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Survey Purpose & Context

- Survey allows OSSE to capture perspectives on measures for both the formal accountability system and for public reporting.
- Sections cover academic achievement, academic growth, graduation measures, English learner proficiency, subgroup weighting, and school quality and student success measures for ES/MS and HS.
- Includes additional open-ended questions and space for comments about each section.
Survey Respondents

About You: I am a...

- Advocate: 20%
- Community member: 17%
- Data manager: 9%
- Head of school/principal: 4%
- LEA leader: 11%
- LEA central office staff: 11%
- Policymaker: 15%
- Teacher: 9%
- Other: 4%

Responses as of Nov. 4, 2016

*N = 158
Perspective on Potential Measures

I have a perspective to provide on potential measures for...

- **High school only**: 9%
- **Elementary/middle only**: 42%
- **Both**: 49%

*N = 149

Responses as of Nov. 4, 2016
• Most favored including overall rate of students at level 4+ on PARCC and MSAA ELA and math.
• Almost equal interest in including level 3+ overall.
• As popular was including a decrease of students at level 1.
• Less interest in incorporating the science assessment in the formal accountability framework.
Respondents to both the elementary/middle and high school surveys were most interested in including a growth measure such as median growth percentile (MGP), accounting for individual student progress.
Graduation Rate

• Per ESSA regulations, we must include 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR) in the accountability framework.
• Over half (62 percent) of respondents “strongly agreed” with the inclusion of growth in the 4-year ACGR over time.
• Respondents also expressed strong interest in including a 5-year cohort measure.
Across high school and elementary/middle school, respondents expressed a similar level of interest in the three options included:

• Proficiency and growth targets on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 assessment
• Proficiency and growth targets on ACCESS for ELLS 2.0, as determined by developmentally appropriate grade level/band
• Proficiency and growth targets on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 assessment and portfolios
Most favored options were:

1. Attendance metric
2. Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) performance
3. Career and technical education measure
4. Student re-enrollment rate
5. Measure of students meeting SAT or ACT “college ready” benchmark
Most favored options were:

1. In-seat attendance
2. Measure of chronic absenteeism
3. Measure of truancy
4. Discipline information
5. Re-enrollment rate
How much do you think the performance of particular groups of students should be weighted?

- A lot: 36%
- Somewhat: 44%
- Little to very little: 20%

Responses as of Nov. 4, 2016

*N = 69
If you were able to include one measure (outside of the required ones), what would that be and why?

- School resources such as libraries, technology, etc.
- Student/parent satisfaction and school climate
- Attendance measures
- Growth over time