ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM REVIEW PANEL

Legislative Services Agency
200 West Washington Street, Suite 301
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2789
Tel: (317) 233-0696 Fax: (317) 232-2554

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: October 28, 2013
Meeting Time: 9:00 A.M.
Meeting Place: State House, 200 W. Washington St., Room 233
Meeting City: Indianapolis, Indiana
Meeting Number: 7

Members Present:
Superintendent Glenda Ritz, Co-Chairperson; Dr. Steve Yager, Co-Chairperson; Steve Baker; Melanie Park; Derek Redelman; Dr. Jim Snapp; Robert Lugo; Casandra McLeod; Claire Fiddian-Green; Dr. Shane Robbins; Sheila Seedhouse; Jessica Dunn Feeser; Scott Bess; Keith Gambill; Cheryl Ramsey; Dr. E. Ric Frataccia; Michele Walker.

Members Absent: None.

Co-Chairperson Yager called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. and reviewed the goals for the meeting. Danielle Shockey, Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education (DoE), presented information about decisions the Panel has taken at previous meetings and decisions that remain to be made (Exhibit A).

Deb Dailey, Assistant Director of Information Services, DoE, led the Panel in discussion

1 These minutes, exhibits, and other materials referenced in the minutes can be viewed electronically at http://www.in.gov/legislative. Hard copies can be obtained in the Legislative Information Center in Room 230 of the State House in Indianapolis, Indiana. Requests for hard copies may be mailed to the Legislative Information Center, Legislative Services Agency, West Washington Street, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2789. A fee of $0.15 per page and mailing costs will be charged for hard copies.
about how points should be assigned for student growth from grade 8 through grade 10 during the transition period from the current accountability model to the recommended accountability model. Under the current model, the performance of a percentage of a student cohort is considered for growth; under the new model, the performance of individual students within a cohort will be considered.

On the question of super subgroups under the federal waiver, for which Indiana uses top 75% - bottom 25% subgroups, Utah and Louisiana use proficient and nonproficient students as their subgroups instead of set percentages. No action was taken on the issue.

On the question of weights for domains and indicators, Ms. Dailey distributed charts of school report cards, calculated using student data from 2012, to show how the new model will impact existing A, C, and F graded schools (Exhibit B). For the purpose of the charts, weights were arbitrarily determined. The Panel decided that for participation, if the percentage of participation is 95% or higher, the school will receive a full credit; if the percentage is 94.9% or lower, the school will receive a partial credit equal to the percentage. Schools will not be penalized for less than 95% participation, and the elementary and high school models will treat participation in the same manner.

The Panel held considerable discussion concerning growth to proficiency: how it will be determined, whether a better way of stating "growth to proficiency" for a school is "students meeting targeted proficiency", the necessity of having a statistical analysis to determine appropriate time frames for students to move to proficiency, and whether a categorical model is sufficient to determine growth to proficiency.

The Panel reviewed the draft final report (Exhibit C), and made changes and corrections to the report. In making the changes, Exhibits D and E were distributed for the Panel's review.

The Panel examined unique school situations under the current model and made recommendations for the new model. Under the current model, small schools (with classes below the size required for the model) are graded by going back up to three years to establish a cohort of a sufficient size. The Panel recommended that practice be continued. For new schools, no recommendations were made. For dropout recovery schools, the changes made to the high school model should also be made for dropout recovery schools during the transition period. For school configurations with no tested grades (for example, a K-2 school or a grade 9 only school): while eventually all grades will be tested in at least some areas, during the transition, the feeder school model, in which the school receives the grade of the school into which it sends students, will be continued.

The Panel decided to have DoE develop flags to identify anomalies in the accountability system’s assignment of grades to schools.

In discussing the final report, Mr. Redelman raised concerns about the lack of data in evaluating recommendations for a model and the lack of agreement on a matrix for the categorical model. He also questioned the definition of "targeted growth" added to the report. Ms. Fiddian-Green pointed out that if a quorum of members of the Panel attend the State Board of Education meeting on November 8, a meeting can be held to correct errors in the final report. The final report was adopted on a voice vote of 16-1.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:26 p.m.
Decisions to Date

Decision on Values of Panel
Decision of What was Preferred as Growth Options based on work in 50 States
Decision to Narrow to Categorical and Trajectory
Decision to not add Domain of Multiple Measures
Decision to build model based on Categorical

Decision made to eliminate the top 25% and bottom 25% indicators
Decision to use a 500 Point Model
Decision to indicate importance of Reading Achievement and Growth as Future Data Point
Decision to put CBI indicators under the domains of Growth and Performance
Decision to indicate a model that could have data points at all grade levels in the future
Decision that Science would not be an Indicator

Decision to add PSAT as an element of CCR

Decision to not have as a stand alone indicator the combined ELA/Math

Decision was made to add Growth to Proficiency back to Growth Domain

Decision was made to not include categorical score in performance domain

Decision was made to include in the new model categorical improvement for High School

Decision was made to add growth to proficiency for high school when data becomes available

Decision for 10th-12th grade growth was to utilize the same points

Decision was made to restate current CCR goal of 33% and utilise CCR rates times a multiplier of 1 to ensure 100%

Decision to consult IITF and CHE on appropriate measures of CCR and transition to 100% CCR Indiana

Decision was made the current top 75% and bottom 25% sub groups with a categorical improvement indicator in the growth domain

Decision was made the lack of evidence to align the reader categories by using Remove/Commentable (R) and Remove/Read only (L)
Decisions for Today

1. During transition how will points for improvement 8th grade to 10th grade be assigned?*

2. Weights for domains and indicators

- How to handle school with unique situations?
  - configurations with no tested grades?
  - small schools- counts below 'N' size
  - options for new schools
  - dropout recovery schools
  - other
Panel requests that during beta testing period experts will be invited to work alongside IDOE and SBOE.

Updates to the Panel and opportunities to meet between now and end of MOU should be created.

Within model some recommendations, such as subgroup indicator require federal input, so recommendation should allow for such adjustments.

Purpose: Recommendations to the State Board of Education that would provide guidance during the beta testing period. Quality guardrails will be used as a measuring stick for recommended model. Intent is that beta testing will be done alongside current model and congruent to rule making to allow for adjustments in the recommended model elements may indicate something "JDLR." These would be shared with outside experts in accountability model design so as they work with IDOE to build the model specifications they understand the intent.

