

Memorandum

To: The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE)

From: Illinois Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Re: TAC Update: Recommendation Summary

Date: May 13, 2018

Introduction

To ensure the ISBE accountability system is operationalized in a manner that reflects the state's core values and provides valid information about the performance of schools, ISBE worked with the National Center for Assessment (Center for Assessment) to assemble and facilitate an independent Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) with expertise in the design and implementation of accountability systems.¹ The TAC was commissioned to work with the existing state ESSA plan, understanding the policy priorities and providing recommendations to support the state goals and values reflected therein.

On April 5, 2018 the TAC issued a preliminary or "Phase One" report, which describes the recommendations to date. This report was reviewed and discussed at the April 2018 state board meeting. A final report, which extends and elaborates that document, will be produced by June 30, 2018. In the meantime, the TAC has prepared this memorandum as an update to ISBE to summarize the recommendations required in order to identify schools for comprehensive and targeted support prior to the 18-19 school year. The final report will provide more details about the process and rationale for the TAC's recommendations, as well as guidance on future improvements and evaluation strategies.

Summary of Recommendations

The table that follows provides a summary of the TAC's recommendations related to each indicator in the state ESSA accountability system. For each indicator the table includes two pieces of information:

- a. **Indicator Description:** summarizes how the indicator is defined²
- b. **Procedures for School Accountability:** summarizes a recommended framework for scoring school performance on a 0-100 point scale to support meaningful differentiation.

Additional clarifications related to the TAC recommendations are provided in the 'notes' column. Red letters in superscript indicate the specific part of the recommendation the notes address.

In general, the TAC's approach to reviewing the state's accountability plan involved three aspects. First, the TAC sought to understand the goals and values reflected in the approved Consolidated State Plan

¹ A list of TAC members and the agenda and materials for each meeting are available at: <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/AccountabilityTechnicalAdvisoryCommittee.aspx>

² As noted in the comments column of the table, for many indicators the TAC fully accepted the definition provided in the Consolidated State Plan (CSP). The only exceptions are academic progress and English Learner Progress toward proficiency for which general recommendations were provided.

(CSP) and identify the highest priority areas to address that would honor these principles in a technically defensible manner. In other words, the TAC’s purpose was not to establish new policy or build a new accountability model; rather, the TAC worked to support and elaborate the current plan. Second, the TAC worked to identify approaches to address these priority areas and articulate a rationale for these proposals. Third, the TAC identified areas where ongoing study and evaluation might help refine and improve the model over time. Importantly, the TAC did not attempt to define the business rules necessary to fully operationalize each indicator. This level of operational detail is a task best undertaken by the department. Where the TAC did provide some specific procedures, such as with academic achievement, the intent was chiefly to illustrate application of the proposed framework. The TAC understands that the specific values or points used in these illustrations may be adjusted pending ongoing investigation by the department or other advisors.

Indicator	TAC Recommendations	Notes											
Academic Achievement	Indicator Description ^A: For a given school academic achievement is defined as the percentage of all served students meeting or exceeding standards on the required applicable assessment (i.e., PARCC in 3-8; Dynamic Learning Maps-Alternate Assessment in 3-8 ³ , 11; and SAT in high school).	^A This description comes directly from IL’s Consolidated State Plan.											
	<p>Procedures for School Accountability: The TAC recommends streamlining the approach described in IL’s Consolidated State Plan for awarding points to schools for academic achievement. The recommended framework reflects IL’s goals and priorities by retaining a focus on long-term goals and interim targets, incentivizing annual gains in proficiency, and utilizing straightforward, calculations that serve to meaningfully differentiate schools that do not achieve annual targets.</p> <p>Under the recommended framework a school would earn points based on its observed proficiency rate in a given content area as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School meets the common, state-defined long term goal or interim target for proficiency: 100 points • School demonstrates a 10% increase in proficiency relative to the previous year: 70 points ^B • School does not meet the interim target: 0-99 points consistent with the percentage of the interim target represented by the current proficiency rate. <p>Example Calculation of School Achievement Score ^C</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="399 1585 1084 1766"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="399 1585 643 1686">3-8 ELA Academic Achievement</th> <th data-bbox="643 1585 781 1686">School A</th> <th data-bbox="781 1585 927 1686">School B</th> <th data-bbox="927 1585 1084 1686">School C</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="399 1686 643 1726">2017</td> <td data-bbox="643 1686 781 1726">62%</td> <td data-bbox="781 1686 927 1726">31.8%</td> <td data-bbox="927 1686 1084 1726">18.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="399 1726 643 1766">2018</td> <td data-bbox="643 1726 781 1766">63%</td> <td data-bbox="781 1726 927 1766">42.2%</td> <td data-bbox="927 1726 1084 1766">28.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	3-8 ELA Academic Achievement	School A	School B	School C	2017	62%	31.8%	18.2%	2018	63%	42.2%	28.4%
3-8 ELA Academic Achievement	School A	School B	School C										
2017	62%	31.8%	18.2%										
2018	63%	42.2%	28.4%										

