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Mechanisms of Accountability

- Public reporting function
- Features important indicators of school quality

- Educational effectiveness function
- Measures reflect highest priorities
- Directs levels of support/intervention (school improvement)

- Essential elements of schools function
- Ensures necessary resources are in place
## Virginia’s Draft Accreditation Matrix: Academic Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>PROPOSED VA ACCRED</th>
<th>REQUIRED IN ESSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement on Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Rates on State Assessments*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Gaps*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth/Progress <em>elementary and middle</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner Progress</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduation/School Progress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Indicator* *high school</td>
<td>Yes (GCI)</td>
<td>Yes (FGI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Out Rates <em>(e.g., 3-year cohort rate, grades 6-9 and 4-year cohort rate, grades 9-12)</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College &amp; Career Readiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; Career Readiness Index</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ESSA requires that these indicators be measured for all students and reporting groups (major racial/ethnic, students with disabilities, disadvantaged, English learners)
‡ At least one indicator of school quality is required for ESSA.

Note: GCI = Graduation Completion Index; FGI = Federal Graduation Indicator
### Virginia’s Draft Accreditation Matrix: Opportunities to Learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Performance Ratings</th>
<th>PROPOSED VA ACCRED</th>
<th>REQUIRED IN ESSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Participation &amp; Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism (e.g., absent 10% or more of school year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Discipline (e.g., short-term suspensions for most frequently reported incidents or disproportionality of short-term suspensions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ At least one indicator of school quality is required for ESSA.
Process Moving Forward

1. Identify high-priority indicators for accreditation
2. Define quality metric for each indicator
3. Define school-level benchmarks for current year achievement and progress
4. Define performance levels for schools based on benchmarks across indicators
5. Define criteria to identify schools for targeted support and intervention based on school performance levels
Process for Defining School Performance Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Performance Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setting Benchmarks:

- ✔ Scientific studies on meaningful cut points
- ✔ Models from other states
- ✔ Analysis of Virginia’s data for patterns and trends

Testing Benchmarks:

- ✔ “What if?” data modeling scenarios
- ✔ Validity checks
- ✔ Relationship with other drivers of school performance
Process for Defining School Performance Benchmarks

• Important questions:
  • Does the benchmark reflect our values and expectations?
    • Aspirational goals versus continuous improvement
  • What are the unintended consequences?
  • How will we know if we are moving in the right direction?
Benchmark Selection Example: Chronic Absenteeism

• **Scientific studies:**
  - Defining chronic absenteeism: absent 10% or more of the school year for any reason (approximately 18 days)
  - Defining improvement in chronic absenteeism: 10% decrease in rate per year

Benchmark Selection Example: Chronic Absenteeism

- **States that currently use chronic absenteeism as an indicator in accountability systems:**
  - Hawaii: schools are divided into performance quintiles based on previous year’s chronic absenteeism rate
  - New Hampshire: four school performance levels set at 5% or less chronically absent students, 6-10%, 11-20%, and greater than 20%
  - Connecticut: index system where schools earn points based on rate’s proximity to state goal of 5% or less
  - Wisconsin: index system where points are deducted if school rate exceeds state goal of 13% or less
Benchmark Selection Example: Chronic Absenteeism

Three-Year Chronic Absenteeism Rate, 2015-2016 (All Virginia Schools)

- Average: 22.29%
- Standard Deviation: 9.42%

Three-Year Chronic Absenteeism Rate, 2015-2016 (Outliers Removed)

- Average: 21.92%
- Standard Deviation: 8.28%

Source: Virginia Department of Education Student Record Collection, 2015-2016
Benchmark Selection Example: Chronic Absenteeism

Three-Year Change in Chronic Absenteeism Rate, 2015-2016 (All Virginia Schools)
- Average: 1.70%
- Standard Deviation: 22.73%

Number of Schools

Change in Rate of Chronic Absenteeism

Three-Year Change in Chronic Absenteeism Rate, 2015-2016 (Outliers Removed)
- Average: 3.24%
- Standard Deviation: 18.60%

Number of Schools

Change in Rate of Chronic Absenteeism

Source: Virginia Department of Education Student Record Collection, 2015-2016
Benchmark Selection Example: Chronic Absenteeism

• What if? scenarios
  • Quartiles based on current year data
    • Pros: Easier to understand
    • Cons: No defined goal; Assumes average rate is acceptable
  • Goal of 5% or less
    • Pros: Sets standard for state
    • Cons: Unrealistic benchmark; Does not account for improvement
  • High benchmark and improvement
    • Pros: Sets a standard that will drive improvement
    • Cons: Dual metric adds complexity in interpretation
Benchmark Selection Example: Chronic Absenteeism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Level 1 Exemplar</th>
<th>Level 2 Monitor</th>
<th>Level 3 Guiding</th>
<th>Level 4 Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT Criteria</td>
<td>3-year rate is less than 10% of all students enrolled</td>
<td>3-year rate is between 10% and 15% of all students enrolled OR rate decreased by more than 10% across a three year average</td>
<td>3-year rate is between 15% and 25% of all students enrolled OR rate decreased between 5% and 10% across a three year average</td>
<td>3-year rate is 25% or more of all students enrolled AND rate increased or decreased less than 5% across a three year average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benchmark Selection Example: Chronic Absenteeism

- **Relationship with other drivers of school performance:**
  - Chronic absenteeism rate and rate of economically disadvantaged students are strongly correlated
  - However, Level 4 schools reflect the full range of student poverty

**Distribution of Economically Disadvantaged Students Among Schools Identified for Intervention on Chronic Absenteeism Indicator**

Source: Virginia Department of Education Student Record Collection, 2015-2016
Progress update on future considerations:

- Piloting school climate survey in Spring 2017 with select schools participating in Virginia Tiered Systems of Support cohorts
  - Student Participation and Engagement
  - Parent/Community Engagement
  - Teacher Engagement

- Teacher Effectiveness: Following implementation studies in other states and examining Virginia’s current guidelines

- School Leadership: Examining other state models of measurement