet the needs of all learners. • All districts have different demographics & needs; those characteristics should be taken into account as they affect achievement. All districts do not begin in the same place. • What does differentiated look like when comparing rural, urban & suburban? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70% 80% 70% 10% 80% 60% 30% 5%-40% 60% 100% 20% 25% 30% 30% 75% 60% 100% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30% 20% 30% 90% 20% 40% 70% 95%-60% 40% 80% 75% 70% 70% 25% 40% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One size doesn't fit all. • Small districts are disadvantaged in several ways: small numbers of students means a very small number of students can drastically change percentages—and small districts just cannot marshal the resources to provide advanced courses, etc. • An accountability check—a check & gauge system for how we compare to others. • There are standards that we agree are needed & that are good for all learners. Those standards should be measured for all schools. • Does one standard meet the needs of all? Is this the way we would treat kids? Hasn't the common core been adopted? • Allows for clarity & consistency—reinforces the established practices. • Everyone learns at same rate. • Competencies—what do the kids need to know? • 14 standards currently. • One size fits all problem—disproportion of sizes, problems & resources. • <u>Standards are crucial.</u> • Standardized is black & white—some schools will never reach higher levels. • Would be fair.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers need to believe in what you're doing & buy in to make anything work. • In context of differentiated for students with individual needs—feel very important; not sure how this impacts the system as a whole—also, size matters. • Do not diff. based upon student factors—demog. Differentiate as described above. • Could be interconnected to Consequences of Status.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for adequate variances within districts. Makes success attainable for all. • More complicated—higher and lower expectations. • Number of IEP students—difficult to administer. • Competencies? • Harder to understand—very difficult to administer. • Difficult to execute—modify to specific situations? • Could be an excuse to lower expectations & cut what some don't consider "core" subjects (not assessable). • Must be heavily differentiated to fairly measure performance of widely diverse population and school throughout state. • Fair & based on student achievement. Keeping in mind of schools w/30 students whom have a high population of Free & Reduced compared to a school with a population of 3,000—take special care & more explanation on non-testing & APR criteria. • Hard to measure, confusion in the public & teachers—more cost. • Lack of consistency. • Alternatives for subgroups. • How can you fairly eval. • Standard is the floor. • Need to change the structures too. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very difficult to distinguish—important on BOTH. • Bonus given (incentives) for above and beyond the standard (not a punitive system)—example—flat tax vs. current system. • Different ways & at different rates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting a standard so students can compete in global society. • Penalty of subgroups—some items need to be standardized. • Does not meet ALL student needs. • Everything we're doing is accountable but diff. is. • Can't put all students or districts into the same mold. • Sets a bar for everyone to strive to meet. • Less meaningful. • Smaller districts hurt by student demograph & movement. • More cost effective. • Discourages continuous improvement. • Less student can be successful. • Less districts can meet target. • Districts/students become hopeless. • Assumes that all students will demonstrate mastery of the standards in the same modality in the same amount of time.
--	---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Creates a very complex measurement tool.• Allows the ability to meet individual student or district needs.• People will say its watered down.• More expensive.• Harder for parents to understand.• More students & districts can be successful.• May cause stakeholders to perceive bias because tests are different.• More complex to administer—more labor intensive—more costly.		
--	--	--