³ The appropriateness of the procedures and frameworks defined in this document will need to be explicitly considered for students who participate in the DLM

	<table border="1" data-bbox="399 331 1084 701"> <thead> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <th>School A</th> <th>School B</th> <th>School C</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Met 2018 Interim Target of 43.2%⁴</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Increase Proficiency by 10% or greater</td> <td>No</td> <td>Yes = 70</td> <td>Yes =70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percentage of Interim Target Represented</td> <td>NA</td> <td>42.2/43.2 =.98</td> <td>28.4/43.2 =.66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2018 Score</td> <td>100</td> <td>98</td> <td>70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="399 737 1084 934">In the Consolidated State Plan (CSP) the state defines five, 3-year interim targets for academic achievement. For purposes of scoring schools, the TAC recommended creating fifteen annual interim targets by equally dividing each 3-year target into annual expectations for school performance. ^D</p>	Outcome	School A	School B	School C	Met 2018 Interim Target of 43.2% ⁴	Yes	No	No	Increase Proficiency by 10% or greater	No	Yes = 70	Yes =70	Percentage of Interim Target Represented	NA	42.2/43.2 =.98	28.4/43.2 =.66	2018 Score	100	98	70	<p data-bbox="1122 730 1425 829">^D See page 20-24 of the CSP for the state-defined 3-year interim targets.</p>
Outcome	School A	School B	School C																			
Met 2018 Interim Target of 43.2% ⁴	Yes	No	No																			
Increase Proficiency by 10% or greater	No	Yes = 70	Yes =70																			
Percentage of Interim Target Represented	NA	42.2/43.2 =.98	28.4/43.2 =.66																			
2018 Score	100	98	70																			
<p>Academic Progress</p>	<p>Indicator Description: The TAC recommends using mean Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) as the academic progress indicator for grades 3-8.</p>	<p>The TAC’s rationale for selecting SGPs and a summary of the other models considered, including the regression approach originally proposed in the IL Consolidated State Plan, are provided in the Phase One report.</p>																				
	<p>Procedures for School Accountability: To award points to schools for meaningful differentiation, the TAC recommends transforming school mean SGPs to a 0-100 scale within a fixed effective range⁵ of 20 and 80. Specifically, schools will earn points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School mean SGP greater than 80: 100 points • School mean SGP below 20: 0 points • School mean SGP between 20-80: 1-99 points based on a school’s score within the range of 20-80.^E <p>Monitor the stability of the SGP scale <i>for at least two years</i> to determine whether a <i>baseline approach</i>, which fixes</p>	<p>A comprehensive discussion around the TAC’s rationale and procedures for scaling mean SGPs within the range of 20-80 will be provided in the final report.</p> <p>^E For example, a school having a mean SGP of 87, would earn a score of 87, because 72 is 87% of the</p>																				

⁴ This value is for illustrative purposes only.

⁵ An effective range is a range of scores defined by a minimum and maximum value specified by the state as defining reasonable limits for that indicator. Effective ranges may defined normatively (i.e., in consideration of a distribution of observed school performance) or based on pre-defined expectations for performance.

