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Overview of Presentation

• Background
  o The process
  o Review of statutory requirements
• Very brief reminder about input system
• The performance-based system
  o A two-level system
  o Almost done
• Timeline
• Questions, comments?
Basic Premise

- Accountability system must enable the state (NH DOE) to evaluate and document that all New Hampshire schools are providing students with “an opportunity to receive an adequate education”

- The law requires a dual system:
  - Input-based system
  - Performance-based system
The “AYP Task Force”, a standing committee that advises NHDOE on a range of accountability issues

- Broad district and school representation
- Led the design and development of the input system
- Now focused on designing the growth metrics for the performance-based system
- Generally meets at least monthly; working on adequacy issues since last April
- Supported by Deb Wiswell, Tim Kurtz (assessment director), Karen Laba and Keith Burke (independent consultants), Scott Marion & Damian Betebenner, Center for Assessment
The “Commissioner’s Task Force”, a legislatively-mandated (RSA:193-E) committee focused on the development of the performance-based system

- A variety of stakeholders—categories of stakeholders legislatively mandated
- Generally meets at least monthly; working on adequacy issues since last October, 2009
- Same support personnel as AYP Task Force
- Groups have been meeting jointly for the past few months
The Input-Based System

A school may demonstrate, through the input-based school accountability system, that it provides the opportunity for an adequate education as set forth in RSA 193-E:2-a by establishing that it met the following school standards in effect as of the effective date of this section:

- (a) English/language arts and reading as set forth in Ed 306.37.
- (b) Mathematics as set forth in Ed 306.43.
- (c) Science as set forth in Ed 306.45.
- (d) Social studies as set forth in Ed 306.46.
- (e) Arts education as set forth in Ed 306.31.
- (f) World languages as set forth in Ed 306.48.
- (g) Health education as set forth in Ed 306.40.
- (h) Physical education as set forth in Ed 306.41.
- (i) Technology education, and information and communication technologies as set forth in Ed 306.42 and Ed 306.47.
- (j) School year as set forth in Ed 306.18.
- (k) Minimum credits required for a high school diploma as set forth in Ed 306.27(f) and (m).
The Input System

- You all reviewed and signed off on your schools’ input system submissions, right?
Beginning with the 2011-2012 school year, a school may demonstrate by the end of the school year that it provides the opportunity for an adequate education through the performance-based school accountability system to be developed and implemented by the department, pursuant to RSA 193-E:3-c and RSA 193-E:3-d and designed to measure educational outcomes.
Commisioner’s Task Force must...

- (a) Define the performance-based accountability system to be used by schools that will ensure that the opportunity for an adequate education is maintained.
- (b) Identify performance criteria and measurements.
- (c) Establish performance goals and the relative weights assigned to those goals.
- (d) Establish the basis, taking into account the totality of the performance measurements, for determining whether the opportunity for an adequate education exists, which may include the assignment of a value for performance on each measurement.
- (e) Ensure the integrity, accuracy, and validity of the performance methodology as a means of establishing that a school provided the opportunity for an adequate education as defined in RSA 193-E:2-a.
The task force shall develop a performance-based scoring system using only the best available data and indicators which are already provided to the department and/or performance measures that schools are already required to provide the department under other state or federal law.
... system **may consider** one or more of the following data and indicators:

- (a) Performance on state tests administered pursuant to RSA 193-C and, upon the prior approval of the department, other assessments administered at local option that are consistent with the state’s curriculum standards.
- (b) Number and percentage of pupils participating in an advanced placement course.
- (c) Number and percentage of graduating pupils going on to post-secondary education and military service.
- (d) Attendance rates

More....
(e) Annual cumulative drop-out rates of high school pupils.
(f) School environment indicators, such as safe schools data.
(g) Expulsion and suspension rates, including in-school and out-of-school suspensions, which shall be reported for each school year.
(h) Number and percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers.
(i) Teacher and administrative turnover rates at the school and district levels.
Goals of the “Performance” System

- The Commissioner’s Task Force clarified the purposes and intended uses for the performance-based system:

- Provide another opportunity for schools to demonstrate adequacy
  - Collect and report data to assist educators in improving student achievement
  - Promote equality of opportunity (subgroups)
  - Identify desirable educational practices and outcomes to
  - Facilitate public reporting of school effectiveness to education stakeholders
A Multi-Level Accountability System

- In order to best serve the identified purposes, the task force recommends a two level system:

