School Performance Grade Redesign

Advisory Group Meeting
October 17, 2022
Welcome and Overview

Agenda Overview

• Work-to-date and meeting overview
• Data framing
• Survey data review
• Small group discussion
• Share out
• Next steps and conversation guide
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

IMPLEMENTATION

’23-’24 School Year
New Measures Potentially Piloted, Data Collection Processes Refined
Work-to-Date Recap

• Advisory Group meeting input for 5th Grade Outcomes
• Codified September 12, 2022
Work-to-Date Recap

• Developed stakeholder survey in partnership with EdNC
• Communicated survey to stakeholders
• Analyzed survey data
• Met with key stakeholders to solicit feedback
Data Quality Considerations

Diana B. Lys, EdD
Assistant Dean
Data Quality

For assessment and accreditation purposes, these are foundational elements for developing a robust and trustworthy data assurance system.
Validity

The extent to which a set of operations, test, or other assessment measures what it is intended to measure.

Validity is not a property of a data set but refers to the appropriateness of instruments and inferences from test scores or other forms of assessment and the credibility of the interpretations that are made concerning the findings of a measurement effort.

Reliability

The degree to which test scores for a group of test takers are consistent for repeated evaluations of a measurement procedure. A measure is said to have a high reliability if it produces consistent results under consistent conditions, and for multiple evaluators.
Representative and Cumulative

**Representative**: The extent to which a measure or result is typical of an underlying situation or condition, not an isolated case.

**Cumulative**: in EPPs, we consider measures of candidate performance across successive administrations.

Measures gain credibility as additional sources or methods for generating evidence of performance are employed. Triangulating with multiple measures helps guard against the inevitable flaws associated with any one approach.
Differentiation and Actionable

**Differentiation**: Able to disaggregate into meaningful unit or sub-groups.

**Actionable**: Sufficiently detailed and relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.
EdNC Survey: "Redesigning NC's School Performance Grades"

- 9 items: Overall feedback on School Performance Measures: Agree-Disagree-Unsure
- 22 items: In addition to student test scores, the following indicators should be used to measure school quality: Yes-No-Unsure
- 1 item: additional ideas about what should be considered when Redesigning N.C.'s School Performance Grades: Open Ended Item
- Participants with at least one response: 19,160
- Comments: 4,884
Preliminary Data Analysis

- Survey forced-option responses analyzed by role
- Open-ended comments analyzed by role and then using existing, initial, and emerging indicator codes for first ~2000 comments
## Results: Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business/industry</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 District leader</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 School leader/principal</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Teacher</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>41.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None given</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/guardian/grandparent</td>
<td>6,128</td>
<td>31.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/local government</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>5.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/college faculty/staff</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,160</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Feedback on Model

**Highest** agreement across roles:

- The North Carolina legislature needs to reform school performance grades.
- K-12 schools should have different measures of success for elementary, middle, and high schools.
- Some level of standardized testing is necessary to understand how students are doing.
- School performance grades should include measures beyond test scores and student growth.
Results: Indicators of School Quality Beyond Test Scores

**Highest** agreement for "Yes" in total and across roles:

- Courses offered outside of core academics (i.e., arts, world languages, career and technical education)
- Durable skills (i.e., communication, collaboration, critical thinking, creativity, persistence)
- High school graduation rate
- School climate (overall social and learning climate)
- School safety (i.e., incidents of school crime, violence, school resource officer)
Results: Indicators of School Quality Beyond Test Scores

High agreement for "Yes" in total and across roles:

- Advanced or honors courses offered
- Closing gaps between different student groups
- Earning college credit in high school (i.e., Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Career and College Promise, Community College)
- Innovative teaching and learning practices (i.e., Project-Based Learning, Competency-Based Education, Digital Learning, Virtual or Blended Courses)
- School environment/cleanliness
- Teacher attendance/absenteeism
- Work-based learning experiences (i.e., internships, apprenticeships)
- Workforce credentials or industry-based certifications
Results: Priority Indicators

Most agreement for **fewest** "Yes" in total and across roles:

- Discipline (suspensions and expulsions)
- Entrance exams (College: ACT, PSAT, SAT; Career: WorkKeys; Military: ASVAB)
- Health of students (physical fitness, mental health, social-emotional health)
- Per pupil expenditures
Results: Open-Ended Items

Teacher Comments

Parent Comments
Results: Open-Ended Items

Top codes for Comments

• Growth is important
• Equity/demographic considerations
• Teacher effectiveness/retention/job satisfaction
Data Next Steps

Data Collection
  • Stakeholder Engagement Sessions

Data Analysis
  • Survey forced-option responses analyzed by region
  • Final 2,800 open-ended comments analyzed by role and using existing and emerging indicator codes
  • 2022 Teacher Working Conditions Survey
  • Stakeholder Engagement Session Notes
Small Group Discussions + Process

Academic Indicators

Non-Traditional Academic Indicators

School Quality Indicators

Short Data Review
5 Minutes

Facilitated Group Discussion
15 Minutes
Small Group Discussions

The current formula for school performance grades, which is calculated using a weight of 80 percent student achievement and 20 percent student growth, should remain in place.

