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New Accountability
Deeper Learning with Equity
NCLB Theory of Action

If we focus on school achievement, educators and policymakers will improve education

Strategies

- Require Annual Testing
- Set Targets for Improvement
- Identify Schools that Fail to Meet all Targets
- Implement School Consequences Under Waivers
- Tie Test Scores to Teacher Evaluation
What Were the Outcomes?

National Test Score Trends (NAEP)  
Pre- and Post-NCLB

- Post-NCLB: 7 point gain
- Pre-NCLB: 15 point gain
What About Higher Order Skills?
US Trends on PISA, 2000-2012
Why Haven’t Outcomes Improved More?

• State Tests Focused on Low – Level Skills
• No Incentives for Enriching Curriculum
• Drivers of Achievement Were Invisible
• Mandated Solutions Often Unhelpful
• Focus on Schools & Teachers Left Important Factors out of the Mix
  -- Inequality in School Resources
  -- Growing Poverty, Homelessness
  -- State / District policies
Can We Develop a More Productive Approach to Accountability?
An accountability system should:

1) encourage high-quality teaching and learning in all schools,
2) provide tools for continuous improvement, and
3) means for identifying and addressing problems that require correction.

Tests can offer information for an accountability system, but they do not by themselves create accountability.
Key Elements of an New Accountability System
In addition, accountability should...

1) Be *reciprocal*, with each level of the system taking responsibility for the contributions it must make to serve each child well;

2) Be designed to produce *continuous system improvement*;

3) Develop *system capacity* to provide good education;

4) Provide transparent and accessible information to the public;

5) Seek and reflect *student, parent, educator and community input*. 
A New Approach to Accountability:

If we focus on what matters for achievement, and require attention to continuous improvement, education will improve

**Strategies**

- Encourage a dashboard of indicators reflecting
  - Student success
  - Engagement
  - Opportunities to learn
- Require systems for school review and continuous improvement
- Require state / district attention to struggling schools and flexibility for interventions based on data
What kind of assessment?
ESSA – Testing Changes

• Tests must include “multiple up to date measures of student academic achievement, including measures that assess higher order thinking skills and understanding, which may include measures of student academic growth and may be partially delivered in the form of portfolios, projects, or extended performance tasks”

• Tests may be a single summative assessment or may be “multiple statewide interim assessments that result in a single summative score”

• States may apply for innovative assessment pilots

• Students are expected to be tested in English after 3 years in the country (not 10 months). This can be extended by up to 2 years if there is a determination that the student’s knowledge can be better evaluated in another language.
Assessment Continuum

Examples

- Traditional Tests
- CCSS Assessments (SBAC & PARCC)
- Performance Based Items & Tasks (MARS, BAM)
- Extended Performance Tasks (SCALE, EPIC, ILN)
- Student-Designed Projects (Envision, NY Performance Standards Consortium, Singapore, IB)

Descriptions

Narrow Assessment
- Standardized tests with m-c & open-ended items + short (1-2 day) performance tasks of some applied skills
- Systems of standardized performance items and tasks (1 day to 1 week) that measure key concepts in thought-provoking items that require extended problem solving
- Performance tasks that require students to formulate and carry out their own inquiries, analyze & present findings, and (sometimes) revise in response to feedback

Assessments of Deeper Learning
- Longer, deeper investigations, (2-3 months) & exhibitions, including graduation portfolios, requiring students to initiate, design, conduct, analyze, revise, and present their work in multiple modalities
Performance Assessment Resource Bank

Performance Tasks
Portfolio Frameworks
Learning Progressions
Assessment Literacy Tools

Performanceassessmentresourcebank.org
Rising Cost of a College Education

STUDENT INSTRUCTIONS

A. Task context:

You are a reporter for the *US News and World Report* magazine. (They are the ones who rank colleges). You have been tasked with writing an article about the rising cost of obtaining a college education. In order to be able to write the article you first need to collect and analyze data on the cost of a college education. You will be creating equations and graphs showing the rising cost of education at different types of colleges including an in-state college, a community college, an out-of-state college, and an Ivy League college. You will provide a short (500 - 750 words max) article on the rising cost of college education. It is recommended that you choose schools that are relevant to you. Are there schools that you might consider attending in the future that you might consider researching?
Multiple Measures Dashboards

What to Measure?