  - **Level One**
    - A very limited set of common (across the state) indicators and metrics
    - Applied consistently across all schools in the state
    - Focused on unarguable outcomes, e.g., NECAP, graduation rate, attendance

  - **Level Two**
    - Locally determined goals, targets, and indicators
    - Participation in Level Two will be optional (for most)
Level One: Indicators (K-8)

- **Inclusion Factors**
  - 95% participation rate;
  - Excessive absence (% absent 10% or more of school days)

- **Status Measures**
  - Index scores for NECAP science and writing

- **Growth and Status Measures**
  - Student growth percentiles for reading and math

- **Gap Analyses**
  - Requiring adequate performance for both key subgroups and whole school
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Level One: Indicators (HS)

- **Inclusion Factors**
  - 95% participation rate;
  - Excessive absence (% absent 10% or more of school days)

- **Status Measures**
  - Index scores for NECAP reading, math, science, and writing

- **“Readiness” Indicators**
  - Graduation rate
  - Dropout rate

- **Gap Analyses**
  - Requiring adequate performance for both key subgroups and whole school
All indicators have been placed on a 1 through 4 scale.
The overall score, at this point, is simply an average of all indicators for each school.
The task force decided to emphasize certain values by weighting certain indicators more than others:
- Growth at elementary/middle
- Graduation and dropout at high school
Level 2: Locally-determined system

- A very limited set (e.g., 2-5) of district/school-determined goals, targets, and indicators
  - For example, “increase the % of students achieving their NWEA growth targets to 90% by 2015”

- The school results related to such goals and targets would count in the performance-based accountability system and would be applied to schools that did not demonstrate the “opportunity for an adequate education” through the input or Level 1 system.
The Commissioner’s Task Force is committed to including measures of student longitudinal growth into the Level 1 accountability system.

- e.g., measuring the change in performance for the same, matched students from 4th grade to 5th grade.

The AYP Task Force has been leading this work and both groups recommend using “Student Growth Percentiles” as the growth model in the Performance-based Adequacy Accountability system.

The specifics of how these results will be included in the accountability system are now finalized.

The following slides provide a brief introduction to this growth model.
Student Growth Percentiles

- Measuring student growth in academic achievement across or even within years is gaining popularity in education for many good reasons:
  - Students all start at different places and measuring change from where they start seems more fair to students and adults
  - “Status” (i.e., single point in time) results are very strongly related to non-school factors such as income and class
- Even though many people want to measure growth, doing so well is not as easy as it might seem.
What does it mean to say that a girl grew 2.5 inches from ages 5 to 6? Is that typical, a lot or not enough?

What does it mean to say that a student’s score increased by 10 points in math from 4th grade to 5th grade?

Would it help us to know that on average, girls grew 3 inches from 5 to 6 years of age and that 85% or so grew between 2 and 4 inches? What would we say about growth of 2.5 inches?

Similarly, would it help us to know that on average student scores increased 7 points from 4th to 5th grade?
To make these growth comparisons more meaningful, it is helpful to take into account where students start in order to judge their growth, for example:

- Consider that there are approximately a couple of hundred students (often more) at every NECAP score in 4th grade.
- We can then rank order these students by their 5th grade scores.
- Imagine a student who scored 432 in 4th grade and 545 in 5th grade.
- In this example, if this student grew at a higher rate than 70% of her peers, we would say that she had a student growth percentile of 70.
Of course, the reality is more complex than this little example. Further, we want to incorporate as many prior scores as possible to best estimate students’ score history.

Student growth percentiles were developed by Dr. Damian Betebenner at the Center for Assessment to help answer these questions about changes in student achievement.

We can then generate individual student reports like the one we developed for Colorado on the following slide...
Student Report Used in Colorado
Aggregating student growth percentiles

- Remember, this is a school accountability system
- We need to be able to take the individual student growth results and aggregate them to a school level
- We have found it most promising to use medians as the “average” school growth percentile
  - The median is the middle score in a distribution (the 50th percentile)
- We have also found it useful to consider the school’s achievement (status) in addition to growth
- The following bubble charts illustrate this...
Growth and Achievement

New Hampshire: 2009–10 NECAP Growth & Achievement
Reading Performance by School Poverty

Fall 2010 Percent at/above Proficient

Fall 2010 Median Student Growth Percentile

Higher Achievement
Lower Growth

Higher Growth
Lower Achievement

School Size
- 50 Students
- 100 Students
- 250 Students
- 500 Students

Percent Free/Reduced Lunch Students
- Less than 20 percent
- 20 to 40 percent
- 40 to 60 percent
- 60 to 80 percent
- More than 80 percent
Growth and Achievement
New Hampshire: 2009–10 NECAP Growth & Achievement
NECAP Math Performance by School Poverty