Examples:
- "If a school has less than ____% of achievement then they shall not have a grade greater than ____.
- "No more than ____% of the schools in the state may fall into same grade band."
- If schools that have historically been an ____ suddenly fall to ____.
### 2014-15 Accountability Report Card
**ABC School of Indiana (1234)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grades 01-08</th>
<th>Grades 09-11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Participation Rate</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition

Total Performance Points: **1.000 48.885**

Total Growth Points: **1.000 76.330**

Performance: **48.89 0.600 29.331**

Growth: **76.33 0.400 30.532**

Overall Points: **59.864**

Overall Grade: **F**

---
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Exhibit B
## 2014-15 Accountability Report Card
### ABC School of Indiana (1234)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grades 01-08</th>
<th>Grades 09 - 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation Rate</td>
<td>Enrollment Ratio</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>71.6 1</td>
<td>71.6 0.6</td>
<td>67 1</td>
<td>67 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>75.9 1</td>
<td>75.9 0.6</td>
<td>65 1</td>
<td>65 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>85 0.95</td>
<td>80.8 0.6</td>
<td>85 1</td>
<td>85 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Performance Points:** 1.000 86.894

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Growth to Proficiency</th>
<th>Higher Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Lower Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
<th>Improvement Rate</th>
<th>Improvement Grade 10 to Grade 12**</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Overall Points: 87.385</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition*

**Performance:** 86.89 0.600 52.137

**Growth:** 88.12 0.400 35.248

**Overall Grade:** B
### Indiana Department of Education
2014-15 Accountability Report Card
ABC School of Indiana (1234)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grades 01-08</th>
<th>Grades 09-11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Participation Rate</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Enrollment Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Performance Points:** 1.000 95.026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Growth to Proficiency (Categorical)</th>
<th>Higher Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Lower Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
<th>Growth to Proficiency (Categorical)*</th>
<th>Higher Performing (Categorical)*</th>
<th>Lower Performing (Categorical)*</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
<th>Improvement Grade 10 to Grade 12**</th>
<th>Improvement Rate</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Final Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>91.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>91.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>91.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition

**Total Growth Points:** 1.000 91.225

**Performance:** 95.03 0.600 57.016
**Growth:** 91.23 0.400 36.490

**Overall Points:** 93.506
**Overall Grade:** A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grades 01-08</th>
<th>Grades 09 - 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition

Total Growth Points: 1.000 71.697
Performance: 51.66 0.600 30.993
Growth: 71.70 0.400 28.679
Overall Points: 59.672
Overall Grade: F
## Indiana Department of Education
2014-15 Accountability Report Card
ABC School of Indiana (1234)

### Total Performance Points:
- **English/Language Arts**: 64.3
- **Math**: 70.5
- **Reading**: 75.0
- **CCR Achievement (IC, IB, DC, AP, PSAT)**: 75.0
- **Graduation**: 75.0

**Total Performance Points: 1,000**

### Overall Points: 64.242

**Overall Grade: D**
Indiana Department of Education
2014-15 Accountability Report Card
ABC School of Indiana (1234)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grades 01-08</th>
<th>Grades 09 - 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Participation Rate</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Enrollment Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Growth to Proficiency (Categorical)</th>
<th>Higher Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Lower Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
<th>Improvement Grade 10 to Grade 12**</th>
<th>Improvement Rate</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Final Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>77.30</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>8.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>78.75</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>8.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>8.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>28.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>72.10</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>24.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition

Total Growth Points: 1.000 78.594

Performance:
Growth: 64.83 0.600 38.900

Overall Points: 70.338
Overall Grade: C
## 2014-15 Accountability Report Card
### ABC School of Indiana (1234)

### Component | Grades 01-08 | Grades 09 - 11 | Grade 12 | Overall
---|---|---|---|---
**English/Language Arts** | NA | NA | NA | NA
**Math** | NA | NA | NA | NA
**Reading** | NA | NA | NA | NA
**CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)** | NA | NA | NA | NA
**Graduation** | NA | NA | NA | NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Final Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>8.311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>9.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>8.889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>33.333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>30.566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Performance Points: **1.000 90.155**

**Growth to Proficiency (Categorical)** | **Higher Performing (Categorical)** | **Lower Performing (Categorical)** | **Enrollment Ratio** | **Pass Rate** | **Higher Performing (Categorical)*** | **Lower Performing (Categorical)*** | **Enrollment Ratio** | **Improvement Grade 10 to Grade 12** | **Improvement Rate** | **Points** | **Weighting** | **Final Points** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>82.50</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>82.80</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>9.444</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>28.333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.30</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>32.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition

Total Growth Points: **1.000 88.244**

Performance: 90.16
Growth: 88.24
Overall Grade: B
# Indiana Department of Education
## 2014-15 Accountability Report Card
### ABC School of Indiana (1234)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grades 01-08</th>
<th>Grades 09-11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IC, IB, DC, AP, PSAT)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Performance Points:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92.477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth to Proficiency</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Categorical)</td>
<td>Performing</td>
<td>Performing</td>
<td>Grade 10 to Grade 12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement</td>
<td>(IC, IB, DC, AP, PSAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition

**Total Growth Points:** 1.000 88.199

**Performance:** 92.48 0.600 55.487

**Growth:** 88.20 0.400 35.280

**Overall Points:** 90.767

**Overall Grade:** A
## Indiana Department of Education
### 2014-15 Accountability Report Card
#### ABC School of Indiana (1234)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grades 01-08</th>
<th>Grades 09 - 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Participation Rate</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Enrollment Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Performance Points:** 0.600  30.440

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Growth to Proficiency</th>
<th>Higher Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Lower Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Enrollmen Ratio</th>
<th>Growth to Proficiency</th>
<th>Higher Performing (Categorical)*</th>
<th>Lower Performing (Categorical)*</th>
<th>Enrollmen Ratio</th>
<th>Improvement Grade 10 to Grade 12**</th>
<th>Improvement Rate</th>
<th>Enrollmen Ratio</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Final Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>13.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>13.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>13.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>13.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>13.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition

**Total Growth Points:** 0.600 39.000

**Performance:** 50.73  0.400  20.293

**Growth:** 65.00  0.600  39.000

**Overall Points:** 59.293  
**Overall Grade:** F
## Indiana Department of Education
### 2014-15 Accountability Report Card
#### ABC School of Indiana (1234)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grades 01-08</th>
<th>Grades 09 - 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Participation Rate</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Enrollment Ratio</td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Growth to Proficiency</th>
<th>Higher Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Lower Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
<th>Improvement Grade 10 to Grade 12**</th>
<th>Improvement Rate</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Final Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition

Total Growth Points: 0.600 43.340

Performance: 63.70 0.400 25.480
Growth: 72.23 0.600 43.340

Overall Points: 68.820
Overall Grade: D
## Indiana Department of Education
### 2014-15 Accountability Report Card
#### ABC School of Indiana (1234)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grades 01-08</th>
<th>Grades 09 - 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Participation Rate</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Enrollment Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Performance Points: 0.600 41.940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Growth to Proficiency</th>
<th>Higher Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Lower Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition

### Total Growth Points: 0.600 51.460

Performance: 69.90 0.400 27.960
Growth: 85.77 0.600 51.460

Overall Points: 79.420
Overall Grade: C
## Indiana Department of Education
### 2014-15 Accountability Report Card

**ABC School of Indiana (1234)**

**Component** | **Grades 01-08** | **Grades 09 - 11** | **Grade 12** | **Overall**
---|---|---|---|---
**Pass Rate** | **Participation Rate** | **Points** | **Enrollment Ratio** | **Pass Rate** | **Participation Rate** | **Points** | **Enrollment Ratio** | **Rate** | **Points** | **Weighting** | **Final Points**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
English/Language Arts | 85.6 | 0.992 | 84.9 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | 0 | 84.90 | 0.200 | 16.980
Math | 86.2 | 0.994 | 85.7 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | 0 | 85.70 | 0.200 | 17.140
Reading | 85 | 0.95 | 80.8 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | 0 | 80.80 | 0.200 | 16.160
CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)* | | | | | | | | | | | |
Graduation | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Total Performance Points:** 0.600 50.280

**Component** | **Growth to Proficiency** | **Higher Performing (Categorical)** | **Lower Performing (Categorical)** | **Enrollment Ratio** | **Growth to Proficiency** | **Higher Performing (Categorical)*** | **Lower Performing (Categorical)*** | **Enrollment Ratio** | **Improvement Grade 10 to Grade 12** | **Improvement Rate** | **Enrollment Ratio** | **Points** | **Weighting** | **Final Points**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
English/Language Arts | 85 | 102.3 | 80.5 | 89.3 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0 | NA | NA | 0 | 89.30 | 0.200 | 17.860
Math | 85 | 100.3 | 78.4 | 87.9 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0 | NA | NA | 0 | 87.90 | 0.200 | 17.580
Reading | 85 | 100 | 90 | 93.3 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0 | NA | NA | 0 | 93.30 | 0.200 | 18.660
CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
Graduation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition

**Total Growth Points:** 0.600 54.100

**Performance:** 83.80 0.400 33.520

**Growth:** 90.17 0.600 54.100

**Overall Points:** 87.620

**Overall Grade:** B
## Indiana Department of Education
### 2014-15 Accountability Report Card
#### ABC School of Indiana (1234)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grades 01-08</th>
<th>Grades 09 - 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement <em>(IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Growth to Proficiency Points</th>
<th>Higher Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Lower Performing (Categorical)</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Improvement Grade 10 to Grade 12</th>
<th>Improvement Rate</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Final Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement <em>(IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition

**Total Performance Points:** 0.600 55.020

**Total Growth Points:** 0.600 55.580

**Performance:**
- Growth: 92.63 0.600 55.580
- Overall Grade: A
### Indiana Department of Education
2014-15 Accountability Report Card
ABC School of Indiana (1234)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grades 01-08</th>
<th>Grades 09 - 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Enrollment Rate</td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Enrollment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Performance Points: 0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Growth to Proficiency (Categorical)</th>
<th>Higher Performing (Categorical) Points</th>
<th>Lower Performing (Categorical) Points</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
<th>Growth to Proficiency*</th>
<th>Higher Performing (Categorical)* Points</th>
<th>Lower Performing (Categorical)* Points</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
<th>Improvement Grade 10 to Grade 12**</th>
<th>Improvement Rate</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Final Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retain Improvement 08 to 10 during transition

Total Growth Points: 0.000 0.000

HS Performance: 70.000
Growth: 30.000

Overall Points: 0.000
Overall Grade: A
FINAL REPORT

Accountability System Review Panel

(Note: An appendix with definitions of terms used is attached to this report.)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Accountability System Review Panel (Panel) was created by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) entered into by the Governor, the Speaker of the House, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The MOU established the Panel to carry out the following duties:

1. Make recommendations regarding the A-F accountability system, including recommendations regarding measurements based on individual academic performance and growth to proficiency and avoiding recommendations based on measurement of student performance or growth compared with peers.

2. Consider a wide range of data in making its recommendations.

3. Examine other states' accountability systems to look for innovative solutions.

4. Ensure the fairness of any recommended accountability system.


6. Exist until after the deadline for such report until December 31, 2013, for the purpose of receiving and investigating any clarifying questions posed by the State Board of Education, the Indiana Department of Education, the Governor, the House, or the Senate, unless otherwise extended or disbanded by the terms of the MOU.

Each signatory to the MOU appointed four members: one teacher, one principal, one superintendent, and one technical advisor. In addition, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Glenda Ritz, served as a member and Co-Chairperson. Dr. Steve Yager, Superintendent of Northwest Allen County Schools, served as the other Co-Chairperson.

Under Indiana's current school accountability system, schools are assessed for performance under two standard models - an elementary and middle school model and a high school model. (There is an allowance made for schools that do not conform to a traditional model, such as a combined school.) The elementary and middle school
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model measures student passage rates on state-wide English/language arts and math tests; it also rewards schools for student growth. The high school model includes four measures:

1. Passage rates on 10th grade end of course assessments (ECA) in English 10 and Algebra 1, as well as student growth in these subjects.
2. Passage rates on both ECA tests by students who initially did not pass these tests in 10th grade, but pass before graduation.
3. High school graduation rates.
4. College and career readiness (CCR) based on student achievement of the following indicators: (1) A passing score on at least one Advanced Placement (AP) examination. (2) A passing score on at least one International Baccalaureate (IB) examination. (3) The completion of at least three college credit hours through a dual credit course. (4) The receipt of an industry certification.

(Note: A brief explanation of the how school scores are determined under the current school accountability model is included as Appendix B.)