How to Use?
ESSA Required Measures

**Academic Achievement**
- English language arts and mathematics, 3-8 and once in HS
- Science, once in 3-5, 6-8, 10-12

**English Proficiency**
- Progress / gains in achieving English proficiency

**Another Academic Indicator**
- Another academic indicator in elementary school
- 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (states can add extended rate)

**At Least One Other Indicator**
- E.g. School climate; opportunity to learn; readiness for post-secondary
# Accountability Pillar Overall Summary

**Annual Education Results Reports - Oct 2008**

**Province: Alberta**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Measure Category</th>
<th>Measure Category Evaluation</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Measure Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: High Quality Learning Opportunities for All</td>
<td>Safe and Caring Schools</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Safe and Caring</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepares of Studies</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Quality</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drop Out Rate</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High School Completion Rate (18 yr)</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Excellence in Learner Outcomes</td>
<td>Student Learning Achievement (Grades K-6)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>PAT Accomplish</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAT Excellence</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Acceptable</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Exams Participation Rate (Gr. 1-6)</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science Improve Participation Rate</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science Exams Participation Rate (Gr. 1-3)</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transition Rate (8 yr)</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work Preparation</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Highly Responsive and Accountable Learning (Ministry)</td>
<td>Parental Involvement</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Parental Involvement</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Student Learning Achievement: PAT Values reported are the weighted average of PAT Accomplish and PAT Excellence results. Courses included: ELA (Grades 3, 5, 6, 8), Math (Grades 3, 5, 6, 8), Social Studies (Grades 6, 8), Science (Grades 5 and 8), French Language Arts (Grades 1-6, Grade 9), French Immersion (Grades 6, 8).
2. Student Learning Achievement: Diploma Exam Values reported are the average of Diploma Acceptable and Diploma Excellence results, weighted by the number of students enrolled in each course.
3. Overall results can only be calculated when improvement and achievement evaluations are available.
4. The ACOL measures are not evaluated as they are not part of the Accountability Pillar and are not included in the AERDR and 3 Year Education Plan reports.
5. Data values have been suppressed where the number of students is less than 8. Suppression is marked with an asterisk (*).
Multiple Measures: CA

**Student Achievement**
- SBAC Test Scores / Gains
- English Proficiency Gains
- Evidence of College & Career Readiness (e.g. AP, IB, dual credit)
- Performance Assessments

**Other Outcomes**
- Completion of a college or career ready pathway
- Completion of a workplace learning or community service experience

**Student Engagement**
- Attendance; chronic absenteeism
- Dropout rates
- Graduation rates
- Evidence from student surveys

**School Climate**
- Suspensions, Expulsions
- Student & Professional Supports (student, teacher, and parent surveys)

**Curriculum Access**
- Access to curriculum in the core academic subjects, STEM, the arts, and physical education

**Basic Services**
- Teacher Qualifications
- Access to materials
- Adequate Facilities

**Implementation of Common Core**
- Access to CCSS instructional practices
- Access to CCSS professional development

**Parent Involvement**
- Efforts to seek parental input
- Evidence of parent participation (parent surveys)
Graduation Rates and Growth
CORE’S Weighting System
School Quality Review
Support for Improvement

• Teams of expert educators trained to work with struggling schools
• School pairs and networks for learning
• Trained curriculum coaches
• Wraparound services, including extended learning after school and in summer
• School redesign initiatives based on research and best practices
Professional Capacity Building

• Teacher Leadership in PD for New Standards
  -- Teacher Leaders (Iowa)
  -- Subject Matter Networks (KY)
  -- Instructional Leadership Corps (CA)

• Teachers Involved in Design and Scoring of Performance Assessments (NH, CO)

• Educators Engaged in School Quality Reviews (VT)
Eyes on the Prize:
College, Career, and Civic Readiness
NH’S LEADING EDGE ASSESSMENT AND SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PILOT