Fall 2010 Percent at/above Proficient

50 Students
100 Students
250 Students
500 Students

Percent Free/Reduced Lunch Students

Less than 20 percent
20 to 40 percent
40 to 60 percent
60 to 80 percent
More than 80 percent

School Size
Quantifying the bubbles

- Both task forces love the bubble charts and wanted to try to find a way to quantify the results such that any school in the lower left quadrant might be considered not adequate.
- It is not as easy as it sounds:
  - Multiple indicators
  - Multiple subgroups
- We tried some pretty interesting things as you can see on the following....
A potential way to award “points”

Median Student Growth Percentile -- Whole School or Subgroup
Norms and criteria

- All of these efforts are really an attempt to capitalize on both the normative information (growth percentiles) and criterion information (proficiency).
- The student growth percentiles allow us to do just that.
The Task Force determined that individual student targets must be created, evaluated, and reported:

- The group decided to establish individual student targets for students currently below proficient to reach proficient in 3 years or less or by 8th grade (whichever is first), while proficient/advanced students stay above proficient.
- The target is based on a defined and meaningful criterion (proficient) and can be used in the aggregate to establish school and subgroup targets.
Student report showing potential targets
Aggregate Criterion Targets

• Similar to aggregating the observed student growth percentiles, we can aggregate the targets for all of the students in the school/subgroup and find the median
  • We can then compare the median of all of the observed growth percentiles with the median of the targets
Norm-referenced growth still counts

- Schools with a lot of high achieving students will have relatively low aggregate targets so that low observed median growth percentiles could still allow schools to meet targets
- Colorado required schools, in order to be classified in one of the higher rubric categories, to still have a relatively modest median growth percentile
- Both Task Forces here in NH agreed with this viewpoint
A rubric-based approach

- As seen on the following slide, a rubric is used to “score” growth
- We have also established rubrics for the other indicators, such as status, attendance, graduation, etc.
  - And will use these rubric ratings for subgroups
- Our current plans are to aggregate across all rubric scores into a single composite
  - We could have made adequacy decisions without creating a single composite, but both Task Forces preferred the single composite approach.
Growth Rubric with Cut Scores for Median SGPs

Did the Observed Median SGP Exceed the Median Target SGP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(rubric score) 4</td>
<td>4 (rubric score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-99</td>
<td>70-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>55-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>40-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-29</td>
<td>1-39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Considering Subgroups

- The Commissioner’s Task Force was always clear that the performance of subgroups was critical in defining adequacy.
- However, the task force was clear that it did not want to repeat the mistakes of NCLB (double-counting, multiple conjunctive decisions).
- After much deliberation, the task force decided to “single count” key historically educationally disadvantaged groups of students in NH.
Group Definitions

- ELL
- Special education
- Economically disadvantaged/not special ed or ELL
- “All others”, i.e., not special ed, ELL or low SES
- Whole school

The task force also wanted to use a low minimum-n (5) to ensure that the system is both fair across schools and focuses on student needs.
  - The compensatory nature of the final decision protects against unreliability.
Growth and Achievement

New Hampshire: 2009−10 NECAP Growth & Achievement
Math Performance by School Subgroup Percent

Subgroup Size
- ○ 50 Students
- ○ 100 Students
- ○ 250 Students
- ○ 500 Students

Super Subgroup Category
- ● IEP
- ● Low SES
- ● All Other
- ● All School

Growth and Achievement

Higher Achievement
Lower Growth

Higher Growth
Lower Achievement

Lower Achievement
Lower Growth

Higher Achievement
Higher Growth

Growth Fall 2009 Median Student Growth Percentile

Achievement Fall 2009 Percent at/above Proficient

Growth Fall 2009 Median Student Growth Percentile

Super Subgroup Category
Growth and Achievement

New Hampshire: 2009–10 NECAP Growth & Achievement
Math Performance by School Subgroup Percent

Growth Fall 2009 Median Student Growth Percentile

Subgroup Size
- ○ 50 Students
- ○ 100 Students
- ○ 250 Students
- ○ 500 Students

Super Subgroup Category
- ● IEP
- ● Low SES
- ● All Other
- ● All School

Lower Growth

Lower Achievement

Higher Growth

Higher Achievement
New Hampshire: 2009–10 NECAP Growth & Achievement
Reading Performance by School Subgroup Percent
ELL Students

- Using the ACCESS for ELLs™ assessment that measures English proficiency instead of NECAP
- We are using the AMAO-1 (progress) calculation
  - Students making any of three defined types of progress (A, B, C) divided by the total number of LEP students in the program for at least 2 years
- Folded into the “reading” average score
What’s Adequate?