In developing a new or revised school accountability system, the Panel followed IC 20-31-8-3, as amended by HEA 1427-2013, which requires the State Board of Education to "establish a number of categories, using an "A" through "F" grading scale, to designate performance based on the individual student academic performance and growth to proficiency in each school.". In addition, IC 20-31-8-1(a) provides that "The performance of a school's students on the ISTEP program test and other assessments recommended by the education roundtable and approved by the state board are the primary and majority means of assessing a school's improvement."

Indiana has a waiver from the requirements of the federal "No Child Left Behind" statutes that requires certain elements in the state's school accountability system, including the following:

- The system must look at student achievement for all defined subgroups of students in at least reading/language arts and math, graduation rates, and school performance and progress over time.

- Once the state has adopted a high-quality assessment, it must take into account student growth for all subgroups. A state must report both its pass rate and participation rate on the assessment.

- Set new ambitious but achievable measurable objectives for all subgroups in at least reading/language arts and math.

- Provide incentives and recognition for success, including, if possible, rewarding Title I schools making the most progress and identifying the schools as Title I
"reward schools".

- Effect dramatic, systematic change in the lowest-performing schools, identifying the schools as Title I "priority schools" and ensuring meaningful interventions.

- Work to close achievement gaps by identifying schools with the greatest achievement gaps as Title I "focus schools" and ensuring interventions based on reviews of the specific academic needs of the school and its students.

- Provide incentives and supports to ensure continuous improvement in Title I schools that are not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps.

- Build capacity to improve student learning in all schools.

Under the current federal waiver, for accountability purposes, Indiana reports data for two "super" subgroups of students - the top 75% and the bottom 25% - instead of data for ten subgroups of students that would be required in the absence of the waiver. The data for the ten subgroups are reported for monitoring purposes. Indiana's waiver expires in 2014; it is likely that Indiana will apply for a new waiver.

II. SUMMARY OF WORK PROGRAM

The Panel met seven times before November 1, 2013.

September 19, 2013: The Panel received information on the Indiana Open Door Law and the MOU. A historical perspective on Indiana’s accountability system was presented, as well as information concerning federal and state legal requirements for accountability systems and Indiana’s waiver from certain federal accountability requirements. The Panel began discussion concerning what elements the members would like to see included in a system as well as elements that the members would not like to include in a system, taking into account policy needs, development needs, and implementation.

September 24, 2013: The Panel began ranking the elements to be included in an accountability system. The Panel received information concerning the role of assessments in accountability systems, particularly in models that focus on growth to proficiency, which is required under Indiana statute. The Panel began examining three existing growth models of accountability: the gain, the categorical, and the trajectory, and discussed the components of each model, as well as components Indiana’s model should include.

October 4, 2013: The Panel considered transition options for going from Indiana’s current accountability system to a new system, and held considerable discussion of the
gain, trajectory, categorical, and student growth percentile models, including considering other states' accountability systems. There was agreement that Indiana's model should look at a student's growth or lack of growth over the course of a year. A hybrid growth model, combining elements of the trajectory model and a criterion-referenced categorical model, was discussed.

October 8, 2013: The Panel received and discussed information concerning the current high school achievement model, and information on multiple measures of achievement. Several members of the Panel expressed concerns with the penalty aspects of the current high school model, and considered student data currently collected in Indiana that could be used as measures of achievement, as well as data could potentially be collected. The Panel received worksheets for developing an accountability framework to determine performance indicators and the weight to be given to specific indicators, and looked at models developed by Panel members based upon discussions held at the previous meetings.

October 18, 2013: The Panel received information on reading assessments for determining growth. The Panel reviewed options for frameworks and components for accountability system models, and discussed whether existing student data can be analyzed in a timely fashion to test the feasibility of the Panel's recommendations. The members reached a consensus to have the accountability grading system based on a 100 point scale instead of the current four point scale, and to have different frameworks for elementary/middle grades and high school grades.

October 24, 2013: The Panel worked through a number of questions concerning elements to be included in the accountability system model, and came to a consensus concerning the following:
- To include a trajectory component in the growth domain of the model to satisfy the statutory requirement of determining "growth to proficiency".
- A categorical element should not be included in the performance domain of the model.
- Categorical improvement in growth in high school should be a part of the final model, but the current use of improvement for grades 8 through 10 should be continued until new assessments that support the final system are in place.
- The current method of determining improvement for grades 10 through 12 should be used until new assessments are adopted, after which improvement between the grade in which the assessment is administered and grade 12 should be rewarded.
- As a performance indicator, the current system of awarding points should be transitioned through the use of a multiplier over the course of several years to a system in which the percentage of students who have attained a CCR indicator is used. For growth in CCR indicators, the increase in the number of students who have CCR indicators in grade 10 to the number of students who have CCR indicators in grade 12 should be used.
- To continue to use categorical scores as measures of growth for the two super
subgroups, rather than using the ten subgroups.
- Weights for the domains of performance and growth: in the high school portion of the accountability system, the weights should be 70% performance and 30% growth.

October 28, 2013: The Panel

III. MATERIALS CONSIDERED

The Panel developed the following framework of values for an accountability system:

1. Growth for all students is valued more highly than performance and schools should be rewarded for individual student growth. Valuing growth acknowledges the diversity of background of each school's students.
2. The model should be simple to be clear and understandable, fair, and transparent. Schools should be able to understand the statistical calculations and be able to use the data to inform instruction.
3. Multiple data points should inform both growth and performance.
4. The model should allow for flexibility for changes in assessments, allow for all configurations of schools, and align with federal Title I category requirements.

The Panel had access to the Council of Chief School Officers report of accountability system comparisons across 38 states that have a No Child Left Behind flexibility waiver. Among these states, the elements of the following states' systems were adopted by the Panel:

- Colorado (the addition of a trajectory model within Indiana's current growth component to indicate "catch up, keep up, move up" once a baseline model has been created to calculate growth scores).
- Alaska & Illinois (expand Indiana's current categorical model from 3 categories to 6-8 categories and to allow for school points for individual student growth progression from category to category)
- Alaska and other states (use easy to understand 100-point scale)
- New Mexico (revise Indiana's super subgroup labels)

A Practitioner's Guide to Growth Models by Andrew D. Ho, Harvard Graduate School of Education and Katherine E. Castellano, University of California, was used to expand the Panel's knowledge base and determine effective yet simple means to measuring growth. The Panel determined that Indiana should show student growth using both categorical and trajectory approaches. While Indiana's system showed minimal student growth across 3 categories (Do Not Pass, Pass, and Pass +), the Panel decided to fully develop the categorical portion by expanding the categories to include 6-8 categories for the purpose of awarding growth points for individual growth crossing categories. In addition, in order to meet the requirements of HEA 1427-2013 to show growth to
proficiency, the Panel decided that the trajectory approach already established within Indiana's current growth model should be revised to reflect a criterion approach as opposed to the current percentile approach, which does not comply with the requirement of IC 20-31-8-3 to be based on individual student performance.