Some level of standardized testing is necessary to understand how students are doing.

K-12 teachers and schools should be evaluated by an equal combination of student achievement - i.e. test scores - and student growth - i.e. growth in a students' test scores from year to year.
## Small Group Discussions

### Academic Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced or honors courses offered</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning college credit in high school (i.e., Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Career and College Promise, Community College)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance exams (College: ACT, PSAT, SAT; Career: WorkKeys; Military: ASVAB)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing gaps between different student groups</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the big takeaways from the survey results?

Of the highly ranked indicators, which are within schools’ locus of control?

Which indicators identified in the survey show a school’s quality?
# Small Group Discussions

## Non-Traditional Academic Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-based learning experiences (i.e., internships, apprenticeships)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intracurricular activities (i.e., JROTC, DECA, Future Farmers of America, SkillsUSA, etc)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce credentials or industry-based certifications</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary pathways (i.e., enrolled (2-year/community college, 4-year/university); employed; enlisted)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Small Group Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Traditional Academic Indicators</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses offered outside of core academics (i.e., arts, world languages, career and technical education)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student attendance/absenteeism</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative teaching and learning practices (i.e., Project-Based Learning, Competency-Based Education, Digital Learning, Virtual or Blended Courses)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduation rate</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Small Group Discussions

What are the big takeaways from the survey results?

Of the highly ranked indicators, which are within schools’ locus of control?

Which indicators identified in the survey show a school’s quality?
## Small Group Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Quality Indicators</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School safety (i.e., incidents of school crime, violence, school resource officer)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline (i.e., suspensions and expulsions)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher attendance/absenteeism</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School environment/cleanliness</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School climate (overall social and learning climate)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Quality Indicators</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular activities (i.e., clubs, athletics, afterschool program)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per pupil expenditures</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable skills (i.e., communication, collaboration, critical thinking, creativity, persistence)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent engagement/satisfaction</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health of students (i.e., physical fitness, mental health, social-emotional health)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the big takeaways from the survey results?

Of the highly ranked indicators, which are within schools’ locus of control?

Which indicators identified in the survey show a school’s quality?
Group Share Out

• What excited you?
• What surprised you?
• What do you have questions about?
Conversation Guide

Includes:
• Talking Points
• Data Slides
• Conversation Questions

Redesigning School Performance Grades Advisory Group
Conversation Guide

Background
School performance grades (SPG) were first implemented using data from the 2013–14 school year. Reporting an A–F grade for each school in the state, the model consists of achievement indicators (80%) and a growth measure (20%). Since implementation, feedback has indicated the weighting of the indicators and the emphasis on test scores does not reflect the broader context of school quality in North Carolina. Most recently, this was evident in the release of the 2021–22 school year’s school performance grades where the impact of lower test scores yielded higher Ds and Fs. Schools worked diligently to provide strong instructional settings for students during the pandemic, but the school performance grades did not reflect the schools’ successes. This supported a review of the purpose and the methodology of the system.

Process for Gathering Input on SPG Redesign
Operation Polaris, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Catherine Truitt’s four-year strategic vision aimed at improving outcomes for NC students, includes a goal for developing a multi-measure accountability model that moves beyond compliance with federal guidelines and represents North Carolina’s educational values. Led by Dr. Michael Maher, an advisory group that is composed of representatives from external stakeholders met on September 12, 2022, to begin a discussion of possible indicators for a robust accountability model that goes beyond test scores. The goal of the advisory group is to develop recommendations for the General Assembly to consider in the upcoming long-session that convenes in January 2023.

At its October 17, 2022, meeting, the advisory group reviewed input from a publicly available
Next Steps

- Review Survey Data
- Consult with Peers
- Complete Individual Survey

Next Meeting November 7, 2022 11:00AM-1:00PM (Virtual)
Thank you!

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction