



# Topic: Accountability Indicators

---

## Contents

Topic: Accountability Indicators.....	1
What the Law Requires.....	2
Peer Review Criteria.....	2
Previously Submitted and Revised Montana Indicators.....	5
Guiding Questions for Feedback.....	6
Feedback on Previously Submitted Indicators.....	7
Summary of Indicators from Submitted State Plans.....	8
Arizona .....	8
Colorado.....	10
District of Columbia .....	10
Illinois .....	11
Louisiana .....	11
Maine .....	12
Massachusetts .....	12
New Mexico .....	14
North Dakota.....	14
Oregon .....	15
Tennessee .....	16
Vermont .....	16

## What the Law Requires

- Annually measure, for all students and separately for each subgroup of students the following **indicators**:
  - **Academic achievement**, as measured by proficiency on the annual assessments (must) And at the state’s discretion, student growth, as measured by such annual assessments, or another valid and reliable statewide indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance
  - For public high schools in the State, and based on state-designed long term goals, the **four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate**; and at the State’s discretion, the extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate
  - **Progress in achieving English language proficiency**, as defined by the State, for all English learners
  - **Not less than 1 indicator of school quality or student** that a) allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance, b) is valid, reliable, comparable and statewide with the same indicators used for each grade span, and may include student growth. These may include measures of:
    - Student engagement
    - Educator engagement
    - Student access to and completion of advanced coursework
    - Postsecondary readiness
    - School climate and safety
    - Any other indicator that meets the criteria

## Peer Review Criteria

Indicator	Peer Review criteria
General criteria for all indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the indicator valid and reliable?</li> <li>• Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals?</li> <li>• Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?</li> </ul>
A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the SEA describe the Academic Achievement indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator for all schools in all LEAs across the State?</li> <li>• Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator, including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2) a description of the weighting of reading/language arts achievement relative to mathematics achievement; 3) if the State uses one, a description of the performance index; 4) if, at the high school level, the indicator includes a measure of student growth, a description of the growth measure (<i>e.g.</i>, a growth model); and 5) if the State averages data, a description of how it averages data across years and/or grades (<i>e.g.</i>, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?</li> <li>• Is the indicator measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments?</li> <li>• Does the indicator measure the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup?</li> </ul>

Indicator	Peer Review criteria
<p>A.4.iv.b: Other Academic Indicator for Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the SEA describe the Other Academic indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, including that the SEA uses the same indicator and calculates it in the same way for all elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, in all LEAs, across the State, except that the indicator may vary by each grade span?</li> <li>• Does the SEA describe, if applicable, how it averages data across years and/or grades (<i>e.g.</i>, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?</li> <li>• If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?</li> <li>• If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, is the indicator another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator?</li> <li>• If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?</li> <li>• Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?</li> </ul>
<p>A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the SEA describe the Graduation Rate indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public high schools in the State, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?</li> <li>• Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all high schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2), if applicable, whether the SEA chooses to lag adjusted cohort graduation rate data; and 3) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (<i>e.g.</i>, consistent with the provisions in ESEA section 8101(23) and (25), which permit averaging graduation rate data over three years for very small schools)?</li> <li>• Is the indicator based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?</li> <li>• If the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted-cohort graduation rates, does the description include how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator?</li> <li>• If applicable, does the SEA’s description include how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25)?</li> </ul>
<p>A.4.iv.d: Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the SEA describe the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?</li> <li>• Is the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator aligned with the State-determined timeline described in A.4.iii.c.1?</li> </ul>

Indicator	Peer Review criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the indicator consistently measure statewide the progress of all English learners in each of grades 3 through 8 and in the grade for which such English learners are otherwise assessed under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) during grades 9 through 12?</li> <li>• Does the SEA’s description include the State’s definition of English language proficiency, based on the State English language proficiency assessment?</li> </ul>
A.4.iv.e: School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the SEA describe each School Quality or Student Success indicator used in its statewide accountability system for all public schools in the State?</li> <li>• If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?</li> <li>• Does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?</li> <li>• Is the indicator valid, reliable, comparable, used statewide in all schools (for the grade span to which it applies), and calculated in a consistent way?</li> </ul>
A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the SEA describe the weighting of each indicator in its system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the weighting is adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students (<i>e.g.</i>, for the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator)?</li> <li>• Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators each receive substantial weight individually?</li> <li>• Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators receive, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate?</li> </ul>

The following table<sup>1</sup> shows how states may use a variety of indicators and measures for a variety of purposes. Indicators for federal and state accountability must conform to the requirements of the law.