Paul Leather, Deputy Commissioner, New Hampshire Department of Education

February 8, 2016
An Evolving National Model Of Accountability

1. Accountability 1.0, driven by NCLB
   Early state accountability systems

2. Accountability 2.0, driven by states and fueled by RTT and efforts to align to CCR

3. Accountability 3.0
   Examples of attributes:
   - Include best measures for full range of CCR knowledge and skills, including new assessment models;
   - Promote shifts in teaching and learning toward personalization, competency, project-based, etc.;
   - Balance and connect student outcome determinations to key inputs and diagnostic review to drive supports based on evidence

Credit: http://ccsso.org/
Accountability For Meaningful Learning In A 51st State – State and Local Partnership:

Locally selected assessments of student progress (Performance Assessments and others)

- State Validation Assessment
- State Validation Assessment
- Graduation Portfolio

Assessment Quality Assurance (reviews local assessment plans and delivery)

Disaggregated Data
Theory of Action – Professional learning
Links with school accountability

- Districts need to be tight on evaluating:
  - Student learning
  - Instructional improvement
  - The quality of professional learning

- This may require:
  - Change in accountability emphasis
  - Change in measures
  - Greater reliance on professional judgement
What is PACE? – Water Tower Proposal!

Geometry PACE Common Task

• **The Problem:** Your town’s population is predicted to increase over the next 3 years. As one of the town planners, you are asked to address this issue in terms of the town’s water supply. In order to meet the future needs of the town, you need to make a proposal to add a water tower somewhere on town property that will be capable of holding 45,000 ± 2,000 cubic feet of water. The town is looking for a water tower to contain the most amount of water while using the least amount of construction material.

• **Student Task:** Your job is to prepare a proposal that can be submitted to the town planning committee. Using your calculations of surface area and volume for the two designs, describe and analyze the characteristics that lead you to a final recommendation.
Solar Cooker

Task:

• **Essential Question:** How is energy transferred between places and converted between types?
• You are working for a company that wants to find affordable and environmentally-friendly ways to reduce the need for wood and charcoal when cooking.
• You have been tasked to create a device that uses renewable energy.
• You and a group will research, design, build, and test a solar cooker, applying everything you have learned about energy this past quarter.
• Your final goal is to change the temperature of a cup of water.

MS Science

Standards:

• **NGSS 4-PS3-2:** Make observations to provide evidence that energy can be transferred from place to place by sound, light, heat, and electric currents and **NGSS 4-PS3-4:** Apply scientific ideas to design, test, and refine a device that converts energy from one form to another.
• **NGSS 4-ESS3-1:** Obtain and combine information to describe that energy and fuels are derived from natural resources and their uses affect the environment. Standard calls for examples of renewable energy sources such as sunlight.
• **NGSS 4-PS3-4:** passive solar heater that converts light into heat example.
Why This Change?

- We need a more **intense** focus on maximizing student **learning**, **engagement**, and **outcomes**
- The old NCLB system focused admirably on **equity**, but **excellence** needs to be incentivized as well
- We need to create **space** for **innovating** approaches for moving from **good to great** while **studying** the implementation and results
- Provides an opportunity for **deep engagement** of our local **educators** and **leaders**, as well as **students**
Why PACE?

- Research on organizational change/reform and human learning supports the notion that real change/learning must be **internally motivated**
- “Drive (motivation) is fueled by a combination of **autonomy**, **mastery** and **purpose**.” (Daniel Pink)
- Yet, **current accountability** systems coming out of the NCLB era are all essentially **externally oriented**
- **PACE** provides an opportunity to shift to a more **internal orientation**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rochester</td>
<td>• Concord</td>
<td>• Allenstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sanborn</td>
<td>• Monroe</td>
<td>• Fall Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>• Pittsfield</td>
<td>• Plymouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Epping</td>
<td>• Seacoast Charter</td>
<td>• SAU 23 North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Souhegan HS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haverhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Manchester (Parker Varney and Gossler Park Elementary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rollinsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SAU 39 (Amherst and Mont Vernon)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engaging The US Department Of Education

March 27, 2012 1st Meeting with Arne Duncan

September 23, 2014 2nd Meeting with Arne

March 3, 2015 Approval!

