The accountability models presented in this document are intended to serve as a strawman for inviting reaction and discussion from the New Hampshire Accountability Task Force. The proposal here reflects a possible accountability model that would meet the requirements of the new law while also reflecting the feedback of the Accountability Task Force as gathered through discussions over the last seven months. After reviewing these proposed models, the Center for Assessment will lead a discussion that will identify potential modifications for moving forward with the state plan this spring.
General Notes on Goal-setting and Index Targets

It is important that there is coherence across three major components of the New Hampshire Accountability System:

1. Long-term and interim goals for Proficiency, English Language Proficiency, and Graduation Rate;
2. The accountability system and its annual differentiation classification for schools; and
3. The identification of Targeted and Comprehensive Support schools.

Due to the disconnected nature of these three components in ESSA, it is possible that outcomes from the three may be incoherent. For example, if goals and targets are not informed by each other, it is possible that Level 1 and Level 2 schools could meet more of the long-term overall and subgroup goals than Level 3 and Level 4 schools. To ensure this potential misalignment is avoided, the indicator targets should be informed by the state’s long-term goals.

For example, if we the goal is to have at least 65% of students scoring at the proficient level in 10 years, then the index targets should incentivize progress toward 65%. Similarly, if the goal is to have 90% of New Hampshire students graduating within 4 years, then the index targets for should incentivize progress toward that goal for the indicator of graduation rate.

These indicator targets would then be used to determine overall system targets to support a single summative rating for schools (note: this is based on the current readings of the law and draft regulations and may be subject to change with the final regulations). These summative ratings would then be tested through simulations using historical data to determine the accuracy of our business rules and assumptions.

### Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric:</th>
<th>Average scale score for students in math and ELA at each grade level on the statewide assessment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection:</td>
<td>As part of the data received from the assessment vendor, in conjunction with roster and Full Academic Year (FAY) collections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rules:</td>
<td>For each school, the mean will be calculated by averaging the scale scores within grade level for all FAY students within the school. Math and ELA achievement will be included separately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indexing: | Index informed by goals, statewide data, and trends\(^1\):
- Mean is less than Level 2 performance standard = 1
- Mean is above Level 2 performance standard = 2
- Mean is above Level 3 (proficiency) standard = 3
- Mean is above Level 4 performance standard = 4 |
| Reporting: | Includes:
- School average in math and ELA for each grade level
- State average in math and ELA
- Index score in math and ELA |

\(^1\) As with all index scores presented in this document, these are just examples and will need to be determined after the data is examined.
Growth and Equity

**Metric:** Mean student growth percentile for all students within the school and mean student growth percentile for lowest 25% of achievers in prior year.

**Data Collection:** Student Growth Percentiles calculated using the longitudinal achievement data for all students.

**Business Rules:** A student growth percentile (SGPs) describes the relative growth a student made compared to other students with the same achievement history—their academic peers. The mean student growth percentile (MGP) is the average SGP for the students within the school.

**Indexing:** Index informed by goals, statewide data, and trends:
- less than 25 = 1
- 25-35 = 2
- 35-64 = 3
- 65 or higher = 4

**Reporting:** Includes: School MGP, MGP of lowest 25% of achievers, State average, State average of lowest 25% of achievers, Index score

---

Graduation Rate

**Metric:** Percent of students who are meeting the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR) and percent of students who are meeting the 5-year ACGR.

**Data Collection:** As part of the annual ACGR submission.

**Business Rules:** Standard ACGR calculation approach: The 5-year ACGR is the number of students who graduate in 4 years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class. From the beginning of 9th grade (or the earliest high school grade), students who are entering that grade for the first time form a cohort that is "adjusted" by adding any students who subsequently transfer into the cohort and subtracting any students who subsequently transfer out, emigrate to another country, or who are deceased.