- The Task Force considered the question, “Does a “1” in any subgroup/content area mean that the school is not providing an opportunity for an adequate education?”, but decided on the overall composite approach instead.

- The Task Forces have agreed to create an overall weighted average score and then undergo a “standard setting” process to determine the adequacy level.
While this system is designed to meet legislative requirements, the Task Force recognizes that it will be a lost opportunity if the information is not useful in school improvement efforts.

The information can only be useful if people can understand and act on it.

To that end, we have engaged the Center for Assessment and other consults to help create data visualization tools to support school improvement efforts.
NEW HAMPSHIRE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS REPORT SAMPLE, DECEMBER 2010
GRAY LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

SCHOOL PROFILE: Enrollment: 377 Grades: K-8 % SWD: 15% %Low SES: 37% % ELLs = 9%

**Performance Indicators Report – Elementary/Middle Schools Revised 12.10.10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Median Target SGP</th>
<th>Median Observed SGP</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading:</strong> NECAP SGP 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole school</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLs ACCESS AMAO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Average Points</strong></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics:</strong> NECAP SGP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole school</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>61.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics Average Points</strong></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science:</strong> NECAP index 2009 State average =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole school</td>
<td>84.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>77.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>82.40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>89.70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science Average Points</strong></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing:</strong> NECAP Scoring 2008 State average =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole school</td>
<td>94.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/Disabilities</td>
<td>72.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>90.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>94.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing Average Points</strong></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participation (in NECAP and Access for ELLs)**

- Met rate: 95%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Whole school</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading ELLs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading SWD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Low SES</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading All others</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Whole school</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math ELLs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math SWD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Low SES</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math All others</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excessive Absence Points**

- Weighting: TIMES 1 3.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole school</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score for Adequacy Decision:** 35/10 3.5
Elementary/ Middle School Definitions:
NECAP SGP = Median Student Growth Percentile based on the New England Comprehensive Assessment Program (a combination of Growth and Performance) Reading and Mathematics Median Growth Percentiles are weighted more than Science and Writing Achievement scores.

**Points earned for Reading and Mathematics Student Growth Percentile (SGP):**

| Did the school meet its Median Student Growth Percentile Target? |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| **YES**                     | **NO**                      |
| (rubric score) 4            | (rubric score) 4            |
| 56-99                       | 70-99                       |
| 45-55                       | 55-69                       |
| 30-44                       | 40-54                       |
| 1-29                        | 1-39                        |

Subgroup Definitions:
ELLs = English language learners; students who are eligible for or are receiving ELL services
SWD = students with disabilities whose instruction is guided by an individual education plan (who are not ELL)
Low SES (socioeconomic status) = students eligible for free and reduced price lunch, a measure of poverty (who are not ELL or SWD)
All others = students who are not ELL, SWD, or Low SES

ACCESS for ELLs™ test: = assessment measuring growth toward English proficiency
 AMAO 1 = percentage of ELL students with at least two years of ACCESS test data who met improvement expectations

NECAP Index – Value representing full credit for students already proficient and partial credit for students working toward proficiency

*Rubric cut points for index scores (Science and Writing):*
90-100 = 4 points  
80-89 = 3 points  
70-79 = 2 points  
below 70 = 1 point

Participation rate = percent of students who were eligible to test and did: (the current threshold is 95%)
“met” threshold = 4 points  
did not meet threshold = 1 point

Excessive absence rate = percent of students absent more than 10% of enrolled days (18 of 180 days)
Excessive Absence points:
5% or less = 4 points  
6 – 10% = 3 points  
11 – 20% = 2 points  
greater than 21% = 1 point

Cell sizes - This report uses a minimum of 5 students for the academic indicators and 40 students in all other categories.
## NEW HAMPSHIRE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS REPORT SAMPLE DECEMBER 2010
### Blue Hills HIGH SCHOOL

**SCHOOL PROFILE:**
- Enrollment: 2215 (Tested: 472)
- Grades: 9 – 12
- % SWD: 12%
- %Low SES: 28%
- % ELLs: 8%

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS REPORT – High Schools

#### READING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole school</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs (ACCESS MAO1)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEIGHTING = TIMES 1**

#### MATHEMATICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole school</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEIGHTING = TIMES 1**

#### SCIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole school</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEIGHTING = TIMES 1**

#### WRITING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole school</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEIGHTING = TIMES 1**

#### EXCESSIVE ABSENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excessive Absence Rate</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole school</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEIGHTING = TIMES 1**

### PARTICIPATION (IN NECAP AND ACCESS FOR ELLS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Threshold</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Whole school</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading ELs (ACCESS)</td>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading SWD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Low SES</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading: All others</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Whole school</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math ELs</td>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math SWD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Low SES</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math: All others</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEIGHTING = TIMES 1**

### PARTICIPATION AVERAGE POINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole school</td>
<td>67.89</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEIGHTING = TIMES 2**

### GRADUATION AVERAGE POINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dropout Rate</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole school</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEIGHTING = TIMES 2**

### DROPOUT RATE AVERAGE POINTS

**WEIGHTING = TIMES 2**

### BLUE HILLS HIGH SCHOOL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS TOTAL

| Score for Adequacy Decision: | 20.75/10 = | 2.075 |

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW ONLY, NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION 12.10.2010**
**HIGH SCHOOL DEFINITIONS:**

**Subgroup Definitions:**
ELLs = English language learners; students who are eligible for or are receiving ELL services
SWD = students with disabilities whose instruction is guided by an individual education plan (who are not ELL)
Low SES (socio-economic status) = students eligible for free and reduced price lunch, a measure of poverty (who are not ELL or SWD)
All others = students who are not ELL, SWD, or Low SES

**ACCESS for ELLs™ test:** assessment measuring growth toward English proficiency
AMAO 1: percentage of ELL students with at least two years of ACCESS test data who met improvement expectations.

**NECAP Index:** Value representing full credit for students already proficient and partial credit for students working toward proficiency.

*Rubric cut points for index scores:*
90-100 = 4 points  80-89 = 3 points  70-79 = 2 points  below 70 = 1 point

**NECAP Writing:** Rubric scores (1-12) converted to Index points
1 or 2 = 0  3 = 20  4 = 40  5 = 60  6 = 80  7+ = 100

**Excessive absence rate:** percent of students absent more than 10% of enrolled days (18 of 180 days)

*Excessive Absence points:*
5% or less = 4 points  6 – 10% = 3 points  11 – 20% = 2 points  greater than 21% = 1 point

**Participation rate:** percent of students who were eligible to test and did (threshold is 95%)

*Points for participation rate:*
met threshold = 4 points  did not meet threshold = 1 point

**Graduation rate:** 4 year cohort rate (the percentage of students who began as 9th graders 4 years ago and graduate with a standard diploma)

*Rubric points for graduation rate:*
90-100% = 4 points  80 – 89% = 3 points  75 – 79% = 2 points  below 75% = 1 point

**Dropout rate:** cohort dropout rate (students from the 4 year cohort earning a GED or who graduate early are NOT counted as dropouts)

*Rubric points for dropout rate:*
0-5% = 4 points  6% - 10% = 3 points  11% - 20% = 2 points  greater than 20% = 1 point

**Cell sizes:** This report uses a minimum of 5 students for the academic indicators and 40 students in all other categories.
Level 2

- Any school may participate in Level 2
- Schools without 2 years of NECAP data (K, K-1, K-2 schools) will need to use alternate data and Level 2
- Schools that do not demonstrate adequacy in any other way may be directed to participate in Level 2 as part of intervention/support
- Goals, measures, and outcomes must be approved by NH DOE in more of a support rather than regulatory role
  - Local boards will have to approve the process and publish the results
  - NH DOE will create guidance and support materials to assist LEA’s in this process
- Task force is still considering how to incorporate Level 2 results into determinations of adequacy
Advantages of two-level system

- Level 1 will meet the statutory requirements on its own
  - Clear outcomes
  - Data already collected by the state
  - No additional burden on districts
- Level 2 creates incentives for the types of school activities and multiple assessments we would like to see in all schools
  - Optional—no unfunded mandate
  - Tied closely with school improvement activities
Timeline

- Input system is already undergoing a pilot
- NH DOE will present the design of the system to the legislature soon [Sometime in January]
- Winter 2010-2011: Share and receive feedback from key constituents and all schools
- March 2011: Performance system design “finalized”
- June 2011: “beta” release of performance system
- June 2012: First implementation of Performance system
- First NH Accountability Report – October 2012