

Virginia Board of Education Agenda Item



Agenda Item: L

Date: November 17, 2016

Title	First Review of Proposed Concepts for Amendments to the <i>Regulations Establishing the Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia</i> , Part VIII (8VAC 20-131) (Proposed Stage)		
Presenter	Dr. Cynthia A. Cave, Assistant Superintendent for Policy and Communications		
E-mail	Cynthia.Cave@doe.virginia.gov	Phone	(804) 225-2902

Purpose of Presentation:

Action required by state or federal law or regulation.

Previous Review or Action:

No previous review or action.

Action Requested:

Action will be requested at a future meeting. Specify anticipated date below:

Date: January 26, 2017

Action: Final review (Proposed Stage)

Alignment with Board of Education Goals: Please indicate (X) all that apply:

X	Goal 1: Accountability for Student Learning
	Goal 2: Rigorous Standards to Promote College and Career Readiness
X	Goal 3: Expanded Opportunities to Learn
	Goal 4: Nurturing Young Learners
	Goal 5: Highly Qualified and Effective Educators
X	Goal 6: Sound Policies for Student Success
	Goal 7: Safe and Secure Schools
	Other Priority or Initiative. Specify:

Background Information and Statutory Authority:

Goal 1: In promulgating these regulations, the Board of Education will establish the policies and standards necessary to ensure accountability of student learning.

Goal 3: The Board will have the ability to expand opportunities to learn by developing policies that promote a more flexible environment in which to create innovative instructional programs.

Goal 6: The regulations will provide the Board with the opportunity to develop sound policies for student success by focusing on college and career readiness.

The following is a summary of the statutory authority for various provisions in Part VIII of the *Regulations Establishing the Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*:

The *Code of Virginia* requires the Board to prescribe standards for the accreditation of public elementary, middle and high schools. Section 22.1-19 of the *Code* provides, in part:

The Board shall provide for the accreditation of public elementary, middle, and high schools in accordance with standards prescribed by it...

The *Code* also requires the Board to establish regulations establishing standards for accreditation, to include certain elements. It also specifies the frequency for the review of the accreditation status of schools, certain actions that are to be taken for schools that do not achieve full accreditation status, or are accredited with warning, and establishes the Superintendent of Public Instruction's role in providing assistance to schools that do not meet the standards of accreditation. Section 22.1-253.13:3 of the *Code* provides, in part:

A. The Board of Education shall promulgate regulations establishing standards for accreditation pursuant to the Administrative Process Act (§ 2.2-4000 et seq.), which shall include, but not be limited to, student outcome measures, requirements, and guidelines for instructional programs and for the integration of educational technology into such instructional programs, administrative and instructional staffing levels and positions, including staff positions for supporting educational technology, student services, auxiliary education programs such as library and media services, course and credit requirements for graduation from high school, community relations, and the philosophy, goals, and objectives of public education in Virginia...

Summary of Important Issues:

The Board of Education's vision is to create a quality statewide system of public education that prepares all students for success in the twenty-first century workplace, for realization of personal goals, and for responsible contributions to the quality of civic life in our state, nation, and the world. The Board is committed to advancing its vision and examining the conditions and needs of public education, presenting them annually through a report to the General Assembly and the public. Through its adopted policies, the board conveys high standards for student learning and achievement in preparation for graduation and life beyond high school. The Board's ongoing work is the further development and refinement of a system of accountability to define school quality and to support schools and school divisions by promoting continuous improvement, providing assistance, and acknowledging progress. The system of accountability is reflected in the Standards of Learning, the School Quality Profile, and the *Regulations Establishing the Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, or more commonly referred to as the Standards of Accreditation (SOA).

The SOA is comprised of sections, or parts, which specify requirements for students' educational preparation and for school quality. Part I provides definitions of terms used in the regulations and statements of purpose for public education in Virginia and for the Standards of Accreditation. Part II provides the board's philosophy, goals, and objectives, with the requirement that schools also have written goals and objectives. Part III presents student achievement expectations for graduation, including credits and requirements, and Part IV addresses instructional programs in elementary, middle, and high schools. Part V defines roles and expectations for principals and professional teaching staff aligned to

Virginia standards and also staffing requirements for administrative and support staff, as well as teaching loads. Part VI provides criteria for school facilities and addresses school safety. Part VII provides requirements for school communications with parents and the community, and specifies requirements for the School Quality Profile. Part VIII provides the bases for school accreditation, school corrective actions, and school support.