**Table 1**  
**Types of Indicators That May Be Included In an Accountability and Improvement System**

<b>Federal indicators, used for federal and state accountability</b>	Measures used for monitoring and identifying schools for intervention as required by ESSA. Data must meet ESSA's requirements for being valid and reliable, and for meaningfully differentiating schools statewide, as well as being disaggregated by student subgroup.
<b>State-reported indicators, used for state and local information and improvement</b>	Measures publicly available in a comparable way across districts and schools to inform ongoing evaluation and continuous improvement processes. May be used to inform state or regional support (but not to identify schools for intervention in the federally required system).
<b>State-supported indicators, used for local information and improvement</b>	Tools and measures provided by the state that districts or schools may choose to use to evaluate, monitor, and improve school and classroom practices and student learning.
<b>Locally selected indicators, used for local information and improvement</b>	Measures schools and districts may develop or select and adopt for their own purposes to guide their monitoring and improvement efforts.

Source: Adapted from *Preparing all students for college, career, life, and leadership in the 21st century: Superintendent's Advisory Task Force on Accountability and Continuous Improvement*, 2016, California Department of Education.

However, states and districts may develop their own indicators as part of their own state or local reporting and information systems to pinpoint challenges or demonstrate success or quality in other ways.

### Previously Submitted and Revised Montana Indicators

No changes were made to the academic indicators between the previously submitted plan and the current draft. There are proposed changes to the school quality indicators, which reflect stakeholder preferences. Stakeholders felt strongly that “school climate” should constitute the indicator of school quality or student success. They felt schools should be able to demonstrate positive programming through this indicator. However, due to time constraints, suspension and attendance were used as valid and reliable measures for the school quality/student success indicators. With more time, we are working to develop new measures more closely aligned to stakeholder wishes. Possibilities include receiving points for having school climate improvement programs in place, family and community engagement, and college and career readiness for high schools.

<b>Previously Submitted</b>	<b>Current Draft</b>
<b>Required Academic Indicators:</b> Assessment Proficiency ~ 20 points Assessment Improvement ~ 20 points Graduation Rate ~ 20 points English Learner Progress ~ 10 points	<b>Required Academic Indicators:</b> Assessment Proficiency ~ 20 points Assessment Improvement ~ 20 points Graduation Rate ~ 20 points English Learner Progress ~ 10 points

<sup>1</sup> Source: Melnick, H., Cook-Harvey, C. M., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Encouraging social and emotional learning in the context of new accountability. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

<b>Previously Submitted</b>	<b>Current Draft</b>
<p><b>Selected School</b>  <b>Quality Indicators:</b>  Average Daily Attendance ~15 points  Suspension Rates ~15 points</p>	<p><b>Selected School</b>  <b>Quality Indicators:</b>  Average Daily Attendance ~7.5 points  Suspension Rates ~7.5 points  <b>Selected School</b>  <b>Climate indicators:</b>  CSIP questions ~10 points (Does your school have a PBIS program? Do you regularly hold family nights?)  <b>College and Career Readiness:</b>  ~5 points</p>

**Guiding Questions for Feedback**

- Do the proposed indicators and weighting of indicators meet the requirements of the law?
- Do the proposed indicators and weighting of indicators reflect evidence of what matters most for college, career and community readiness?
- Do the proposed indicators and weighting reflect what’s most important to Montanans?
- Can the proposed indicators for school quality or student success be measured validly and reliably?
- What additional indicators or measures should we consider?