	<p>scale score changes in each year to the SGPs associated with a baseline distribution, is technically feasible. ^F</p> <p><i>Reporting Growth Grades⁶:</i> To assign schools grades for growth for reporting purposes (this will not influence school accountability determinations) the TAC recommends dividing the distribution of school mean growth SGPs into quintiles, consistent with that suggested in the CSP. Schools in quintiles five through one will receive a grade of A through F, respectively. This process will be conducted for all schools, and then again for each subset of “like” schools representing a key informational factor identified by the state. ^G</p>	<p>distance between 20 and 80. $(72-20)/(80-20)=0.87$</p> <p>^F Once the stability of the mean SGP scale is better understood the implications of fixing vs. resetting thresholds for A-F can be discussed in general and in light of the message the state wants to send through the assignment of grades.</p> <p>^G Review the distribution of mean SGPs on an annual basis to understand the degree to which cut scores for A-F fluctuate from one year to the next.</p>
<p>English Learner Progress toward English Language Proficiency</p>	<p>Indicator Description: The TAC recommends awarding points to ELL students for progress toward English Language Proficiency based on the degree to which they achieved their defined interim target for performance on the ACCESS 2.0 using a framework such as that provided below.</p> <p><i>Scoring Student Progress: ^H:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A student that meets the ELP criterion of 4.8 or his/her interim target earns 100 points • A student that does not meet his/her interim target earns 1-99 points consistent with the degree to which his/her interim target was met within the given year ^I • A student that does not meet the ELP exit criteria within five years will receive 0 points until the year of exit, then he/she will receive 100 points <p><i>Illustrative Examples:</i> <i>Option 1: A student who earns a scaled score of 310, but needs a scaled score of 340 to meet his/her interim target earns $(310/340)*100= 94$ points</i></p>	<p>^HThe CSP indicates that all ELL students have 5 years to reach ELP. The TAC recommended that ISBE review multiple years of ACCESS 2.0 data to determine if the number of years a student has to achieve ELP (i.e., 4.8 PL) should vary based on baseline proficiency level and/or grade of program entry.</p> <p>^I Additional data and discussion are necessary to determine a) how points should be calculated for students who don’t meet the interim target and b) whether student-level interim targets should be fixed or recalculated each year. The TAC did not</p>

⁶ Many TAC members expressed concern that the letter grades for growth could be misunderstood or misused due to preconceived notions about what it means to earn a particular grade. The TAC strongly believes these letter grades should not influence a school’s overall accountability rating and should only be used to describe a school’s relative performance with respect to academic growth, hence the assignment of grades by quintile bands.

	<p><i>Option 2: A student who shows a gain of 30 scaled score points from the previous year, but requires 50 points to meet his/her interim target earns $(30/50)*100=60$ points</i></p>	<p>have sufficient opportunity to establish recommendations in either of these areas.</p>
	<p>Procedures for School Accountability: To award points to schools for meaningful differentiation, the TAC recommends transforming school mean ELL progress scores to a 0-100 scale within a fixed minimum and maximum score range. This <i>effective range</i>⁷ will be determined by reviewing the distribution of school mean ELL scores and associated impact data once available.^J</p> <p>Once this range is defined points will be awarded to schools using a procedure similar to that previously defined for growth. For example if the effective range were 40-90, a school <i>may</i> earn points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School mean ELL score greater than 90: 100 points • School mean ELL score less than 40: 0 points • School mean ELL between 40-90: 1-99 points based on a school's score within the range of 40-90.^K 	<p>^J Specifically, this distribution will be evaluated to determine the range within most ELL school means fall, so that scaling serves to differentiate schools with respect to this indicator.</p> <p>^K For example a school having a mean ELL of 60 would earn a score of 40, because 60 is 40% of the distance between 40 and 90. $(60-40)/(90-40)=0.40$</p>
Graduation Rate	<p>Indicator Description: Graduation rate is defined as a combined measure of the 4, 5 and 6 year adjusted cohort graduation rates, weighted as 30%, 15% and 5%, respectively.</p>	<p>This description comes directly from IL's Consolidate State Plan.</p>
	<p>Procedures for School Accountability: To award points to schools for meaningful differentiation, the TAC recommends transforming school graduation rates to a 0-100 scale within an effective range defined by a minimum value and the state-defined long term graduation rate goals, which are 90%, 92% and 92.5% for the 4, 5 and 6 year adjusted cohort graduation rates, respectively.^L</p> <p>Once this effective range⁸ is defined, points will be awarded to schools using a procedure similar to that defined for academic progress. For example if the effective range for 4-year graduation rate were 67-90 a school may earn points as follows:</p>	<p>^L Additional discussion is necessary to define a minimum graduation rate that, in combination with the long term goal, produces an effective range that serves to differentiate schools with respect to this indicator.</p> <p>^M For example, a school having graduation rate of 92 would earn a score 100 because they already</p>

⁷ An effective range is a range of scores defined by a minimum and maximum value specified by the state as defining reasonable limits for that indicator. Effective ranges may defined normatively (i.e., in consideration of a distribution of observed school performance) or based on pre-defined expectations for performance.