**Indexing:** Index informed by goals, statewide data, and trends:
- Less than 67% = 1
- 67% to 79% = 2
- 80% to 89% = 3
- 90% and above = 4

**Reporting:** Includes: School 4 and 5 year grad rates, State average grad rates, Index score

---

**Index Score = 3**

---

**Mean Student Growth Percentile**

- **High Growth, Low Achievement**
- **High Growth, High Achievement**
- **Low Growth, Low Achievement**
- **Low Growth, High Achievement**

**Percent Proficient**

- **Your school**
- **State Average**

**Index Score = 3**

**State = 88.12%**
**English Language Proficiency**

**Metric:** A schoolwide indicator based on the percent of students who attain or are growing toward English language proficiency on ACCESS 2.0

**Data Collection:** As part of the data received from the assessment vendor, in conjunction with roster and Full Academic Year (FAY) collections.

**Business Rules:** Student-specific proficiency level goals will first be identified by determining the Level and age of each student (e.g., Level 1 = 5 years; Level 2 = 4 years; etc.). For each school, the number of students who have reached or are on track to reach proficiency will be divided by all students who are considered English Learners after the 2nd year of being in the U.S. Proficient students will be carried over for 3 years. Schools that do not meet the minimum-n will be awarded an index score of 3.

**Indexing:** Index informed by goals, statewide data, and trends:
- More than 1 SD below the average = 2
- Between 1 SD above/below the average = 3
- More than 1 SD above the average = 4

**Reporting:** Includes: School progress, State progress, Index score

**Work-Study Practices**

**Weight:** 10% for elementary and middle schools

**Metric:** A school-reported indicator based on the school’s involvement in activities designed to improve students’ work-study practices.

**Data Collection:** The school will report their degree of involvement along with the necessary documentations for the targeted index score.

**Business Rules:** The NHDOE has adopted four Work-Study practices that are thought to contribute to college and career readiness. Schools will identify their level of commitment to foster and develop these competencies as defined by the indexing process described below.

**Indexing:** Index and Evidence System:

1. School provides no evidence of engaging in activities related to the work-study practices
2. School indicates that they explicitly incorporate the work-study practices into their school activities for all students.
3. School provides evidence of programming aligned to work-study practices (e.g., syllabi, curricula)
4. School provides evidence of student success on the work-study practices for all students (e.g., samples of student work, validated survey data, recordings of student discussion groups about work-study practices)

**Reporting:** Index score along with the locally-supplied evidence and any locally reported measures.

**WSP Index Score = 2**

Evidence = School indicates that all students participate in the MindUP Social-Emotional Learning Program
College and Career Readiness

Weight: 25% for high schools

Metric: Percentage of high school seniors with one or more indicators of college and career readiness

Data Collection: Schools will need to provide documentation of student attainment on each of the indicators counted towards college and career readiness.

Business Rules: The number of seniors who meet one or more of the indicators will be divided by the total number of high school seniors. The indicators are the following:
- NH Scholars Course of Study
- Completion of ELO of WBL experience
- SAT Assessment meeting college ready cut score
- 2 or 4 year college enrollment

Indexing: Index informed by goals, statewide data, and trends:
- Less than 53% = 1
- 54% to 64% = 2
- 65% to 84% = 3
- 85% and above = 4

Reporting: Includes: School CCR rate, State CCR rate, Index score, and any additional locally-determined measures of CCR

CCR Index Score = 2

School Identification

Schools will be identified for comprehensive support if:
- the school is identified as within the bottom 5% of Title 1 schools for achievement and growth.
- the 4-year ACGR is below 67%, OR
- the school has been identified for targeted support for three years in a row

Schools will be identified for targeted support if:
- any subgroup within the school falls below the threshold for identification for comprehensive support on the basis of achievement/growth or graduation rate.

Aggregation

A summative school rating (e.g., Levels 1-4) will be reported based on a series of decision tables. Note, this is NOT a ranking, but an overall performance rating. This approach allows for policy-dictated scores and is transparent. Once schools know their index scores, they will be able to easily identify their summative rating. On the other hand, at least one state is proposing a “dashboard” approach where they do not produce an overall determination, so we should discuss whether we want to pursue such an approach.

Reporting

The summative school rating of 1-4 will be reported along with the reporting information identified for each of the four indicators within the school accountability system. The distribution of summative school ratings for all schools in the state will also be provided. Information on achievement, growth, graduation rate, ELP progress, and college and career readiness will additionally be reported at the sub-group level for all schools.