## Feedback on Previously Submitted Indicators

*Education Northwest and the Center for Assessment*

In refining the overall plan, we suggest considering the following processes and specific recommendations:

- Establish a clear statement of the state's policy priorities and values
  - For example: Montana prioritizes graduation from high school, promoting college/career readiness, equity, and developing non-academic skills in students.
  - In order to align with stated priorities and goals, long term goals should include a plan for establishing goals for college/career readiness and developing non-academic skills in addition to the stated goals for performance (General and ELL), growth, and graduation.
- For the School Quality/Student Success indicator, School climate has emerged as an indicator of interest in a few states for ESSA planning. We present a few ideas to consider:
  - The consideration of how school improvement plans are being implemented or are viable is critical to the successful use of climate data. While climate data may be a measure of interest, it may be premature to use it as a high-stakes measure. This is based on the need to have an explicit theory of change or action at the school level to effectively use these data to drive change, which is reliant on the supports, resources, and conditions on the ground level (e.g., quality of the school's leadership team or school culture to collect, interpret, and act upon data).
  - The acts of collecting, interpreting, and acting upon data (e.g., climate data) in a systematic fashion can be made explicit through school improvement plans that are focused so they are not arduous, but encourage schools to think through the links between the data, behavioral changes, and eventual outcomes.
  - The consideration of school improvement plan viability is naturally tied to this, but quantifying this with rubrics should be tested to ensure the process can be done systematically, can be replicated, and is defensible without the need for an unreasonable amount of resources (e.g., staff and time).
- The state should provide additional details of how the measures are being combined in a way that is supported by the measurement, consistent with the design principles and aligned with the overall goals of the system (e.g. weights, decision rules for combination, reporting).
  - The plan outlines the measures under consideration but is silent on the process that will be followed to determine the specifics.
- Clearly articulate how Montana wishes to conceptualize school quality. For example, by deepening the measure of student learning or by expanding the concept of school quality (e.g., through the use of improvement strategies or measures of student success).
- Career ready indicators: We think promising alternatives that many states are exploring include:
  - Assessments of college/ career readiness
  - Course credit accumulation
  - Completion of pathway especially with and/or industry or 3<sup>rd</sup> party certification
  - Co-curricular learning experiences
  - Post- secondary accomplishments

- We offer the following general advice with regard to **weighting**:
- Consider the intuitiveness of the system. The accountability system should be explainable, transparent, and the aggregation methods should align with the measures. There is a need to balance the ability of system to adequately and validly (based on your intended outcomes of the system) differentiate schools and incentivize behaviors based on a clear understanding of the indicators and reporting.
- Typically, this would be a judgment based process but it should be evaluated with impact data.
- We recommend the following process to help define expectations:
  - Define what an “ideal” school looks like.
  - Identify a sample of schools that should in theory be high on the “ideal” continuum, a sample of schools that have some but not all of the highly valued characteristics, and a sample of schools that are struggling.
  - Calculate scores for each of the schools
  - Explore different weighting models
  - Select the weighting model that
    - Corresponds to scores most aligned with the stated goals.
    - Adheres to the law
    - Emphasizes the indicators that are most important to the state
    - Is not biased against certain school profiles.
      - For example, one would want to see if schools that serve high percentages of students in poverty have access to favorable outcomes. If not, that may signal the model is not well specified. Note: we don’t suggest the distribution of performance is equivalent for high/low poverty schools, only that there should be some proof of concept that schools with various demographic profiles have access to favorable outcomes.

## Summary of Indicators from Submitted State Plans

### Arizona

K-8 Indicators	Description	Weights
Academic achievement	Proficiency statewide assessment . Current considerations for all grades include AzMERIT and Achievement MSAA ELA and Math Proficiency calculation, as well as AIMS and AIMS A Science.	30%
Academic progress	Growth statewide assessment: Student Growth Percentile (SGP) (25%): Students are classified as low (1-33), average (34-66) or high (67-99) SGP. Based on their performance level the prior year (MP, PP, P, HP) and their growth level in the current year students are awarded points. Student Growth to Target (SGT) (25%). Students are assigned a target needed to get to proficiency within 3 years or eleventh grade, whichever comes first. Students get points if they hit their annual target, with lower performing students hitting their target getting the most points.	50%