Theory of Action → PD → Design → Implementation

NH Process
Engaging The US Department Of Education!

NATIONAL PARTNERS:
CCSSO
UKY--CIE
Linda Darling-Hammond,
SCOPE

NH TEAM:
Virginia Barry
Paul Leather
Scott Marion
Brian Blake
Ellen Hume-Howard
Nate Greenberg

USED TEAM:
Arne Duncan
Deb Delisle
Amy McIntosh
What Was NH’s Message?

- Local
- State
- Federal

Locus of Ownership of the System
## Designing A District-Wide Plan To Support Assessment

### QPA School Year Time-Line

The timeline for creating a QPAs dependent on the grade-level team or course. The goal is that every teacher contribute to creating one QPA for the year. Some teachers/teams may create multiple QPAs based on their experience and level of expertise in creating assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>QPA FOCUS</th>
<th>Tools Explained</th>
<th>Teacher Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPT/OCT</td>
<td>Creating common performance assessments using topics being studied and the standards/competencies.</td>
<td>Using Hess’s Rigor Matrix (Tool 5 &amp; 6) reminds us that for an assessment to measure competency, students must be asked questions or be expected to perform tasks that reflect expectations of DOK 3. Tool 1: Provides the steps for reviewing the task including looking at student work.</td>
<td>1. Create a Performance Assessment for a course or grade-level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referencing Hess’s Rigor Matrix and Depth of Knowledge. Use Tool 1 (pg. T3) as a guide from the QPA book.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Use Tools 5 &amp; 6 to create the assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Use Tool 1 to review the assessment after it has been given. The course and students have produced work to review. If an assessment is targeted for later in the school year, complete the steps for looking at student work when the work is completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV/DEC</td>
<td>Use the validation protocol Tool 2 and 3 (pg. T6) from the QPA book during PLC time to review Performance Assessments. Upload Performance Assessment in Atlas.</td>
<td>Tool 2 is a cover sheet for the QPA and Tool 3 is a validation protocol to review task specifics. Uploading to Atlas allows teachers within a course and curriculum to review collaboratively and add to improve the assessment.</td>
<td>4. Complete cover sheet Tool 2 for the QPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Use Tool 3 to review the tasks after you have reviewed student work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Upload the QPA into Atlas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Complete at least one QPA for the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Participate in a District Performance Assessment Calibration Process [pg. T3] with grade-level team members or colleagues in your department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Submit QPA to the task bank when all tools have been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN/FEB</td>
<td>Use the calibration protocol Tool 1 (page T9) from the QPA book during PLC time to review Performance Assessment. Edit assessments using the state of NH TASK BANK and review student work is included.</td>
<td>Tool 4 is designed to help teachers learn to evaluate the scoring of an assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR/APR</td>
<td>Create a common performance assessment for the end of the year using topics to be studied, standards/competencies, and referencing Hess’s Rigor Matrix and Depth of Knowledge. Use tools previously used for creation of assessment and validation. Think about creating assessments that are</td>
<td>Repeat the process for creating a QPA as an end of year summative. If your first QPA is designed as an end of year common summative, continue fine-tuning the assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY/JUN</td>
<td>Administer the Performance Assessment. Review student work. Review student performance comparing other assessments to performance assessment.</td>
<td>Administer the QPA for your course. If your assessment is a PACE or COURSE assessment, set aside time to score the assessment once as a teacher and then a second time by a colleague also teaching the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial PACE Expectations

• **State-model competencies** aligned with college and career outcomes provide the main **learning targets**

• **Instructional** system to support student learning of competencies
  • Includes strategies to personalize learning

• **Locally-design assessment system** to measure student achievement and growth related to competencies

• High quality **local performance assessments** occupy a visible place in the local assessment system

• **Smarter Balanced** assessment administered at least once in elementary, middle and high school