⁸ An effective range is a range of scores defined by a minimum and maximum value specified by the state as defining reasonable limits for that indicator. Effective ranges may defined normatively (i.e., in consideration of a distribution of observed school performance) or based on pre-defined expectations for performance.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School graduation rate greater than the long term goal or annual target: 100 points ^M • School graduation rate less than 67: 0 points • School graduation rate between 67-90: 1-99 points based on a school’s score within the range of 67-90. <p>Consider awarding points to schools that demonstrate a meaningful increase in graduation rate from one year to the next, even if they performed above/below the effective range. ^N</p>	<p>surpassed the long term goal.</p> <p>^N Guidelines for determining a “meaningful” increase in graduation rate have not yet been established.</p>
Chronic Absenteeism	<p>Indicator Description: The percentage of students in a school having 10% or more of excused and unexcused absences in the prior academic year.</p>	<p>This description comes directly from IL’s Consolidated State Plan.</p>
	<p>Procedures for School Accountability: To award points to schools for meaningful differentiation, the TAC recommends transforming chronic absenteeism rates to a 0-100 scale within a fixed minimum and maximum score range. This <i>effective range</i> will be determined by reviewing distributions of school chronic absenteeism rate once available. ^O</p> <p>Once this effective range is defined, points will be awarded to schools using a procedure similar to that defined for academic progress. For example if the effective range for chronic absenteeism rate was 5-45% a school may earn points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chronic Absentee rate less than 5% - 100 points • Chronic Absentee rate greater than 45% - 0 points • Chronic Absentee rate between 45 and 5%: 1-99 points based on a school’s score within the range of 5-45. ^P 	<p>^O The TAC suggested looking at chronic absenteeism data by grade band and school type to determine whether a common scoring framework and effective range could be used for all schools.</p> <p>^P For example a school having a chronic absenteeism rate of 10 would earn a score of 88, because 10 is 88% of the distance from 45 to 5. $(45-10)/(45-5) = 0.875$</p>
9th grade On Track	<p>Indicator Description: Percentage of students within a school that earn at least five full- year course credits and no more than one semester F in a core course in their first year of high school.</p>	<p>This description comes directly from IL’s Consolidated State Plan.</p>
	<p>Procedures for School Accountability: To award points to schools for meaningful differentiation, the TAC recommends transforming 9th grade on track to a 0-100 scale within a fixed minimum and maximum score range. The TAC suggested that ISBE define a minimum 9th grade on-track rate that accurately reflects what the state believes to be unacceptable, regardless of where that value falls in the current school-level 9th grade on-track distribution.</p> <p>Once this effective range is defined, points can be awarded to schools using a procedure similar to that defined for</p>	

	academic progress, chronic absenteeism and graduation rate.												
School Climate	Indicator Description: For a given school the school climate indicator is defined as the percentage of students (grades 6-12) within a school that participate in the school climate survey.	This description comes directly from IL’s Consolidated State Plan.											
	<p>Procedures for School Accountability: To award points to schools (0-100) for meaningful differentiation, the TAC recommends establishing a table that award points to schools based on state-defined expectations for participation. ^Q</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <th>PTS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>96-100% participation</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>90-95%</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>85-90%</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>80-85%</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Below 80%</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Consider using school performance on the survey (rather than participation) in future versions of the accountability system.</p>	Outcome	PTS	96-100% participation	100	90-95%	75	85-90%	50	80-85%	25	Below 80%	0
Outcome	PTS												
96-100% participation	100												
90-95%	75												
85-90%	50												
80-85%	25												
Below 80%	0												
Future Indicators	<p>The TAC reviewed the recommendations in the CSP related to college and career readiness and the working group recommendations related to P-2 indicators and future 3-8 indicators.</p> <p>The TAC supports initiatives to promote continuous improvement of the state accountability model, including efforts to more broadly address the range of factors that contribute to holistic student development and readiness for post-secondary success. However, the TAC was not able to sufficiently study these areas to offer concrete recommendations at this time.</p> <p>Additional study informed by three years of data collection and review will better position the TAC to provide guidance about strategies for inclusion in the state accountability model.</p>	The TAC encourages additional study and data collection to inform recommendations on future indicators.											

Establishing a Summative Designation

After each indicator has been transformed to a 0-100 scale, as described in the previous section, a weighted sum will be calculated for each school using the indicator weights defined within the Consolidated State Plan. The sole purpose of this summative score is to support identification of the lowest 5% of schools within the state for Comprehensive Support and Improvement, consistent with requirements defined within ESSA. Similarly, using procedures consistent with those defined for all students, indicator scores and an overall weighted sum will be calculated for

each sub-group in a school (meeting minimum N-count requirements) to identify schools having one or more consistently underperforming sub-groups for Targeted Support and Improvement.

Next Steps

The TAC will produce a final report by June 30, 2018 that more fully elaborates the final recommendations, as well as the process and rationale for these decisions. The TAC will also provide guidance related to future enhancements to the model and ongoing monitoring and evaluation.