

Three Systems of Accountability

SEPTEMBER 2019 STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING

Understanding Michigan's Current Accountability Landscape

I. The Parent Dashboard for School Transparency

- Co-developed with the SBE through the ESSA process
- Launched in January 2018
- Provides large amounts of information to parents in a transparent way without assigning labels or judgments, to allow parental choice in which factors are important

II. The Michigan School Index System

- Developed through the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) process to produce a U.S. Department of Education approved accountability system
- Run for the first time in February 2018 with data from 2016-17
- Allows the MDE to identify schools in need of additional supports through the Partnership District Model

III. P.A. 601 (“A-F Law”) passed in December 2018; in development now

I. Celebrating the Parent Dashboard for School Transparency

Over 1.5 million views in 18 months

Easy to use and versatile search functions (text- and map-based)

School performance presented with context to similar schools and the state

Large amounts of information on schools' services and offerings (e.g. clubs, sports, services for English learners and students with disabilities)

The dashboard allows parents to decide which factors are most important to them, to receive accurate and clear data on those topics, and to make their own judgments.

II. Michigan School Index System

The Michigan School Index System was developed to comply with the accountability requirements set forth in the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015.

Schools receive credit in each area based on the degree to which the school meets its targets.

Schools receive an overall index value, as well as index values for each individual area and student subgroup.

Index values can range from 0-100.

Schools with low index values are identified as one of three low-performing school types according to federal requirements specified in ESSA.

II. Michigan School Index System

Component	Weight
Student Growth	34%
Student Proficiency	29%
School Quality/Student Success*	14%
Graduation Rate	10%
English Learner Progress	10%
General Assessment Participation	2%
English Learner Participation	1%

*Includes: Chronic Absenteeism, Advanced Coursework, Postsecondary Enrollment, Access to Arts/Physical Education, and Access to Librarians/Media Specialists

III. P.A. 601: A - F

Public Act 601 signed into law December 2018

Legislation requirements include:

- Five annual letter grades and three ranking labels, as applicable, for all individual public schools
 - No summative grade/ranking
- Identification of lowest and highest achieving schools, and schools with consistently underperforming subgroups
- Alternative education campuses excluded from letter grades and rankings
- Peer review panel to review and submit findings to Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and state legislature

III. P.A. 601: Guiding Principles for Implementation

Implement the law. In many cases, P.A. 601 has prescriptive language and requirements.

In places where the law is not prescriptive:

- Reuse existing policies, practices, and procedures for school and district familiarity.

- Align as closely as possible to existing Parent Dashboard and School Index System.

- Make simple and understandable for parents and the general public.

III. P.A. 601: Buckets of Implementation Decisions

Bucket 1: Law: specified in PA 601

Bucket 2: Alignment with ESSA:

In the context of:

The Parent Dashboard

The School Index

Bucket 3: Decision-making discretion

III. P.A. 601: What is required to have a letter grade (A-F)?

A. Student proficiency in math and ELA (law)

- Students enrolled for a full academic year (Alignment with ESSA/Index)
- Single letter grade based on combined math and ELA performance (decision-making discretion)

III. P.A. 601: What is required to have a letter grade (A-F)?

B. Students' adequate growth in math and ELA (law)

- Based on student growth percentiles and adequate growth percentiles (law)
- Students enrolled for a full academic year (Alignment with ESSA/Index)
- Single letter grade based on combined math and ELA performance (decision-making discretion)

III. P.A. 601: What is required to have a letter grade (A-F)?

C. English learner growth (law)

- Based on the English language proficiency assessment (law)

III. P.A. 601: What is required to have a letter grade (A-F)?

D. Graduation rate (law)

- Using best of the 4-, 5-, or 6-year cohort rate (Alignment with ESSA/Index)

III. P.A. 601: What is required to have a letter grade (A-F)?

E. Student proficiency compared to similar schools (law)

- Reuse methodology currently in place on the Parent Dashboard (Alignment with ESSA/Index)
 - Up to 30 similar schools used to calculate an average
 - Characteristics used:
 - Student/Teacher Ratio
 - Percent of Economically Disadvantaged Students
 - Instructional Expenditures per Student
 - Headcount (Student FTE)
 - Schools filtered by grade spans, i.e. high school to high school
- Using the same methodology as the Parent Dashboard would allow the same comparisons across accountability systems

III. P.A. 601: What is required to have a “ranking label”?

Ranking labels (Significantly Above Average, Above Average, Average, Below Average, Significantly Below Average) assigned for the following: (law)

- Rate of chronically absent students (Alignment with ESSA/Index)
- Assessment participation rate (percentage assessed) (Alignment with ESSA/Index)
 - Single ranking label based on combined math and ELA participation rates (decision-making discretion)
- Student subgroup proficiency compared with corresponding statewide student subgroup proficiency (law)

III. P.A. 601: Determining Cuts for Letter Grades and Ranking Labels

The law requires that schools be assigned grades and labels (as discussed in previous slides)

Determining the “cut scores” for those grades and labels is decision-making discretion.

- A “cut score” can also be interpreted as the grading scale

How is a “cut score” determined?

1. Utilize a process to develop *recommended* cut scores

- Independent facilitator
- Educators develop recommended definitions, use data, and produce recommended cut scores/grading scales

2. Peer review panel reviews these proposed standards and writes report (Note: The law does not say “approve” but simply review.)

3. Approval of the cut scores (decision-making discretion)

III. P.A. 601: Other System Features

No summative letter grade or ranking label (not required in law)

- Schools receive up to five letter grades and three ranking labels

III. P.A. 601: Buckets of Implementation Decisions

Bucket 1: Law: specified in PA 601

Bucket 2: Alignment with ESSA:

In the context of:

The Parent Dashboard

The School Index

Bucket 3: Decision-making discretion

Summary of Decisions for P.A. 601

1. Combined math and ELA for one grade or separate? [Bucket 3 decision]
2. “Cut scores” for A-F grades and labels [Bucket 3 decision]
3. Keep alignment with ESSA and Parent Dashboard for calculation rules or have separate ones for the A-F system? [Bucket 2 decision]
4. Comparison of similar schools; keep the current Parent Dashboard methodology developed with the SBE or use a different one for this purpose only. [Bucket 2 decision]

Questions?

Venessa A. Keesler, Ph.D.

Deputy Superintendent, Division of Educator, Student, and School Supports

keeslerv@michigan.gov

Chris Janzer

Assistant Director for Accountability, Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability

janzerc@michigan.gov

For more information visit

The MDE Accountability website: www.Michigan.gov/mde-accountability