Recommendations from the report "The Examination of Indiana's A to F School Accountability Model", September 6, 2013, by John Grew and William Sheldrake, also served as a catalyst for considering multiple data points for accountability in addition to ISTEP testing.

The Panel reviewed the following data points for consideration within the two domains of performance and growth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Points</th>
<th>Accepted by Panel?</th>
<th>Performance or Growth?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math Performance (1-10)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Growth (2-12)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Participation</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA Performance (1-10)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA Growth (2-12)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA Participation</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Performance</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Participation</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Performance (1-11)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Growth (2-12)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Performance</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR Growth</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Growth</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension/Expulsion Rate</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM RECOMMENDATIONS

The Panel recommends the following interdependent components for the Indiana school accountability system:

1. The grading scale for the A - F system, currently a 4-point scale, will be changed to a 100-point scale.

2. The accountability system model will have different frameworks for grades 1 - 8, grades 9 - 11, and grade 12.

3. The accountability system will have two (2) domains: performance and growth.

4. The model will allow for assessments changes.

5. As required under IC 20-31-8-1, the performance of a school's students on the ISTEP program test and other assessments recommended by the education roundtable and approved by the state board are the primary and majority means of assessing a school's improvement.

6. The model will include the data points to measure reading growth and performance in grades 1-11.

7. The model will measure college and career indicators in both domains of performance and growth.

8. The college and career indicators will include the PSAT as a data point.

9. The model will measure growth to proficiency.

10. The model will measure categorical growth improvement.

11. The model will allow growth to proficiency to be measured for high school when
data becomes available.

(12) The model will use improvement rates as data points for growth in the 10th to 12th grade.

(13) The model will retain college and career ready goal at 25% student participation (the current level) and the data will be multiplied by 4 to create points.

(14) The model will allow for a gradual increase in significance of college and career ready goal to move from 25% to 100% student participation.

(15) The model will use a categorical improvement indicator for the super-subgroups in the growth domain.

(16) The model will align with Title I category descriptors by identifying terms that align with A-F categories of the accountability system.

(17) The model will be developed to have vertical scale alignment with assessment in grades 1-10 (possibly to grade 11).

(18) The model will expand to 6 - 8 performance categories from the current 3 performance categories to show improvement in growth.

V. ACCOUNTABILITY MODEL - IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The complete recommended accountability model should be used to assess all schools with tested grades starting in school year 2014-15.

2. Point scale

   a. The model should use a 0.0 to 100.0 scale
   b. Category placements are established based on total points (weighted average of domain points) assigned to a school using the following scale:

   *SCALE NEEDS TO BE DETERMINED*

3. Total points assigned to a school should be a weighted average of the designated domains within the accountability framework.

   A. Performance

   *i. The performance domain will be assigned a weight in the overall framework.*
   ii. Total performance points will be the sum of the domain indicators final
points.
iii. Domain placements are established based on domain points (weighted average of indicator points) assigned using the following scale:

*SCALE NEEDS TO BE DETERMINED*

iv. Indicators to be included are:

1. English/Language Arts
   a. Points are to be assigned for grades 01-11 where test data is available.
   b. Points are not awarded for grade 12.
   c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the product of the state assessment pass rate and the participation rate.
   d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
   e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

2. Math
   a. Points are to be assigned for grades 01-11 where test data is available.
   b. Points are not awarded for grade 12.
   c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the product of the state assessment pass rate and the participation rate.
   d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
   e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

3. Reading
   a. Points are to be assigned for grades 01-11 where test data is available.
   b. Points are not awarded for grade 12.
   c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the product of the state assessment pass rate and the participation rate.
   d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
   e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

4. College and Career Readiness Achievement
   a. Points are to be assigned for grade 12.
   b. Points are not awarded for grades 1-11.
   c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the product of the College and Career Readiness Rate and the
state readiness factor. State Readiness Factor should be
determined through the following:
   i. The readiness factor should be the quotient of total
      achievable and the annual goal. Currently 100/25=4.
   ii. The current goal presented to Indiana schools is
       25%. The accountability panel recommends review of
       the current goal including recommendations from the
       Department of Workforce Development and the
       Commission for Higher Education as to an obtainable
       goal and additional accurate measures of college and
       career readiness.
   d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade
      span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
   e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product
      of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

5. Graduation
   a. Points are to be assigned for grade 12.
   b. Points are not awarded for grades 1-11.
   c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the four
      year graduation rate.
   d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade
      span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
   e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product
      of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

B. Growth
   *i. The growth domain will be assigned a weight in the overall
framework.*
   ii. Total growth points will be the sum of the domain indicators final points.
   iii. Domain placements are established based on domain points (weighted
        average of indicator points) assigned using the following scale:

   *SCALE NEEDS TO BE DETERMINED*

iv. Indicators to be included are:
   1. English/Language Arts
      a. Points are to be assigned for grades 2-12 where test data
         is available.
      b. Points awarded in each grade span should be assigned
         as follows:
         i. Grades 2-11 points should be the average of three
            growth indicators:
            1. Growth to Proficiency points should
               be awarded equal to the percent of
students achieving the expected annual growth.
  a. Currently data is only available for grades 3-8.
  b. In absence of continuous data on a vertical scale, growth for the indicator should be measured as improvement from grade 8 to grade 10.
2. Higher Performing Categorical Growth Improvement points should be awarded equal to the average categorical score for students within the top 75 percent of prior year performance.
3. Higher Performing Categorical Growth Improvement points should be awarded equal to the average categorical score for students within the bottom 25 percent of prior year performance.

ii. Grade 12 points should be awarded equal to the rate of improvement of students on graduation qualifying exams between the primary administration year and graduation.

c. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
d. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

