

Idaho Schools
Accountability and
Annual Planning System
Recommendations

- Discussion -

July 2014

Objectives & Components

1. The objective of the accountability system and district annual planning should be to support the State's goal to have 60% or more of its students prepared for career or college.

To achieve this goal, the accountability and annual planning system must have two major components.

1. The first component is designed to provide state intervention and assistance for struggling or failing schools.
2. The second component is designed to create dynamics that will propel good schools to become great schools, and great schools to continually advance.

The design of the second component differs from the first, in that it is founded on continuous improvement and relies on local control and transparency to establish accountability to the local community.

Recommendation #1

Revise and refine the 5-Star Ranking System to facilitate accurate and fair measurement and ranking of schools and districts that require intervention and assistance.

- This system allows schools and districts to be sorted into categories that are either "superior", "adequate" or "failing". Failing schools should receive additional assistance from the State Department of Education in the form of expert assistance and additional resources. Failing schools that refuse additional assistance or do not "turn around" within a period of time would trigger more forceful intervention on the part of the State.
- Revisions to the existing 5-star system should include:
 - Adjusting the balance between student growth, school achievement, and other relevant measures. As the system is currently designed, too much weight is placed on growth and other relevant measures, often in response to federal regulation. The work team already in place to review the 5-star system should receive and consider this feedback.
- The State's intervention and assistance program for failing schools should:
 - Initially focus on resource and technical support and encouragement. Only if the school in question continues to fail and/or the district refuses outside assistance or demonstrates repeatedly that local leadership is unable to turn the school around, should the State intervention become more forceful.
 - If necessary, the ultimate intervention should include replacing local leadership (principal/superintendent) that has demonstrated, for whatever reason, that they are unable to turn around a failing school. Without this level of intervention, the state would be failing its constitutional and fiduciary responsibility, and the cost of this failure would be born directly by the students in that school and indirectly by the community and state when those students are not prepared for career and/or college. (For further notes on the issue of to whom the local superintendent is accountable, see the last section of this document.)
- If federal regulations allow, alternative schools should be removed from this part of the accountability system. An alternative ranking system should be explored that is clear, and more specifically tailored to alternative schools.

Recommendation #2

Implement an Annual Planning Cycle and Continuous Process Improvement Plans that Lead to Achievement Scores that Align to the 60% Goal.

“Turn every good school into a great school”

1. Update the State’s strategic planning law to focus on continuous annual improvement
2. Each school district, led by its board and superintendent, should be required to prepare annually a performance improvement plan, setting clear, measureable goals to improve achievement in the coming school year.

Recommendation #2

1. Each school in the state should be scored on two metrics: Readiness and Improvement.
 - Readiness is the % of graduating students that are prepared to continue to the next level (e.g. the 60%)
 - Improvement is the year over year improvement in the level of readiness produce by that school

Examples	Readiness Score	Improvement Score
High School	Career and College Readiness Score (CCR) (e.g. % students \geq 500 on all SAT Sections)	CCR Improvement (e.g. 2014 CCR / 2013 CCR)
K-8 School	High School Readiness Score (HSR) (e.g. % students proficient or above on 8 th grade SBAC)	HSR Improvement
K-6 School	7th Grade Readiness Score (7GR) (e.g. % students proficient or above on 8 th grade SBAC)	7GR Improvement

2. The State will provide to each district its official Readiness and Improvement Scores for each school in the district at the end of each academic year.
3. These State reports should include state goals, statewide and cohort comparisons. Such that local districts have a context to interpret the numbers and is critical to local accountability.
4. Timeliness of the report must be adjusted to match the planning rhythm of the districts.

Recommendation #3

- We recommend the state offer professional development and collaborative training and support for local boards/leadership to develop awareness of and competencies in continuous improvement practices.

Definitions of Key Terms

- "**Achievement**" means academic performance relative to a standard. For example, one measure of achievement could be the percentage of students who score 500 or greater on Standardized Achievement Tests, such as SAT
- "**Improvement**" measures the change (positive or negative) from year to year in the percentage of students in a particular school or district who met the achievement standard. For example, if 70% of students at a particular high school achieved 500 or greater on the SATs in year one, and 77% achieved or exceeded that level the following year, that would be a 10% year-to-year improvement.
- "**Relevant Indicators**" includes such factors as the number of Advanced Placement tests taken and passed, the number of students successfully participating in dual credit programs, and similar indicators of advanced academic achievement.
- "**Growth**" measures the improvement in the performance of an individual student from the beginning to the end of a given school year (or specified number of years), relative to the student's initial status and growth of his or her relevant cohort.
- "**60%**" or "**60% Goal**" refers to the state's goal to have 60% or more of its citizens entering the workforce with some form of post-secondary diploma or certificate (1, 2, 4, or more) by 2020. The supporting SBE goal is that Idahoans age 25-34 will have achieved the 60% goal. For the purposes of the taskforce work on the K-12 system, we focused on how the K-12 system prepares its students to achieve that goal.

