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Creating Intelligent 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 a New Accountability System
Accountability Should...

1) Be designed to produce *continuous system improvement*, not just test scores;

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

3) Focus on *meaningful learning* for college, careers, and citizenship, using *more valid and authentic assessments*, reported in disaggregated form;

4) Ensure adequate *resources* allocated intelligently to meet student needs well;

5) Develop and ensure *professional capacity and accountability*;

6) Use *multiple measures* evaluated through systems of expert *review, judgment, and intervention*;

7) Focus on *system capacity building*, shifting from a *test-and-rank* approach to an *assess-support-and-improve* model;

8) Reflect ongoing *student, parent, educator and community input* and provide transparent and accessible information to the public.
The New Challenge of College- and Career-Readiness: Expectations for Learning are Changing

The new context means new expectations for deeper learning, including abilities to:

• Think critically and creatively
• Communicate in multiple forms
• Collaborate
• Conduct research
• Solve problems
• Analyse and conceptualise
• Use new technologies
• Engage in learning new things at all times
• Reflect on and improve one’s own performance
Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions for Postsecondary Success

College & career readiness competencies

Common Core State Standards
- Research
- Experimentation
- Communication
- Collaboration
- Use of technology, etc.

SBAC or PARCC Assessment
New Accountability in the 51st State
Interactive Elements of an Assessment System for Meaningful Learning

- Standardized Tests (With Performance Components)
- Performance-Based Assessments and Portfolios

Used to validate local assessment results
Used to enrich test results and inform teaching
Professional Capacity and Accountability

• Intensive *clinical preparation and mentoring*

• *Professional development* connected to standards, high-quality curriculum resources, and development/scoring of assessments

• *Job-embedded PLCs*, collaborative planning, and coaching; subject matter networks

• Standards-based *evaluation and feedback* promoting learning and collaboration
Resource Accountability

- Weighted Student Formula funds schools by student needs
- Communities engage in decisions about allocating funds
- A dashboard of measures provides transparency about use of resources and outcomes, disaggregated by student groups
- Outcomes are evaluated and plans are adjusted regularly
# Accountability Pillar Overall Summary

## Annual Education Results Reports - Oct 2008

**Province: Alberta**

### Goal: High Quality Learning Opportunities for All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Category</th>
<th>Measure Category Evaluation</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Measure Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe and Caring Schools</strong></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Safe and Caring</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program of Study</strong></td>
<td>Program of Study</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Quality</strong></td>
<td>Education Quality</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Out Rate</strong></td>
<td>Time Out Rate</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Completion Rate (Cyc)</strong></td>
<td>High School Completion Rate (Cyc)</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal: Excellence in Learner Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Category</th>
<th>Measure Category Evaluation</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Measure Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning Achievement (Grades K-9)</strong></td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>PAT: Acceptable</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAT: Excellence</strong></td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal: Highly Responsive and Responsible Jurisdiction (Ministry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Category</th>
<th>Measure Category Evaluation</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Measure Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation for Living, Work, Citizenship</strong></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Transition Rates (Cyc)</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Preparation</strong></td>
<td>Work Preparation</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizenry</strong></td>
<td>Citizenry</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACOL Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Category</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Satisfaction with Program Access</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Involvement</strong></td>
<td>Involvement in Educational Needs</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Student Learning Achievement: PAT values reported are weighted averages of PAT Acceptable and PAT Excellence results. Courses included: ELA (Grades 3, 6, 9), Math (Grades 3, 6, 9), Social Studies (Grades 6, 9), Science (Grades 6 only), French Language Arts (Grades 6, 9), French (Grades 6, 9).
2. Student Learning Achievement: Diploma Exam values reported are averages of Diploma Acceptable and Diploma Excellence results, weighted by the number of students examined in each course.
3. Overall evaluations can only be calculated if both improvement and achievement evaluations are available.
4. The ACOL measures are not evaluated as they are not part of the Accountability Pillar and are included only to enable inclusion in the ABRR and 3-Year Education Plan reports.
5. Data values have been suppressed where the number of students is less than 6. Suppression is marked with an asterisk (*)
A Multiple Measures Dashboard
Indicators of Learning Opportunities