K-8 Indicators	Description	Weights
Progress in achieving ELP	<p>ELL Growth (5%): schools get points based on their school's growth (change in performance calculations levels) compared to the state's average change in performance levels the prior year.</p> <p>ELL Proficiency: schools get points based on their percentage of students proficient compared to the states average ELL proficiency.</p> <p>The following students count: current ELL status, including recent arrivals, with AZELLA scores; with two AZELLA scores to measure growth.</p> <p>Schools with fewer than 20 FAY, ELLs do not get these points. Their point total is calculated with a maximum of 90 points, not 100.</p>	10%
School quality/student success	<p>Acceleration/Readiness measures School Quality and Success indicators for K-8 schools: Success Acceleration Menu items (10% -- up to 10 points from the following)</p> <p>This is a menu, not all schools can earn all types of points depending on their grade configuration and offerings. There are multiple ways to get to 10 points.</p> <p>End Of Course (EOC) math testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A school can earn up to 5 points.</li> <li>• Increasing the percentage of 5-8 grade students accelerating in EOC math</li> <li>• A school's current year proficiency percentage is greater than the school's prior year proficiency percentage= 5 points</li> <li>• A school's current year and prior year proficiency percentage equals 100 = 5 points</li> <li>• A school's current year proficiency percentage is less than the school's prior year proficiency percentage= 0 points</li> </ul> <p>Decreasing 3 grade minimally proficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A school can earn up to 5 points.</li> <li>• A school's current year minimally proficient percentage is less than the school's prior year minimally proficient percentage=5 points</li> <li>• A school's current year and prior year minimally proficient percentage equals 0 = 5 points</li> <li>• A school's current year minimally proficient percentage is greater than the school's prior year minimally proficient percentage= 0 points</li> </ul> <p>Subgroup improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two points per group with a maximum of 6 points.</li> <li>• School's current year weighted, stable proficiency compared to the prior year weighted, stable state average for the subgroup.</li> <li>• Groups required for Federal Accountability: White, African-Am, Hispanic, Asian, Nat Am, Pacific Islander, Two or More Races, ELL (current and FEP 1-4), SpEd, FRL and Gender</li> </ul> <p>Special education inclusion in general classroom</p>	10%

K-8 Indicators	Description	Weights
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A school can earn up to 2 points.</li> <li>Schools with 7% or more of their population in special education are eligible.</li> <li>Students spending 80%+ of their day in the general education classroom receive points depending on their classification.</li> <li>Depending on the average points per special education student enrolled, schools receive points.</li> </ul> <p>Chronic absenteeism: students absent for 10% or more of the year (18+ days)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A school's current year chronic absenteeism percentage is less than the school's prior year chronic absenteeism percentage=5 points</li> <li>A school's current year and prior year chronic absenteeism percentage equals 0 = 5 points</li> <li>A school's current year chronic absenteeism percentage is greater than the school's prior year chronic absenteeism percentage = 0 points</li> </ul>	

Colorado

Indicators	Description	Weights
Academic achievement	Mean Scale Score-The mean scale score for each state-required content assessment in 3 <sup>rd</sup> through 11 <sup>th</sup> grades in ELA, math, and science.	ES: 35% HS: 30%
Academic progress	Median student growth percentile Will use a quantile regression model using the median student growth percentile for statewide assessments administered in the 4 <sup>th</sup> through 9 <sup>th</sup> grades.	ES: 60% HS: 40%
Graduation rate	Four, five, six, or seven year graduation rate	
Progress in achieving ELP	Uses same model as growth in student achievement. Median student growth percentile.	
School Quality or student success	Reduction in chronic absenteeism for elementary/middle schools Reporting the number of chronically absent students by school (absent 10% or more of the days enrolled)	ES: 5%
	Dropout rates for HS Defined as annual rate, reflecting the percentage of all students enrolled in 7 <sup>th</sup> through 12 <sup>th</sup> grades who leave during a single year without subsequently attending another school or educational program.	6.7*

District of Columbia

Indicator	Description	Weight
Academic achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% performing at 4 or above on PARCC (K-12)</li> <li>% performing at 3 or above on PARCC (K-12)</li> <li>% of students meeting or exceeded "college ready" benchmark on SAT/ACT (9-12)</li> <li>% of students meeting or exceeding a ACT/SAT threshold determined by the state</li> <li>% of students taking at least one AP/IB exam</li> <li>%of students scoring 3+ on at least one AP and/or 4+ on at least one IB exam</li> </ul>	K-8: 30% 9-12: 50%