2. Math
a. Points are to be assigned for grades 2-12 where test data is available.
b. Points awarded in each grade span should be assigned as follows:
   i. Grades 2-11 points should be the average of three growth indicators:
      1. Growth to Proficiency points should be awarded equal to the percent of students achieving the expected annual growth.
         a. Currently data is only available for grades 3-8.
         b. In absence of continuous data on a vertical scale, growth for the indicator should be measured as improvement from grade 08 to grade 10.
2. Higher Performing Categorical Growth
   Improvement points should be awarded equal to the average categorical score for students within the top 75 percent of prior year performance.
3. Higher Performing Categorical Growth
   Improvement points should be awarded equal to the average categorical score for students within the bottom 25 percent of prior year performance.
   ii. Grade 12 points should be awarded equal to the rate of improvement of students on graduation qualifying exams between the primary administration year and graduation
   c. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
   d. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

3. Reading
   a. Points are to be assigned for grades 2-11 where test data is available.
   b. Points awarded in each grade span should be assigned as follows:
      i. Grades 2-11 points should be the average of three growth indicators:
         1. Growth to Proficiency points should be awarded equal to the percent of students achieving the expected annual growth.
         2. Higher Performing Categorical Growth Improvement points should be awarded equal to the average categorical score for students within the top 75 percent of prior year performance.
         3. Higher Performing Categorical Growth Improvement points should be awarded equal to the average categorical score for students within the bottom 25 percent of prior year performance.
      ii. Grade 12 no points awarded.
   c. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
   d. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

4. College and Career Readiness Achievement
   a. Points are to be assigned for grade 12.
b. Points are not awarded for grades 1-11.
c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the rate in which graduates improved College and Career Readiness status from non-achievement by the end of the 10th grade year to achievement by graduation.
d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

5. Graduation
a. Points are to be assigned for grade 12.
b. Points are not awarded for grades 1-11.
c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the five year graduation rate.
d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRANSITION BETWEEN THE CURRENT SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM AND THE NEW SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

The Panel recommends full implementation of the new school accountability system in 2015-16.

The Panel recognizes that it may be asked to conduct follow-up recommendations in addition to the work included in this report. The Panel recognizes that work conducted for additional recommendations will include more extensive use of subject matter experts as the statistical aspect of the accountability system is realized.

The Panel recommends that the model should be validated by various methods, including beta testing, during the rules development process to insure accuracy of the accountability system. Validation should use actual past years of data.

The Panel recommends that procedures be developed in rule that automatically places a school in a review process if the overall grade changes by two (2) or more grades in one year.

One of the concerns of transitioning to a new accountability system is to buffer schools from significant changes in category placement until the accountability model is mature. Although schools may be experiencing large changes in their performance or growth, or both, due to their own actions, safeguards should be in put in place to protect schools from unforeseen deficiencies in the model.
The Panel recommends that protocols and procedures should be developed for addressing any grade configurations issue when not adequately addressed by rule. Although the model presented in the Panel's recommendation factors in different current configurations, past experience shows that it is difficult to insure rules for the accountability system will address all configuration complexities.

The Panel recommends a web-based "calculator" be developed for local school administrator use. School administrators should be able to replicate and explain how their schools grades were calculated.

The Panel recommends that steps for an appeal process for the overall category placement be simple and clear. The Panel recommends that schools shall receive a written notice of appeal findings. The written notice shall include the reason for the findings and if the remedy affects the overall category placement.

**Grew/Sheldrake Report Transition Recommendations**

The Panel is in agreement with the following recommendations from the Grew/Sheldrake report, "Examination of Indiana’s A to F School Accountability Model", September 6, 2013, relevant to the Panel's scope of duties:

**Developing a Revised Accountability System Under HEA 1427-2013:** The authors observe and recommend:

- The authors observe that the recently announced memorandum of understanding between the Governor, the General Assembly, and the Superintendent for establishing a collaborative process for development of a new accountability rule is an excellent step towards increasing support by the educational community and the public.

- The process of development of a new system should:
  1. Provide for extensive involvement by experts and practitioners from the education community.
  2. Provide for transparency in all decision-making.
  3. Result in development of a new system that is as simple as possible, more easily understood, and equitable.

- In compliance with HEA 1427 - 2013, the new accountability system should incorporate measures that involve less reliance on standardized tests passage rates and more reliance on individual student growth based on criterion-referenced measures.

**Further Recommendations regarding the Revised Accountability System:**

- Additional measures for the elementary/middle school model should be
included, besides the two student test measures, which provide additional indicators of school performance.

Because of the complexity involved in implementing any new accountability system, the system should be piloted prior to implementation, if possible, permitting the Department of Education to solicit and receive extensive feedback from schools, adequately perform programming tests, and evaluate policy components incorporated into the system.

In order to ensure that the General Assembly has the capability to perform analyses on the new accountability system, Legislative Services Agency staff should be provided with ongoing access to all data and computer programming necessary for the agency to replicate results and respond to various inquiries from legislators about the system.

Until the new accountability system required by HEA 1427-2013 is implemented, state policymakers should consider not subjecting a school to state interventions described in IC 20-31-9-4 due to a sixth consecutive year of placement in the lowest category or designation of school performance.
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APPENDIX A

DEFINITIONS (AS USED IN THIS REPORT)

Categorical model: Evaluates students moving from one performance category to another. Requires the use of cut scores.

College and Career Readiness (CCR): For a high school, measures of student college and career readiness include the number of students attaining International Baccalaureate degrees, successfully completing Advanced Placement courses, successfully completing dual credit courses, receiving industry certifications, or attaining satisfactory scores on PSAT exams. For a student, successfully achieving one or more of the CCR components.

Criterion referenced: A test in which an individual's performance is compared to a performance standard and not to the performance of other individuals in a peer group.

Cut score: A score used to determine the minimum competency level needed to pass a test.

Graduation rate: Four year rate: The percentage of students within a cohort who graduate during their expected graduation year. (The cohort is the class of students who are considered to have entered grade 9 in the same year and expected to graduate three years after entering grade 9.)

Five year rate: The percentage of students within a cohort who graduate during either their expected graduation year or within one year after their expected graduation year. Under Indiana statutes, the four year graduation rate is determined under IC 20-26-13-10; the five year graduation rate is determined under IC 20-26-13-10.2. Under federal law, only the four year graduation rate is reported.

Growth to proficiency: A student's progress towards meeting and passing established proficiency levels, as demonstrated by at least two data points.

Improvement: For a school, positive change in: (1) the percentage of students passing an assessment; and (2) the number of students achieving CCR.

Indicators: Measures of performance that are not student test scores.