Basic Services
- Qualification of Staff
- Safe, adequate facilities
- Access to standards-based materials
- Access to technology resources

Engagement
- Efforts to support parental involvement
- Efforts to seek community input

Curriculum and course access
- Access to a full, rich curriculum (arts, PE, STEM, etc.)
- Access to and participation in college and career ready courses of study
School Quality Review

- Robust Data
- Examination of Practice & Learning
- Peer Review
- Expertise
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
To find the report, go to:
https://edpolicy.stanford.edu
Multiple measures accountability systems: Incentivizing and supporting schools for deeper learning and continuous improvement

Soung Bae
Senior Research and Policy Analyst
The needs of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century workforce is rapidly changing
Schools and districts must prepare students to acquire 21\textsuperscript{st} century content and skills
Scholars, educators, reform advocates are calling for a more meaningful next phase of school accountability that promotes continuous improvement and support
New System of Multiple Measures of Accountability

Should include:

- Broader set of outcome measures
- Measures of opportunities to learn
- Mix of state and local indicators
- Data dashboards
- School reviews
Broader Set of Outcome Measures

- Develop student competencies beyond basic skills (e.g., New Hampshire Performance Assessment for Competency Education)
- Promote the development of non-cognitive skills (e.g., California Office to Reform Education)
- Cultivate college and career readiness in all students (e.g., South Carolina’s Education and Economic Development Act)
Measures of Opportunities to Learn

- Access to resources
- Access to highly qualified teachers
- Access to rich curriculum
- School climate
Measures of Opportunities to Learn

- Access to resources
- Access to highly qualified teachers
- Access to rich curriculum
- School climate
Measures of Opportunities to Learn

- Access to resources
- **Access to highly qualified teachers**
- Access to rich curriculum
- School climate
Measures of Opportunities to Learn

- Access to resources
- Access to highly qualified teachers
- **Access to rich curriculum**
- School climate
Measures of Opportunities to Learn

- Access to resources
- Access to highly qualified teachers
- Access to rich curriculum
- School climate
Mix of State and Locally Determined Indicators

- **Incentivizes** schools and districts to pay attention to critical outcomes beyond student achievement scores in math and English
- Provides schools and districts with the **flexibility** to be responsive to local needs and contexts
- Allows schools and districts to **better monitor** student learning and progress throughout the year
Data Dashboards

- Provide **insights** into critical measures of what is working and what is not
- Create **transparency** for educators and the local community on key aspects of accountability
- Facilitate the **prioritization** of needs and targeting limited resources to support intervention and corrective action
School Reviews

- **Program Review** (e.g., Kentucky)

- **School Quality Review** (e.g., NYCDOE’s Quality Review)

- **Diagnostic Review** (e.g., Massachusetts Review of Low-Performing Schools)

- **Accreditation Review** (e.g., West Virginia)
School Reviews

- Make **qualitative judgments** about the quality of teaching and learning in schools
- Assess a school’s performance and progress against **well-defined standards and criteria**
- Develop a **culture of inquiry and reflection** and promote continuous improvement
- Refine a school’s **action or improvement plan** and trigger a system of targeted and intensive support
Considerations for Practice

- Provide ongoing professional development to all stakeholders on data literacy and conducting school reviews
- Engage stakeholders and build consensus
- Create organizational structures to fast-track support to struggling schools
Future Directions for Teacher Policy that Supports Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement: A Review of Emerging Research

Elizabeth Leisy Stosich, Ed.D.
Travis J. Bristol, Ph.D.
Research & Policy Fellow
@lizleisystosich @tjacksonbristol
Problem

• Thirty-three years after *A Nation at Risk*, teachers’ initial preparation still varies greatly from program to program and this variation has direct consequences for students’ learning (Boyd et al., 2009; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2010; NCEE, 1983)

• General qualifications provide little information about teachers’ ability to support student learning (Chingos & Peterson, 2011; Goldhaber, 2007; Rivkin et al., 2005)

• Although “value-added” techniques have been used to measure teachers’ contribution to student learning (Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Rockoff, 2004), such strategies are not always effective (Darling-Hammond, 2015; Raudenbush, 2015)
New Direction

• Growing attention to the conditions and processes that support continuous improvement and growth in the profession (Darling-Hammond, Wilhoit, & Pittenger, 2014; Johnson, 2012).