Indicator	Description	Weight
Academic progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Norm reference/relative growth measure, student growth percentile that measures how a student performed in this year's assessment when compared to other DC students who had similar achievement on previous year's exam.</li> <li>• Criterion reference growth measure, will consider including an criterion referenced or absolute growth measure.</li> </ul>	K-8: 40%
Graduation rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 year ACGR</li> <li>• Alternate metric looking at the number of total graduates in a given year divided by the number of student in the 4-year ACGR</li> </ul>	9-12: 20%
Progress in achieving ELP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WIDA ACCESS growth</li> </ul>	K-8: 5% 9-12: 5%
School environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chronic absenteeism—school receives points based either 90%+ attendance or student attendance growth percentile for the median students at a school (whichever is better)</li> <li>• In seat attendance--Daily average percentage of enrolled students who are present</li> <li>• Re-enrollment-- % of students who are able to re-enroll in same school and do</li> <li>• CLASS—observational tool looking at the quality o classroom interactions</li> <li>• Access and opportunity--- measure currently being piloted.</li> </ul>	K-8: 25% 9-12: 25%

### Illinois

Indicator	Elementary subjects & weights	High school subjects & weights
Core Academic Indicators = 75%	ELA Proficiency -10% (7.5% beginning in 2019-20)	ELA Proficiency -10% (7.5% beginning in 2019-20)
	Math Proficiency - 10% (7.5% beginning in 2019-20)	Math Proficiency 10% (7.5% beginning in 2019-20)
	Science Proficiency - 0% (5% beginning in 2019-20)	Science Proficiency - 0% (5% beginning in 2019-20)
	ELA and Math Growth –50%(simple linear regression)	Graduation/ELA and Math Growth - 50% (simple linear regression)
	English Learner Proficiency 5% (growth to target treatment)	English Learner Proficiency 5% (growth to target treatment)
School Quality Indicators = 25%	Chronic Absenteeism - 10%	Chronic Absenteeism - 7.5%
	Climate Surveys- 5%	Climate Surveys- 5%
	Fine Arts Indicator-0%	Fine Arts Indicator- 0%
	[Elementary/Middle Grade Indicator]- 5%	9th Grade On-Track- 6.25%
	[P-2 Indicator] - 5%	College and Career Readiness - 6.25%

### Louisiana

Indicator	Description	Weight (beginning 2019-2020)
Academic achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elementary/Middle school assessment index</li> <li>• HS end-of-course index</li> <li>• ACT/WorkKeys index</li> </ul>	ES: 70% MS: 65% HS:25%

Indicator	Description	Weight (beginning 2019-2020)
		HS: ACT/WorkKeys: 5%
Academic progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth index on ELA and math grade 3-10 state assessments</li> </ul>	ES: 25% MS: 25%
Graduation rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4-year ACGR</li> </ul>	HS: 20%
Progress in achieving ELP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual progress toward attaining ELP</li> </ul>	*is included in academic achievement index
School Quality or student success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All levels—Interests and opportunities (I/O) will measure whether schools are providing studies with access to a well-rounded education and the extent schools are providing students the opportunity to take courses needed to successfully transition to postsecondary studies</li> <li>Middle schools—Dropout credit accumulation index through 8<sup>th</sup> grade</li> <li>High schools—strength of diploma---points awarded based on attainment of a diploma and post-secondary credit or credentials.</li> </ul>	All levels I/O=5% MS: Dropout credit accumulation: 5% HS: strength of diploma: 25%

### Maine

Indicator	Description	Weight
Academic achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proficiency rate as measured on annual statewide assessments in ELA and Math, will be SAT for grade 11</li> </ul>	ES/MS: 42% HS: 40%
Academic progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress as measured on annual statewide assessments in ELA and math grades 4-8</li> </ul>	ES/MS: 38%
Graduation rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ACGR, for 4,5,and 6 year rates</li> </ul>	HS: 40%
Progress in achieving ELP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English learner progress</li> </ul>	10%
School Quality or student success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K-12: consistent attendance, or the % of students who have “regular” attendance</li> </ul>	10%