<u>Consequences of Simple/Transparent Systems</u>	<u>Simple/Transparent</u>	<u>Complex/Precise</u>	<u>Consequences of Complex/Precise Systems</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have to be able to explain outcome & foundation in simple terms. • Simple accountability systems are likely to be less valid and even flawed, leading to wrong decisions. • Not clear what this means. NCLB is simple in that all groups must meet the same target. However, not transparent. • Parent being able to clearly examine student growth. In parent-friendly language. • NCLB. • The system must be sufficiently complex for educators to understand the opportunities for their students, but sufficiently simple for parents to understand what is happening in the school. • It's difficult to assign percentages to such broad, potentially nebulous concepts. • Is the data clearly in front of you? • Districts—cross sharing of complex & transparent best practices. • Simple is not always transparent—complex is not always precise. 	<p>50%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>20%</p> <p>20%</p> <p>75%</p> <p>40%</p> <p>40%</p> <p>10%</p> <p>10%</p> <p>30%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>25%</p>	<p>50%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>100%</p> <p>80%</p> <p>80%</p> <p>100%</p> <p>25%</p> <p>60%</p> <p>60%</p> <p>90%</p> <p>100%</p> <p>90%</p> <p>70%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>75%</p> <p>100%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data calculations must be complex to be effective (complex is not necessarily precise). • Multiple measures clearly explained. • You can take a complex system and report its results simply—for instance the APR scoring guide is fairly complex but we report to the public met/not met (9 on 14 standards) & that's all. • To be fair must be complex. Can be complex and transparent—especially if student demog. are not part of regression. • Education is complex! We must have a complex measure to review all areas of complexity. • APR. • The system will be complex and can be transparent while being precise. A differentiated model will be complex. • General public would have difficulty understanding. • Same for this one!—need to make sure the public can have a clear understanding of reports, etc. • Complex can be simplified. • Clarity difficult to general public. • It is complex & we can't expect everyone to understand we don't understand all medical, law, etc.—loses importance.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently too complex yet all the variables need to be recognized for their impact. • Given our consequences. • Sufficiently complex to credit schools for progress, but transparent enough so that there are no hidden measurements or standards—public can understand. • Complex and transparent. 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels as though it is simplifying for the clarity of the public even though it is not beneficial to schools. • Does not accurately measure a districts needs and/or progress or assessment. • Too much red tape & time & money—more hoops to jump through—doesn't adequately measure. • Easier to understand. Less valid. • Apply common sense. • Standards. • Community/kids need to understand system. • Desirable for everyone to understand the tool and how they're measured. • Limits differentiation. • Easy to understand. • Can be simple & still be precise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority feels system will need to be complex to be able to measure diverse population in Missouri. • If <u>properly</u> designed it <u>can be both</u>—need a <u>parent accountability system</u>/component. • Local control. • Needs to be simpler but IS complex—complex systems don't need. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More accurately depicts student achievement. Allows educator to focus on areas that need improvement. • Fear of <u>too many</u> variables, too difficult to control. • Have many layers in place already—must be able to be explained to general public. • Takes more time to explain. • Gives the ability for differentiation. • Hard for everyone to know what they're trying to do. • Difficult to understand.
--	--	---

<u>Consequences of Focused Department Resources</u>	<u>Focused Resources</u>	<u>Resources for All</u>	<u>Consequences of Department Resources for All</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that low but not lowest will really struggle with design. • We want required resources only for the lowest 5%—focused, differentiated support for the neediest districts. • Flexibility to have focus in terms of resources for struggling districts (eg. form Prof. Dev. Support). • Would focused resources be taken from other districts? Are there current resources already dedicated for school districts? As resources increase, what if results don't increase? • No stigma is needed for focused resources. If a district is successful at not being a SIG and/or priority school system, then we lose funding. • Some get a lot/some get less • Focused—where its needed the most, it should come with marked improvement—growth & differentiation (resources will be focused). • Not equitable. • Someone will be left out. • Local control of spending resources 	<p>25% 5% 80% 70% 20% 50% 70% 80%</p> <p>10% 95% 60% 40% 75% 50%</p>	<p>75% 95% 20% 30% 80% 50% 30% 20%</p> <p>100% 90% 5% 40% 60% 25% 50% 100%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to support those who struggle—not waste & by spreading too thin. • Have to support especially small districts so they don't <u>become</u> struggling. • We want resources (PD, assessment & curriculum support, etc.)—AVAILABLE—to all at their request, including geographic distribution. • Not fair for low-achieving districts to receive all funds. If all are to achieve equal funding is needed! • The RPDC's allow us to provide supports statewide; therefore, sustaining the RPDCs is one way to provide resources for all. • All districts need a certain level of support. RPDCs are valued in state. • Those that need it most don't benefit. • Not be equitable based on size of districts. • Poor performing & economic districts suffer. • This would be a dream—split the pot too much. • Spread too thin—too little money to meet the needs. • Accountability—resources spread too thin to benefit all. • Must have RPDC support for districts to show C.I.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intense help for those who need it in a way that they agree that they need it. • Made with assumption this doesn't impact foundation formula. • It would help if resources were more clearly defined. • All schools need resources. However, mandated resources/assist. should only be for low-performing. • Is this a change in basic funding? Tying accountability to funding? 		

<p>based upon local needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accountability. • Time most needed for those with most need. • Gives the ability to provide support where it is most needed. • Rewards poor performance. • Districts are not treated equally. All districts have needs and should be able to request resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We believe that a combination is needed if we want all schools to improve. • Can't come w/higher degrees of accountability than others. • To keep pool from thinning based on what districts need. • Group agrees it is important that all schools receive similar resources to "level" the playing field. • Give local control. • Staff development. • Do you HAVE resources—"Time". • Resources are more than just dollars! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline of support for all. • Some districts don't need much support, so this would be misdirected. • Everyone gets a share of the pot. • Not able to target limited resources in perceived high needs areas.
--	--	---