• Teachers make greater gains in effectiveness when they work in schools with opportunities for collaboration with colleagues, strong principal leadership, and meaningful feedback as part of the evaluation process (Jackson & Bruegmann, 2009; Kraft & Papay, 2014).
A New Approach to Accountability for Learning

Figure 1. Key elements of an accountability system

(Darling-Hammond, Wilhoit, & Pittenger, 2014)
Research Questions

• 1) How do individual educators grow over the course of their career?

• 2) How do school working conditions influence educators’ growth and development?

• 3) How can we identify effective educators?
RQ#1: How do individual educators grow over the course of their career?

Research

- Teachers are most effective in their initial years, then plateau (Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, Rockoff, & Wyckoff, 2008; Rockoff, 2004)

- Elementary and middle school teachers improve during first few years in the classroom and continue to be “effective” long after their first five years on the job (Ladd & Sorensen, 2015; Papay & Kraft, 2015)

Policy

- In 2002, Washington provided monetary incentives for teachers who pursued and attained National Board Certification
  - 2002 (99 NBCTs)
  - 2014 (946 NBCTs; 324 taught in a “challenge school”)
- NBCTs more effective when compared to non-NBCTs (Cowan & Goldhaber, 2015)
RQ#2: How do school working conditions influence educators’ growth and development?

Research

- Sustained and focused
- Includes both teachers and school leaders
- Addresses participants’ knowledge and skills gaps related to teaching and learning
- Responsive to the contexts in which participants teach and students learn (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009; King & Bouchard, 2011)

Policy

- West Virginia, based on a survey of educators about their professional learning experiences, created an online resource bank designed to support high-quality learning experiences
- Teachers can access specific professional learning materials based on the areas for development identified during evaluation
RQ#3: How can we identify effective educators?

**Research**
- Common professional standards designed by educators and aligned to performance based assessments can serve as an important lever for identifying beginning and accomplished teaching and improving student learning (Cavalluzzo, Barrow, & Henderson, 2014; Sato, 2014; Wilson & Hallam, 2006).

**Policy**
- In 2002, California State Legislature required pre-service programs to include a performance based assessment in teacher preparation programs
- 12 public and private universities created the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT)
- Teachers’ PACT scores predict later effectiveness, as measured by students’ math and ELA standardized exam scores (Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2013)
Implications for Research, Policy, and Practice

• Teacher effectiveness is not “fixed”

• Supportive working conditions are essential for developing teachers throughout their career

• Performance based assessments aligned to professional standards can both assess and support the capacity of novice and experienced educators
Future Directions for Teacher Policy that Supports Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement

• Review recent teacher policies

• Underlying assumptions behind these policies

• Emerging research that can inform future teacher policies designed to prepare, develop, and support educators at each stage of their career
How Do States Integrate Performance Assessments into Their Systems of Assessment?

Elizabeth Leisy Stosich
Jon Snyder
Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education (SCOPE)

Katie Wilczak
Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE)
Strategy 1: Performance Assessment for Classroom Purposes

**Focus:** Develop educator capacity to design, develop, implement, and score performance tasks.

**Colorado Department of Education** formed “Content Collaboratives,” teams of teachers who review, develop, pilot, and share performance tasks.
Strategy 2: Performance Assessment for High School Graduation

Focus: Evaluate students’ abilities to apply their knowledge in ways that reflect the demands of college, career, and life.