Remaining Issues

- Autonomy
- SAT 500 question
- 8th Grade CCR

Pocket Slides

2013 High School Performance – Raw Scores

HIGH SCHOOLS TESTING MORE THAN 50 STUDENTS									
SAT 2013									
Career/College Rediness					Career/College Rediness				
Rank	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	Performance		Rank	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	Performance	
1	RENAISSANCE	MERIDIAN	63%		36	COLUMBIA	NAMPA	24%	
2	BOISE	BOISE	60%		37	MERIDIAN	MERIDIAN	24%	
3	MOSCOW	MOSCOW	52%		38	SHELLEY	SHELLEY	24%	
4	TIMBERLINE	BOISE	49%		39	VALLIVUE	VALLIVUE	24%	
5	SANDPOINT	LAKE PEND O'REILLE	48%		40	NEW PLYMOUTH	NEW PLYMOUTH	23%	
6	MCCALL	MCCALL	45%		41	BLACKFOOT	BLACKFOOT	22%	
7	MADISON	MADISON	42%		42	EMMETT	EMMETT	22%	
8	HILLCREST	BONNEVILLE	41%		43	MIDDLETON	MIDDLETON	22%	
9	EAGLE	MERIDIAN	40%		44	MOUNTAIN HOME	MOUNTAIN HOME	22%	
10	TWIN FALLS	TWIN FALLS	38%		45	PARMA	PARMA	22%	
11	CENTENNIAL	MERIDIAN	37%		46	FIRTH	FIRTH	21%	
12	CENTURY	POCATELLO	37%		47	JEROME	JEROME	21%	
13	IDAHO FALLS	IDAHO FALLS	37%		48	MELBA	MELBA	21%	
14	ROCKY MOUNTAIN	MERIDIAN	37%		49	OROFINO	OROFINO	21%	
15	TIMBERLAKE	LAKELAND	35%		50	IDAHO VIRTUAL	IDAHO VIRTUAL	20%	
16	CAPITAL	BOISE	34%		51	MARSH VALLEY	MARSH VALLEY	20%	
17	SKYLINE	IDAHO FALLS	34%		52	POCATELLO	POCATELLO	20%	
18	COEUR D'ALENE	COEUR D'ALENE	33%		53	BUHL	BUHL	19%	
19	LAKE CITY	COEUR D'ALENE	33%		54	FILER	FILER	19%	
20	MOUNTAIN VIEW	MERIDIAN	33%		55	SNAKE RIVER	SNAKE RIVER	19%	
21	KIMBERLY	KIMBERLY	32%		56	BONNERS FERRY	BOUNDARY CTY	18%	
22	IDAHO	STATE	31%		57	RIRIE	RIRIE	18%	
23	BONNEVILLE	BONNEVILLE	30%		58	BURLEY	CASSIA CTY	17%	
24	HIGHLAND	POCATELLO	30%		59	DECLO	CASSIA COUNTY	17%	
25	FRUITLAND	FRUITLAND	29%		60	HOMEDALE	HOMEDALE	16%	
26	GRANGEVILLE	GRANGEVILLE	28%		61	PRESTON	PRESTON	16%	
27	LEWISTON	LEWISTON	28%		62	GOODING	GOODING	15%	
28	BORAH	BOISE	27%		63	CALDWELL	CALDWELL	14%	
29	MALAD	ONEIDA CTY	26%		64	NAMPA	NAMPA	14%	
30	LAKELAND	LAKELAND	25%		65	SOUTH FREMONT	SOUTH FREMONT	14%	
31	RIGBY	JEFFERSON COUNTY	25%		66	MARSING	MARSING	13%	
32	SALMON	SALMON	25%		67	TETON	TETON	13%	
33	SKYVIEW	NAMPA	25%		68	AMERICAN FALLS	AMERICAN FALLS	12%	
34	SODA SPRINGS	SODA SPRINGS	25%		69	MINICO	MINIDOKA COUNTY	11%	
35	ST MARIES	ST MARIES	25%		70	ABERDEEN	ABERDEEN	8%	

- Not the actual scores... these are % of students that TOOK the SAT... not the total count of kids that graduated or dropped out. Actual scores would be slightly lower.
- Need 2014 scores to calculate improvement scores