Norm referenced: A test in which an individual's performance is compared to the performances of other individuals in a peer group.

Multiple measures: Multiple indicators and sources of evidence of student learning, of various kinds, gathered at multiple points in time.
**Performance:** For a student, primarily determined by the student's score on one or more assessments. For a school, determined by the performance of all students, in addition to other established indicators (such as attendance, graduation rate, etc.).

**Title I:** A federal program that provides additional funding for schools with high poverty levels among students. Title I schools are subject to additional regulation and requirements by the federal government.

**Trajectory model:** A model in which a student's growth towards a goal and future achievement of the goal is determined using at least two data points.

*Targeted growth*
APPENDIX B

Simple Explanation of Indiana A-F Accountability System

(From the "Examination of Indiana’s A to F School Accountability Model", September 6, 2013, prepared by John R. Grew and William J. Sheldrake, Appendix D)

Elementary & Middle School (EMS) Model

A School’s grade is based on English/Language arts and math test results and various adjustments according to the following steps:

1. Preliminary scores for both English/Language Arts (ELA) math tests are based on the percentage of a school’s students that passed ISTEP+, IMAST and ISTAR. The preliminary score is determined using a proficiency grading scale awarding a grade for a given passage rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90.0 - 100%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.0 - 89.9%</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.0 - 84.9%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.0 --- 79.9%</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0 - 74.9%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.0 - 69.9%</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0 - 64.9%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 59.9%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. A school’s preliminary score for both ELA and math may be raised or lowered based on student academic growth:

   a. The preliminary score is raised by 1.00 if at least 42.5% of the school’s lowest performing students on ISTEP+ (the bottom 25%) score high growth on the ELA test and for the math test, at least 44.9% of students score high growth.
   b. The preliminary score is raised by 1.00 if at least 36.2% of the school’s remaining students on ISTEP+ (the top 75%) score high growth on the ELA test and for the math test, at least 36.2% of students score high growth.
   c. The preliminary score may be lowered by 1.00 if 39.8% or more of all students taking ISTEP+ score low growth on the ELA test and for math test, less than 42.4% of students score low growth.

3. A school’s score will also be lowered by 1.00 if student participation in testing is:

   a. Less than 95% of their lowest performing students (bottom 25%) take ISTEP+.
   b. Less than 95% of their remaining students (top 75%) take ISTEP+, ISTAR, and IMAST.

4. To determine the final grade for an EMS, sum the ELA and Math grades and divide by two.
High School (HS) "A-F" Model

The high school grade is determined by calculating scores on four weighted measures:

1. English 10 End of Course Assessment (ECA) – weighted at 30%
2. Algebra I ECA – weighted at 30%
3. Graduation Rate – weighted at 30%
4. College & Career Readiness – weighted at 10%

The steps in determining the high school score are as follows:

1 & 2. Determining English 10 and Algebra I ECA Scores:

   a. Schools receive a preliminary score based on the percentage of their students in the 10th grade cohort that passed the ECA or ISTAR. The same proficiency grading scale (above) for EMS ELA and math is used to determine the preliminary score (e.g. a 90% passage rate = 4.00 points).

   b. The preliminary score is raised by 0.50 if there is at least a 10.3 percentage point improvement in the English passage rate and by 0.50 if there is at least a 17.1% percentage point improvement in the math passage rate (from the 8th grade passage rates for ISTEP+, IMAST or ISTAR to the 10th grade ECA or ISTAR).

   c. The preliminary score is lowered by 0.50 if there is -0.1 percentage point or greater decline in the English or math passage rate (from the 8th grade ISTEP+, IMAST or ISTAR to the 10th grade ECA or ISTAR).

   d. The preliminary score shall be raised by 0.50 if at least 59.3% of students taking English or 62.8% of students taking math tests that did not pass the ECA or ISTAR in 10th grade do so by graduation.

3. Determining the Graduation Rate Score:

Schools receive a preliminary score based on their four-year graduation cohort rate. A proficiency grading scale (same as that used for EMS ELA and math) is used to determine the preliminary score (e.g. a 90% or higher passage rate = 4.00 points). For school years prior to 2014-15, the preliminary score is the final graduation rate score.

Note: Beginning with the 2014-15 school year, the preliminary score will be adjusted as follows:

   a. The preliminary score is raised if 34.4% or more students receive non-waiver Honors Diplomas.
b. The preliminary score is lowered if 32.8% or more students receive general or waiver diplomas.

c. The preliminary score is raised if 13.2% of students that did not graduate within four years do so in five years.

4. Determining the College & Career Readiness Score:

Schools receive a score based on the percentage of graduates who receive at least one of the following:

a. a passing score (3, 4, or 5) on an AP exam; or
b. a passing score (4, 5, 6, or 7) on an IB exam; or
   c. three (3) verifiable college credits from the Priority Liberal Arts or CTE course lists; or
   d. a IDOE approved industry certification.

The college and career readiness score is based on the percentage of students achieving one of the above activities using a different proficiency scale than above:

\[
\begin{align*}
25.0 - 100\% & - 4.00 \text{ points} \\
18.4 - 24.9\% & = 3.00 \\
11.7 - 18.3\% & = 2.00 \\
5.0 - 11.6\% & = 1.00 \text{ points} \\
0.0 - 4.9\% & = 0.00 \\
0.0 - 1.6\% & = 0.00 \\
1.6 - 2.4\% & = 0.00
\end{align*}
\]

Determining a Final Grade for a High School

The school's final grade is determined by summing the weighted scores from steps 1-4 above.

**Determining a School Corporation Combined Score**

1. Determine the % of total school corporation students enrolled in EMS (grades 3-8) and H.S. (grades 9-12).
2. Multiply the % of EMS students by the average grade for all EMS schools.
3. Multiply the % of H.S. students by the average grade for all HS schools.
4. Sum steps 2 and 3 to determine the combined score.
Accountability Model—Technical Recommendations

1. The complete recommended accountability model should be used to assess all schools with tested grades starting in school year 2014-15.