Vermont passed proficiency-based HS graduation requirements, which allow to present multiple types of evidence of proficiency, including portfolios, performances, and projects.
Strategy 3: Include Performance Tasks in State Systems of Assessment

**Focus:** Make statewide assessments more meaningful by incorporating performance tasks or replacing statewide assessments with local performance tasks.

*California, New Hampshire, and Oregon* all adopted SBAC and engaged in the Building Educator Assessment Literacy (BEAL) project, which trains teachers to score SBAC performance tasks and make instructional shifts to support students in being successful with these tasks.
Strategy 4: Seek a Waiver to use Performance Assessment for Federal Accountability

**Focus:** Transform state system of assessment to incorporate performance assessments extensively.

**New Hampshire’s** Performance Assessment of Competency Education (PACE) pilot program connects curriculum, assessment, and instruction by integrating locally developed and curriculum-embedded performance assessments, common summative performance assessments, and SBAC.
Implications for Integrating Performance Assessment in State Assessment Systems

✓ All four strategies can be implemented under ESSA.
✓ All strategies included extensive investment in growing educator capacity to design, develop, implement, and/or score performance tasks.
Our vision, in collaboration with:

• The Governor;
• The General Assembly;
• The Board of Education;
• Local School Boards;
• Community Partners;
• Education Stakeholders and Parents;

is to create an excellent statewide system of public education that prepares every Virginia student for success.
Virginia Highlights

1. Assessments
2. College and Career Readiness
3. Innovation
Assessments
Public Education in Virginia

132 school divisions in eight regions
Structure of Schools and the Profile of a Virginia Graduate
High School Graduate

State Board of Education will develop a “Profile of a Virginia Graduate”

• In consultation with stakeholders
• Consider critical thinking, creative thinking, collaboration, communication, and citizenship
• Opportunities for internships, externships, and credentialing
In Virginia, the career-ready individual will, during his or her K-12 educational career:

- Achieve and apply appropriate academic and technical knowledge
- Attain and demonstrate productive workplace skills, qualities, and behaviors
- Align knowledge, skills, and personal interests with career opportunities
- Build connections and value for interactions with diverse communities
Innovation

• Innovation Grants
  • Workforce readiness
• Personalized learning
• Competency based learning
Virginia Public Schools Prepare Students for SUCCESS
Thank You

Dr. John W. “Billy” Haun
Chief Academic Officer/Assistant Superintendent of Instruction

Billy.Haun@doe.virginia.gov
NH’S LEADING EDGE ASSESSMENT AND SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PILOT

Paul Leather, Deputy Commissioner, New Hampshire Department of Education

Designing Systems of Support and Accountability for Meaningful Learning: Early Lessons from State Efforts
AERA -- April 10, 2016
Key Events Shaping NH Education:

- Interest in Competency based transcripts -- NHBIA
- NH Rules require credit based on mastery of competencies by 2008
- 4 pilot NH HS given substantial financial support and TA by the Nellie Mae Education Foundation (NMEF) to develop comprehensive ELO/CBE programs
- NH is founding member of CCSSO Innovative Lab Network
- NH Rules amended requiring CBE K-12
- NH, VT, and RI pass joint resolutions to form the NESSC
- ECS selects NH for Newman Innovation Award
- NHDOE Taskforce on Effective Teaching releases 2nd Report
- The NHCBE is formed, supported by NMEF
- The NHDOE convenes a task force to design a clear vision for a “fair and equitable” teacher evaluation system, producing the Phase I Report
- NMEF funds PACE Pilot development
- NHDOE recognizes PACE Pilot, supported by NMEF
- USED recognizes PACE Pilot, supported by NMEF
- NH awarded NGA Grant to advance SCL


- NH launches competency education pilot in 27 high schools
- NGA Planning Grant awarded to NH to integrate ELOs with CBE
- NH raises the compulsory age of education from 16 to 18, reducing the dropout rate to 1.26%
- The NHDOE Taskforce on Effective Teaching is formed, supported by NMEF
- Reaching Higher NH and NH Learning Initiative Formed