### Massachusetts

Indicator	Description	Weight
Academic achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grades 3-8 ELA and Math average scale score</li> <li>Grades 5 and 8 Science average scale score equated to the Next Generation ELA and Math MCAS scale</li> <li>Grade 10 ELA, math, and science: average scale score equated to the Next Generation ELA and Math MCAS scale</li> </ul>	ES: 60% ES w/o EL: 70% HS: 50%
Academic progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mean student growth percentile</li> <li>Measure of growth to standard (to be incorporated in the future)</li> </ul>	ES: 25% HS: 20% HS w/o EL: 25%
Graduation rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4-year ACGR</li> <li>5-year ACGR plus percentage of students still enrolled in HS</li> <li>Annual dropout rate</li> </ul>	HS: 17.5%
Progress in achieving ELP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student attainment of ELP</li> <li>Progress made by students toward ELP as measured by WIDA ACCESS</li> </ul>	ES: 10% HS: 5%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Weight</b>
School Quality or student success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chronic absenteeism (all grades)—missing more than 10% of school days</li> <li>• Success in grade 9 courses</li> <li>• Successful completion of broad and challenging coursework (HS)--% of students who successfully complete AP/IB/honors classes.</li> </ul>	ES: 5% HS: 7.5%

## New Mexico

Indicator	Description	Weight
Academic achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student proficiency on ELA and Math</li> <li>• Student STEM readiness--drawing primarily upon student performance on statewide science assessments, but also considering overall student engagement in STEM fields. The state will continue to engage educators, as well as business and industry, in the development of this new indicator.</li> </ul>	K-8: 33% 9-12: 25%
Academic progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student growth</li> </ul>	K-8: 5% for growth of students in quartile 4 (highest performing) 12% for growth of students in quartiles 2 & 3 25% for growth of students in quartile 1 (lowest performing) 9-12: 5% for growth of students in quartile 4 (highest performing) 10% for growth of students in quartiles 2 & 3 15% for growth of students in quartile 1 (lowest performing)
Graduation rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4, 5, and 6 year ACGR</li> </ul>	HS: 6% for 4-year rate, 2% for 5-year rate 1% for 6-year rate
Progress in achieving ELP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth toward proficiency</li> </ul>	K-8: 10% 9-12: 5%
School Quality or student success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College and career readiness (still being developed)</li> <li>• Opportunity to learn –developing a survey to account for school safety, climate, culture, and responsiveness to community needs, including a version for PreK-3.</li> </ul>	9-12 CCR: 12%  Opp to learn: 10%

## North Dakota

Indicator	Description	Weight
Academic achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proficiency in ELA and math on statewide assessments</li> </ul>	K-8: 30% 9-12: 25%
Academic progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic growth progress on statewide assessments</li> </ul>	K-8: 30%
Graduation rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4,5, 6 year graduation rates</li> </ul>	9-12: 13%
Progress in achieving ELP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ELP growth progress on WIDA ACCESS</li> </ul>	K-8: 10% 9-12: 10%
School Quality or student success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K-8: Student engagement survey</li> <li>• HS: Climate engagement (not yet determined)</li> <li>• HS: College and career readiness: ND choice ready framework to measure the% of students on track to graduate choice ready.</li> </ul>	K-8, engagement: 30% 9-12, CCR: 22% 9-12, Climate: 22%v

