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Creation of the SQWG

External Advisory Committee on Student Assignment
(March 2012 – Feb. 2013)

• Heard from more than 5,100 community members across the city, and one of the key messages was the importance of school quality

• Recommended a system of student assignment that includes four tiers of schools (with tiers determined by MCAS scores/growth)

• Also recommended creating a working group to develop a more comprehensive way to examine school quality and determine school tiers

School Quality Working Group
(May 2013 – present)
**Structure of the School Quality Working Group**
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- **Meg Campbell**, School Committee member, Founder and Director of Codman Academy Charter Public School
- **Rahn Dorsey**, Evaluation Director, Barr Foundation (previously Hardin Coleman, BSC Member and Dean BU School of Education)
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The SQWG was charged with developing a Quality Framework that includes the core indicators of quality.

This Framework includes both measures of quality and features or attributes of a school that may play a role in school quality for some families and students.

The Framework has several purposes:

- **To inform school choice** by giving families more information about schools and helping to determine the school choices available to students.

- **To ensure transparency around school quality** in order to promote greater public accountability.

- **To educate stakeholders** about the many aspects of school quality.
The SQWG used a variety of sources to determine the characteristics of a quality school...

- Recommendations from the External Advisory Committee
- Existing BPS policies and practices:
  - Policy on Eliminating the Achievement Gap
  - Seven Essentials of Whole-School Improvement
  - Five Core Elements of Family and Student Engagement
- Recommendations from the 2004-2005 Quality Work Group
- Work from BPS and other districts to create a school performance index
...including feedback from students, parents, and community members over 40+ meetings

- **Fall 2013: Community Engagement Pilot**
  - Purpose: To review potential measures of school quality and seek input on what might be missing

- **Jan. – Mar. 2014: Community Meetings**
  - Purpose: To explain the draft Quality Framework and gather feedback

- **May 2014: Community Outreach and Survey**
  - Purpose: To share an updated draft of the Quality Framework and learn which elements of quality are most important

- Several community groups were also active participants in SQWG meetings throughout the year, particularly the NAACP and QUEST
Structure of School Quality Domains

What makes a school high quality?

- Student Performance
- Teaching and Learning
- Family, Community, and Culture
- Leadership and Collaboration
- Student Access and Opportunities

Domain

Outcome

Metric

Outcome

Metric
Weight of School Quality Domains

* Most of the proposed Student Access & Opportunities metrics are not statistically sound based on our analysis.

We will be exploring alternative ways to measure these outcomes in the future.

Table this domain for the first version of the School Quality index.

- Student Performance: 75%
- Teaching and Learning: 7.5%
- Leadership and Collaboration: 7.5%
- Student Access and Opportunities: 10%
- Family, Community, and Culture: 10%

What makes a school high quality?
School Quality Attributes

- Based on analysis, most of the proposed Student Access and Opportunities metrics are not statistically sound.

- SQWG recommend this domain be tabled for the first version of the School Quality Framework and BPS work to explore alternative ways to measure this domain in the future.

- Key opportunities/characteristics of schools should be included in a list of attributes through DiscoverBPS.

- Using this platform, parents will be able to sort schools by characteristic as well as obtain specific information on school attributes through the school’s profile page.
Creating Index Scores: Each metric is converted to a 100-point scale so that all metrics can be averaged to generate the overall tier.

The structure of the index score comes from the State’s Progress and Performance Index

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Growth/Improvement (ELA, Math)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Target (100 Points)</td>
<td>• Median SGP of 60 points or higher; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Median SGP improvement of 15 or more points from prior year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Target (75 Points)</td>
<td>• Median SGP between 51-59; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10-14 median SGP point improvement; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decreased non-proficient percent by 10 percent or more from prior year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Below Target (50 Points)</td>
<td>• Median SGP of 41-50; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1-9 point median SGP improvement from prior year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change (25 Points)</td>
<td>• Median SGP of 31-40 (reported as Below Target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined (0 Points)</td>
<td>• Median SGP of 1-30 (reported as Below Target)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• For each metric, we have created a scale based on defined targets, so schools will receive 0, 25, 50, 75, or 100 points per metric

• Targets come from various sources, including State guidelines and historical data

• We have based the overall tier cut-offs on similar targets
The Quality School Measure includes new and innovative ways to measure the achievement of Boston students

- Uses the quadrant analysis methodology to make apples to apples school comparisons
- Gives student growth more weight
- Takes demographic population of schools into account
- Rewards schools for making progress with low performing students
- Rewards schools for continuing to make progress with high performing students
- Allows voice of entire school community to be taken into consideration (students, teachers, parents)
- Explicitly measures achievement gaps at the school level
- Holds schools accountable for measures unique to Boston
Growth to be weighed twice as much as proficiency

Based on research from other large urban districts, community feedback, and SQWG values.

The Working Group took two polls to determine how growth and proficiency would be weighed in the new measure; this outcome represents the average of both polls.
Sample of Unique Metrics

- Median growth percentile on ACCESS for English Language Learners who are at ELD levels 1, 2, or 3.
- Median growth percentile in ELA and Math for high needs Students with Disabilities (i.e. those not in resource rooms)
- Median growth percentile of students who were Warning/Failing in previous year (Math & ELA)
- Median growth percentile of students who were Proficient/Advanced in previous year (Math & ELA)
- Are subgroups of students meeting their proficiency targets in ELA and Math? (Black, Hispanic, White, Asian)
- Are schools closing the achievement gap between Black/Hispanic and White/Asian students? (In ELA & Math, with specific targets to halve gaps by 2016-2017)
- Family and student engagement index
- Teacher retention rate of proficient/exemplary teachers
- For high schools, % of students enrolled in college within 16 months of graduation
- For high school, % students who felt the school prepared them for further education, employment, and personal life after high school
- Percent of students making progress on DIBELS assessment (Grade K2-2)
Creating Tier Cut Scores: Each tier cut-off is based on the same process that was used for index scores*

After each metric is given an index score and growth, proficiency, and domain weights are employed a school receives:

- An overall framework score between 1-100
- Criterion referenced based gives all schools the ability to reach Tier 1
- Schools with 65+ points are considered Tier 1
- Used a +/- range from the State system to give more schools the opportunity to be considered Tier 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Quality Score</th>
<th>School Quality Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to index score guidelines, schools in the 0-45 range are not making any improvements from year to year and therefore given tier 4 status

*There is an override provision for schools where the State classifies them as Level 4 or 5
**Tier 4 Override Provision**

BPS schools classified as Level 4 or 5 by the State Department of Education receive specific interventions and monitoring by the District and the State. For these reasons the School Quality Measure includes the following override provision:

BPS schools identified as Level 4 or 5 by the State Department are automatically identified as Tier 4.
Policy and implementation of the Quality Framework

- These **new assignment tiers** will replace the current MCAS tiers in the student assignment plan starting this fall.

- We will **update the data each year** to show a school’s “snapshot tier” (the tier that it would belong to given the most recent data).

- However, **assignment tiers will not change every year**; instead, we will reconvene a stakeholder group in 2016 to review the data and recommend how to update assignment tiers in the future.

- See the Policy Statement for more detailed recommendations.
Communication Plan:

• Continue to engage parents, stakeholders, and community members before and after school committee vote

  • Simplify language, create FAQ documents, hold information sessions, etc.