ESSA passes with Innovative Demonstration modeled after PACE
Accountability For Meaningful Learning In A 51st State – State And Local Partnership:

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

K-2: SBAC
3 - 4: SBAC
5 - 6: SBAC
7 - 8: SBAC
9 – 10: SAT
11 -12: SAT

State Validation Assessment
State Validation Assessment
Graduation Portfolio

Disaggregated Data

Assessment Quality Assurance (reviews local assessment plans and delivery)
# 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>☑ Local PAs</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>☑ Smarter Balanced</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>☑ Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Smarter Balanced</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>☑ Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>☑ Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>☑ Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>☑ Smarter Balanced</td>
<td>Smarter Balanced</td>
<td>Smarter Balanced</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>☑ Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>☑ Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>☑ Smarter Balanced SAT in 2016</td>
<td>Smarter Balanced SAT in 2016</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
<td>Common PACE PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>☑ Local PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
<td>Local PBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
# Note Weight of Local Assessments!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>CLASSROOM COMPETENCY GRADING [All courses and disciplines]</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COURSE COMPETENCY COMMON ASSESSMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMPETENCY COMMON ASSESSMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. NUMBERS &amp; QUANTITIES, 2. ALGEBRA, 3. FUNCTIONS, 4. GEOMETRY, 5. STATISTICS &amp; PROBABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unit Summative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place value, rounding, addition, subtraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement conversions, addition, subtraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fractions with like denominators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiplication/division facts, Multi-digit</td>
<td></td>
<td>NWEA (MAP) 212.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>multiplication, division (multi-digit) Geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fractions with unlike denominators Decimal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fractions Geometry Geometry &amp; symmetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tri 1: Mapping Migrating Monarchs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unit Summative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place Value Multiplication Division Fraction</td>
<td></td>
<td>NWEA (MAP) 221.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addition/Subraction Multiplication of Fractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Division of Fractions Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volume and Capacity Algebraic Expressions Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Analysis Geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tri 1: Summer Olympics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unit Summative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratios , Rates and Measurement Conversions, Order of Operations, Exponents and Algebraic Expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td>NWEA (MAP) 225.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tri 1: Summer Olympics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Combining Multiple Measures

SBAC/SAT in select grades

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

PACE Common Performance Task

District-Level Competency Scores

PACE
Comparable Annual Determinations
Yes, this is hard!!

• This is not for the faint of heart, or the Unprepared!
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
System Design is based on High Performing Professional Learning Communities

• **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
• **Assessment system** to measure student achievement and growth related to competencies
• Validated **performance assessments** occupy a visible place in the local assessment system
• **Educators review student work** on performance tasks regularly
• **Smarter Balanced** assessment administered at least **once** in elementary and middle school
• **SAT** once in High School
Quality Performance Review

Robust Data

Examination of Practice and Learning

Peer Review

Expertise

51st State White Paper, 2014
Darling-Hammond, Wilhoit, Pittenger
In-state Partners:
Consultants – Rose Colby, Center for Assessment

Tier 3 Planning Districts

Tier 2 Preparing Districts

Tier 1 Implementing Districts

DoE/NH Learning Initiative
PACE Management Team

National Partners:
Foundations
Center for Collaborative Education
CIE/Stanford

Planning Districts:
developing CBE:
Competencies, instruction, assessment, grading

Preparing for implementation:
PD in Performance Assessment development and implementation

Institutional Supports:
State Board
Governor’s Office
NH Legislature

Implementing districts:
PD in Callibration/scoring practices

Organization to PACE Scaling
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”
Questions?
Soung Bae (soungb@stanford.edu)
Travis Bristol (tbristol@stanford.edu)
Billy Haun (Billy.Haun@doe.virginia.gov)
Paul Leather (Paul.Leather@doe.nh.gov)
Elizabeth Leisy Stosich (stosich@stanford.edu)

Learn More: https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/