Oregon

Indicator	Description	Weight										
		Weighted criteria: Each indicator will be measured on one of five levels.										
Opportunity to learn	Growth in ELA	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Level 5</td> <td>Meets long term goal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 4</td> <td>Meeting the interim target, but not yet meeting the long term goal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 3</td> <td>Below the interim target, but not in the lowest 30% of schools.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 2</td> <td>In the lowest 30% of schools, but not in the lowest 10%.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 1</td> <td>In the lowest 10% of schools</td> </tr> </table>	Level 5	Meets long term goal	Level 4	Meeting the interim target, but not yet meeting the long term goal	Level 3	Below the interim target, but not in the lowest 30% of schools.	Level 2	In the lowest 30% of schools, but not in the lowest 10%.	Level 1	In the lowest 10% of schools
	Level 5		Meets long term goal									
	Level 4		Meeting the interim target, but not yet meeting the long term goal									
Level 3	Below the interim target, but not in the lowest 30% of schools.											
Level 2	In the lowest 30% of schools, but not in the lowest 10%.											
Level 1	In the lowest 10% of schools											
	Growth in Math											
	Chronic Absenteeism											
Academic Success	Achievement in ELA											
	Achievement in Math											
	English learner proficiency											
College and Career Readiness	Graduation rate-four-year cohort	<p>These weights will be applied as follows: If a school is rated as Level 1 on an indicator with double weight, this indicator will count as 2 toward the total number of indicators that triggers comprehensive or targeted improvement. For instance, a school will be identified for comprehensive improvement if the “All Students” group is Level 1 in both ELA and math growth and on at least one other indicator.</p> <p>The accountability system will apply additional weights to academic growth for elementary and middle schools, and to graduation for high schools (using the weights in the table below) indicates the weights that will be applied. Note that “combined schools” are schools serving high school grades as well as students in grades 7 or lower.</p> <p>The total weight applied to the academic indicators is much higher than that for the School Quality/Student Success indicators, and low performance on the academic indicators is sufficient to trigger identification for comprehensive or targeted support.</p>										
	Freshman on-track (% of students earning at least one quarter of credits required for graduation)											
	Five-year completion rate											

Indicator	Grade span			
	Elementary	Middle	High	Combined
Achievement in ELA	1	1	1	1
Achievement in math	1	1	1	1
Growth in ELA	2	2		2
Growth in math	2	2		2
EL Progress	2	2	2	2
4-year ACGR			2	2
Chronic absenteeism	1	1	1	1
Freshmen on track			1	1

Indicator	Description		Weight	
5-year ACGR			1	1
TOTAL	9	9	9	13

### Tennessee

Indicator	Description	Weight
Academic achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Absolute proficiency or Annual measurable objective (AMO) on statewide assessments</li> </ul>	* K-8: 45% 9-12: 30%
Academic progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student growth measure on statewide assessments</li> </ul>	K-8: 35% 9-12: 25%
Graduation rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ready Graduate Graduation rate X (percent of graduates scoring 21+ on ACT or EPSO/Industry Cert achievement) Absolute or AMO</li> </ul>	9-12: 25%
Progress in achieving ELP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth on WIDA ACCESS</li> </ul>	10%
School Quality or student success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chronically out of school Students who miss 10% or more of school due to absence or suspension/expulsion Absolute or AMO</li> </ul>	10%

\*indicators will be analyzed for both all students and student subgroups. i.e., you a schools total score will be composed of how all students performed and a separate analysis for subgroups. Weights for both analyses will be the same

### Vermont

Category	Accountability Question(Indicators)	School-Level Weights					
		High School					
		EL Present	NoEL Present	EL Present		No EL Present	
				Science	No	Science	No Sci.
Content Standards	How well are students performing in ELA/reading? (Growth and proficiency)	20%	22%	35%	37.5%	37.5%	40%
	How well are students performing in mathematics? (Growth and proficiency)	20%	22%	35%	37.5%	37.5%	40%
	How well are students performing in science? (Proficiency)	5%	6%	10%	0%	12.5%	0%
	How well are students performing in physical education? (Proficiency)	5%	6%	10%	12.5%	12.5%	20%

Category	Accountability Question( <b>Indicators</b> )s)	School-Level Weights					
		High School					
		EL Present	NoEL Present	EL Present		No EL Present	
				Science	No Sci.	Science	No Sci.
English Language Proficiency	How well are English Learners gaining English (Growth)	10%	0%	10%	12.5%	0%	0%
Graduation Rate	Are students staying in school until they graduate? (4-year and 6-year)	20%	22%	0%	0%	0%	0%
College and Career Readiness	How well did seniors perform on career and college ready assessments? (SAT,ACT, AP, IB, ASVAB, etc.)	10%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Are alumni pursuing a career and college ready outcome within 16 months of graduation?	10%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%