School Performance Grade Redesign

Operation Polaris Testing and Accountability Advisory Group

January 31, 2023
Agenda Overview

- Welcome and Process Update
- Next Steps for Model
- Multiple Measure Model Review and Discussion
- Growth/Proficiency Ratio Discussion
- Advocacy Discussion
- Process Next Steps
School Performance Grade Redesign Timeline

September ’21 - August ‘22
Operation Polaris - Testing & Accountability Committee Formed, Research on Multiple Measures

September ’22 - November ’22
Advisory Group Convenes Monthly, Stakeholder Engagement (Survey + Feedback Sessions), New Measures Identified

December ’22 - January ‘23
New Measures Examined by Content Experts, Advisory Group Considers New Criteria for School Performance Grades

January ‘23
Policy Recommendations Shared with General Assembly

’23-'24 School Year
New Measures Potentially Piloted, Data Collection Processes Refined

RESEARCH

DESIGN

IMPLEMENTATION
Statewide Stakeholder Engagement

• NC School Board Association
• Superintendent Quarterly Meeting
• Public Information Officers
• NCPAPA
• RESA Meetings – Superintendents
• Charter School Leadership
• Chief Academic Officers
• AIM Conference - Office Hours
• Testing and Growth Advisory
• AIG Regional Leadership
• Teacher Leadership Council
• Governors’ Teacher Advisory Council
SPG Model Next Steps
PART IV. STUDY AND EVALUATION OF SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT SCORES AND METRICS

SECTION 4.(a) The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall study (i) school achievement, growth, achievement scores, and grades awarded pursuant to G.S. 115C-83.15 and (ii) school performance indicators for compliance with federal law pursuant to G.S. 115C-83.16. The Superintendent shall report the results of the study to the House Committee on Education – K-12, the Senate Committee on Education/Higher Education, and the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on or before April 15, 2023. The report shall include the following:

1. Any efforts by the Department of Public Instruction to review the statewide model of evaluating school achievement, growth, achievement scores, and grades.

2. The results of any research regarding external school accountability systems in states comparable to North Carolina and how those states were determined to be comparable.

SECTION 4.(b) On or before February 15, 2024, the Department of Public Instruction shall submit a report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on suggested changes to the school evaluation model used in Part 1B of Article 8 of Chapter 115C of the General Statutes. The report shall include at least the following:

1. Potential indicators to be considered when evaluating schools.

2. The impact of potential indicators on school performance metrics and compliance with federal law.

3. Recommendations and suggested legislation for the General Assembly to consider if there are changes to the methodology behind awarding scores and grades pursuant to G.S. 115C-83.15 or performance indicators pursuant to G.S. 115C-83.16.
Process Update on Indicators

• Data from stakeholder discussions reviewed for levels of agreeance.

• Based upon discussions some indicators were collapsed to provide more aligned metrics.

• Indicators with little agreeance were removed from the model or collapsed into other categories.

• Indicators with little to no valid and reliable measurement were removed from the model.
School Performance Grades

Potential Indicators
Extended High School Graduation Rate

**Definition:** The percentage of students who graduate within five years (adjusted cohort graduation rate).

**Indicator Type:** Required

**Existing Data System:** Yes

**State or Federal Model:** Possibly Both

Note: This is in addition to the adjusted 4-year cohort rate.

Academic Indicator
Improving Student Group Performance

**Definition:** Increase in student group achievement from previous year (Options: Level 3, Level 4, Change in Academic Achievement Level, Change in Percentile).

**Indicator Type:** Required

**Existing Data System:** Yes

**State or Federal Model:** Possibly Both

---

Academic Indicator

---

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Postsecondary Outcomes – Employed, Enlisted, Enrolled

**Definition:** Number of graduating students who enlist, enroll, or are employed postsecondary.

**Indicator Type:** Required

**Existing Data System:** No

**State or Federal Model:** Possibly Both

**Applicable Grade Span**

- Elementary School
- Middle School
- High School

Academic Indicator
Postsecondary Preparation Inputs

**Definition:**
- **Elementary:** Number of students participating in career exploration opportunities;
- **Middle:** Number of students completing Career Development Plans;
- **High:** Number of students who earn at least one credit in AP, IB, CIE, CCP, Inherently Honors Courses (Arts, CTE, World Language, etc.), Work-based Learning;
  
  *(For all: Percentage of unduplicated students)*

**Indicator Type:** Required

**Existing Data System:** Yes

**State or Federal Model:** Possibly Both
Extra/Intra-Curricular Activities

**Definition:** The percentage of students who participate in extracurricular or intra-curricular (non-course credit) activities (unduplicated).

**Indicator Type:** Required

**Existing Data System:** No

**State or Federal Model:** State
Durable Skills

**Definition:** Identified qualities cited in Portrait of a Graduate; possibly a subset.

**Indicator Type:** Choice

**Existing Data System:** No

**State or Federal Model:** State
Chronic Student Absenteeism

Definition: The percentage of students whose absences exceed 10% of days in membership.

Indicator Type: Choice

Existing Data System: Yes

State or Federal Model: State

Applicable Grade Span
- Elementary School
- Middle School
- High School

School Quality Indicator
School Climate

**Definition:** Outcomes of student, parent, and teacher surveys of parent engagement and satisfaction, teacher effectiveness, and school safety, environment and cleanliness.

**Indicator Type:** Choice

**Existing Data System:** No

**State or Federal Model:** State
Group Discussion

What Resonates?
Initial concerns?
Proficiency v. Growth

• Consistently, feedback has supported changing the weights for proficiency and growth.
  – Emphasis on achievement had a significant impact on distribution of school performance grades, both prior to and during COVID
  – Compared to other states, North Carolina has more D/F schools
• Examining adjusting the current weights (80/20) to 70/30, 60/40 or 50/50
Modeling Growth

Count of schools earning As, Bs, Is, Ds, and Fs when the formula is 20% growth and 80% achievement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bs</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cs</td>
<td>1,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ds</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSs</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of students by school performance grade and percentage of Economically Disadvantaged Students (EDS):

- **0 - 25% (low poverty)**
  - As: 150,955
  - Bs: 212,256
  - Cs: 325,606
  - Ds: 90,092
- **26 - 50%**
- **51 - 75%**
- **76 - 100% (high poverty)**

https://tinyurl.com/SPGgrowth
Growth & Proficiency Weighting Discussion
Lunch
Advocacy Discussion

What do you see as the core principles of this work?

How will you continue to share this work with your stakeholders?

To support your advocacy, what does the agency need to provide you?
NCDPI - Next Steps

• Provide updates to advisory group.
• Explore accountability model options.
• Conduct in-depth studies of selected indicators:
  • Implications of implementation
  • Weighting of indicators
  • Reliability/Validity of indicators
• Convene superintendent and charter leader advisory group.
• Continued conversations with General Assembly.
Thank You