2. Point scale
   a. The model should use a 0.0 to 100.0 scale
   b. Category placements are established based on total points (weighted average of domain points) assigned to a school using the following scale:
      i. 80.0 to 100.0 A
      ii. 80.0 to 89.9 B
      iii. 70.0 to 79.9 C
      iv. 60.0 to 69.9 D
      v. 0.0 to 59.9 F

3. Total points assigned to a school should be a weighted average of the designated domains within the accountability framework.
   a. Performance
      i. The performance domain will be assigned a weight in the overall framework.
      ii. Total performance points will be the sum of the domain indicators final points.
      iii. Domain placements are established based on domain points (weighted average of indicator points) assigned using the following scale:
         1. 90.0 to 100.0 A
         2. 80.0 to 89.9 B
         3. 70.0 to 79.9 C
         4. 60.0 to 69.9 D
         5. 0.0 to 59.9 F
   iv. Indicators to be included are:
      1. English/Language Arts
         a. Points are to be assigned for grades 01-11 where test data is available.
         b. Points are not awarded for grade 12
         c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the product of the state assessment pass rate and the participation rate.
         d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
         e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.
      2. Math
         a. Points are to be assigned for grades 01-11 where test data is available.
         b. Points are not awarded for grade 12
         c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the product of the state assessment pass rate and the participation rate.
         d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
         e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.
      3. Reading
         a. Points are to be assigned for grades 01-11 where test data is available.
         b. Points are not awarded for grade 12
c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the product of the state assessment pass rate and the participation rate.
d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

4. College and Career Readiness Achievement
   a. Points are to be assigned for grade 12.
   b. Points are not awarded for grades 01-11.
   c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the product of the College and Career Readiness Rate and the state readiness factor. State Readiness Factor should be determined through the following:
      i. The readiness factor should be the quotient of total achievable and the annual goal. Currently 100/25=4.
      ii. The current goal presented to Indiana schools is 25%. The accountability panel recommends review of the current goal including recommendations from DWD and CHE as to an obtainable goal and additional accurate measures of college and career readiness.
   d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
   e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

5. Graduation
   a. Points are to be assigned for grade 12.
   b. Points are not awarded for grades 01-11.
   c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the four year graduation rate.
   d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
   e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

b. Growth
   i. The growth domain will be assigned a weight in the overall framework.
   ii. Total growth points will be the sum of the domain indicators final points.
   iii. Domain placements are established based on domain points (weighted average of indicator points) assigned using the following scale:
       1. 90.0 to 100.0   A
       2. 80.0 to 89.9    B
       3. 70.0 to 79.9    C
       4. 60.0 to 69.9    D
       5. 0.0 to 59.9     F
   iv. Indicators to be included are:
       1. English/Language Arts
          a. Points are to be assigned for grades 02-12 where test data is available.
          b. Points awarded in each grade span should be assigned as follows:
i. Grades 02-11 points should be the average of three growth indicators:
   1. Growth to Proficiency points should be awarded equal to the percent of students achieving the expected annual growth.
      a. Currently data is only available for grades 03-08.
      b. In absence of continuous data on a vertical scale, growth for the indicator should be measured as improvement from grade 08 to grade 10.
   2. Higher Performing Categorical Growth Improvement points should be awarded equal to the average categorical score for students within the top 75 percent of prior year performance.
   3. Higher Performing Categorical Growth Improvement points should be awarded equal to the average categorical score for students within the bottom 25 percent of prior year performance.

ii. Grade 12 points should be awarded equal to the rate of improvement of students on graduation qualifying exams between the primary administration year and graduation.

c. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.

d. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

2. Math

   a. Points are to be assigned for grades 02-12 where test data is available.
   b. Points awarded in each grade span should be assigned as follows:
      i. Grades 02-11 points should be the average of three growth indicators:
         1. Growth to Proficiency points should be awarded equal to the percent of students achieving the expected annual growth.
            a. Currently data is only available for grades 03-08.
            b. In absence of continuous data on a vertical scale, growth for the indicator should be measured as improvement from grade 08 to grade 10.
         2. Higher Performing Categorical Growth Improvement points should be awarded equal to the average categorical score for students within the top 75 percent of prior year performance.
         3. Higher Performing Categorical Growth Improvement points should be awarded equal to the average categorical score for students within the bottom 25 percent of prior year performance.
      ii. Grade 12 points should be awarded equal to the rate of improvement of students on graduation qualifying exams between the primary administration year and graduation.
         c. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
         d. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

3. Reading
a. Points are to be assigned for grades 02-11 where test data is available.

b. Points awarded in each grade span should be assigned as follows:
   
   i. Grades 02-11 points should be the average of three growth indicators:
      
      1. Growth to Proficiency points should be awarded equal to the percent of students achieving the expected annual growth.
      
      2. Higher Performing Categorical Growth Improvement points should be awarded equal to the average categorical score for students within the top 75 percent of prior year performance.
      
      3. Higher Performing Categorical Growth improvement points should be awarded equal to the average categorical score for students within the bottom 25 percent of prior year performance.

   ii. Grade 12 no points awarded.

c. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.

d. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

4. College and Career Readiness Achievement
   
   a. Points are to be assigned for grade 12.
   
   b. Points are not awarded for grades 01-11.
   
   c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the rate in which graduates improved College and Career Readiness status from non-achievement by the end of the 10th grade year to achievement by graduation.
   
   d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
   
   e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.

5. Graduation
   
   a. Points are to be assigned for grade 12.
   
   b. Points are not awarded for grades 01-11.
   
   c. Points awarded in each grade span should equal the five year graduation rate.
   
   d. Overall Points should be the sum all applicable grade span points weighted to reflect enrollment in each span.
   
   e. Overall Final Points for the indicator should be the product of the Indicator Points and the Indicator Weighting.
4. The accountability model should use the following weights to determine final school points:
   a. For grade span 01 to 08
      i. The Performance domain should be weighted 30%
         1. Assessment indicators should be weighted equally as available to equal 100%:
            a. English/Language Arts
            b. Math
            c. Reading
         2. Other
      ii. The Growth domain should be weighted 70%
         1. Content area growth indicators should be weighted equally as available to equal 100%:
            a. English/Language Arts
            b. Math
            c. Reading
         2. Other
   b. For grade span 09 to 012
      i. The Performance domain should be weighted 70%
         1. Assessment indicators should be weighted equally as available to equal 40%:
            a. English/Language Arts
            b. Math
            c. Reading
         2. College and Career Readiness should be weighted 30%
         3. Graduation should be weighted 30%
      ii. The Growth domain should be weighted 30%
         1. Content area growth indicators should be weighted equally as available to equal 40%:
            a. English/Language Arts
            b. Math
            c. Reading
         2. College and Career Readiness should be weighted 30%
         3. Graduation should be weighted 30%