• The use of at least one **common (to all PACE districts) performance assessment** in grades/subjects not assessed by Smarter Balanced (17)
  • To evaluate comparability only!
Key Goals and Design Principles of PACE

• Focuses on **college** and/or **career** outcomes and promotes **deeper learning** for **all students**

• A clear **commitment** towards improving the achievement of **educationally-disadvantaged** students

• A clearly-described **internal accountability** process supported by the **local boards** of education

• **Commitment of resources** (local and state) necessary to ensure the plan’s success

• **Leadership** and **educator capacity** to design, implement, support and sustain the system
## NH’s Blend of State, PACE, and Local Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Course/Grade Academic Competency</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>SCIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Local PAs</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Smarter Balanced</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Smarter Balanced</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Smarter Balanced</td>
<td>Smarter Balanced</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Smarter Balanced SAT in 2016</td>
<td>Smarter Balanced SAT in 2016</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CLASSROOM COMPETENCY GRADING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
<th>Performance Task</th>
<th>CLASSROOM COMPETENCY COMMON ASSESSMENTS</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unit Summative</td>
<td>Tri 1: Mapping Migrating Monarchs</td>
<td>Place value, rounding, addition, subtraction Measurement conversions, addition, subtraction Fractions with like denominators</td>
<td>Multiplication/division facts, Multi-digit multiplication, division (multi-digit) Geometry Fractions with unlike denominators Decimal fractions Geometry &amp; symmetry</td>
<td>NWEA (MAP) 212.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unit Summative</td>
<td>Tri 1: Summer Olympics</td>
<td>Place Value Multiplication Division Fraction Review Addition/Subtraction Multiplication of Fractions Division of Fractions Area</td>
<td>Volume and Capacity Algebraic Expressions Data and Analysis Geometry</td>
<td>NWEA (MAP) 221.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unit Summative</td>
<td>Tri 1: Summer Olympics</td>
<td>Ratios, Rates and Measurement Conversions, Order of Operations, Exponents and Algebraic Expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td>NWEA (MAP) 225.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note Weight of Local Assessments!
Yes, this is hard!!

- As we tell other States, this is not for the faint of heart!
Combining Multiple Measures

SBAC/SAT in select grades

- Local performance assessments
- Competency 1
- Local performance assessments
- Competency 2
- Local performance assessments
- Competency 3
- Local performance assessments
- Competency 4

PACE Common Performance Task

District-Level Competency Scores

PACE
Comparable Annual Determinations
Annual Determinations

- Being able to produce “comparable annual determinations” was a key component of our waiver
- What are they?
  - Annual determinations are declarations of proficiency for students and schools often based on a single assessment (e.g., Smarter Balanced)
- Four major components:
  - Performance level descriptors
  - Cross-district comparability
  - “Standard setting”
  - Reporting annual determinations
What do these annual determinations mean?

• They are based on the full set of competency (or related performance) information collected throughout the year.

• The three “cutscores” reflect the points in the average competency score distribution that mark the divisions among the four achievement levels.

• Annual determinations are NOT based on the PACE common task.

  • The PACE common task is a calibration tool.

• Results must be computed for each grade/subject combination.
## ELA: 2015 PACE District Results by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 3 &amp; 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBAC Grade 3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE Grade 4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE Grade 5</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE Grade 6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE Grade 7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAC Grade 8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAC Grade 11</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Math: 2015 PACE District Results by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 3 &amp; 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PACE Grade 3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAC Grade 4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE Grade 5</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE Grade 6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE Grade 7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAC Grade 8</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAC Grade 11</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary

• **We’ve learned a ton** and have had some major successes!
  - Collaborative capacity building
  - Demonstration of reciprocal accountability
  - Cross-district calibration
  - Annual determinations
  - Improving assessment quality

• **Implications for the Future --** The new “Innovative Assessment and Accountability Demonstration Authority” in ESSA
  - What are the broad takeaways?
    - New Era of Assessment and Accountability may be upon us!
    - Multiple Measures Demand new conceptualization of validity/reliability
    - Educator Skill Development is key – “Educator Judgment”