In October 2014, the Board held a work session to focus on an in-depth comprehensive examination of the SOA in its entirety. The following month, the Board withdrew pending amendments to the SOA, approved in 2013 and proceeding through the regulatory process, in favor of conducting a more extensive review and consideration of revisions. The first components of the comprehensive review, the revisions to Part I through Part VII of the SOA, were received by the Board for first review on September 22, 2016 and will be presented for second review at the November 2016 Board meeting.

The revisions to Part VIII are being presented separately, to allow additional time for the Board to consider approaches to measuring school quality, including alignment with new requirements for state accountability systems established by the new federal *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)*, the reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*. Through discussion at the Committee on School and Division Accountability, the Board has identified goals for Virginia's accountability system, which include:

- providing a comprehensive picture of school quality;
- driving continuous improvement for all school schools;
- building on school strengths and addressing weaknesses;
- informing areas of technical assistance and use of school improvement resources; and
- informing stakeholders.

A matrix-based system has been presented to the Committee that would emphasize outcomes and learning opportunities through multiple school quality measures, or indicators. Examples include: pass rates on state assessments, dropout rates, and rates of chronic absenteeism. Technical assistance and school improvement resources would be targeted based on performance in each indicator. Each school would be held accountable for each measure based on one of four performance levels for each applicable measure, from Level 1 for the highest performing schools, to Level 4 for the schools most in need of improvement. These multiple performance levels would encourage continuous improvement in schools as they strive to achieve the next-highest performance level. Displaying accountability information in this manner would also provide a more comprehensive picture of school quality than academic outcome measures alone.

The attached concept paper describes the matrix-based system, and incorporates questions for the Board to consider through its decision-making process. Concepts for consideration and associated questions are listed below:

Concept 1: Defining School Quality. This concept compares the current accreditation system based on endpoints with a matrix system based on multiple measures and levels of performance.

Should the overall purpose and approach to measuring school quality be centered around a summative accreditation rating that is based on one outcome, or should school quality be measured through a process which is based on multiple measures and drives continuous improvement?

Concept 2: School Quality Measures. This concept discusses several potential measures to be used in the matrix, as well as the criteria that should be used by the Board when selecting school quality measures.

Is the proposed criteria adequate to determine whether an indicator provides an accurate picture of school quality?

Concept 3: Performance Levels. This concept illustrates how schools would be grouped into four performance levels indicating their performance for each school quality measure from demonstrating best practice to needing state intervention.

Are the four levels described adequate and appropriate?

Concept 4: Benchmarks. This concept would establish benchmarks used to group schools into each of the four performance levels. A procedure for selecting appropriate benchmarks is discussed.

Are the steps listed for determination of benchmarks adequate?
Should the Board anticipate regular re-benchmarking over time?

Concept 5: Actions. This concept describes the types of actions a school would be required to take based on the school's performance level for a given school quality measure.

Are the actions suggested appropriate for each level?

Concept 6: System Transition. This concept proposes providing time and a transitional period to shift from the existing accreditation system to a matrix-based system.

How should the transition to the new system occur?
Is a three-year transition period appropriate?

Based upon the Board's consensus on each concept, staff will draft revisions to Part VIII of the SOA, which will be presented for final review at the Board's January 2017 meeting.

Impact on Fiscal and Human Resources: The administrative impact required in promulgating these regulations will be absorbed within existing resources.

Timetable for Further Review/Action: The proposed revisions to Part VIII of the regulations will be presented for final review on January 26, 2017.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education receive for first review the proposed concepts to be incorporated into the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, Part VIII.

Measuring School Quality Using Multiple Indicators

Virginia's school accountability system establishes the commonwealth's expectations and highest priorities for public schools. The system also establishes a methodology to ensure educational effectiveness, to direct levels of support and intervention for distressed schools, and to provide a standardized reporting system to inform the public and stakeholders.

School accreditation has been part of the accountability system. Originally, school accreditation in Virginia was an input-based system, meaning accreditation was determined upon each school meeting established minimum standards for staffing, facilities, textbooks, and other resources, generally on a per-pupil basis. About twenty years ago, the accreditation system was comprehensively reformed to evaluate outcomes, where accreditation was based upon student achievement, primarily through pass rates on standardized tests. The Board, through its Committee on School and Division Accountability, has begun a comprehensive review of the accreditation system, including considerations to encourage continuous improvement in multiple areas. This review also considers alignment with new requirements for state accountability systems that are required by the new federal *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)*, the reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*.

Five themes have emerged through the Committee's discussions about the future of accreditation in Virginia. Specifically, these themes indicate that Virginia's accountability system should:

- provide a comprehensive picture of school quality;
- drive continuous improvement for all schools;
- build on school strengths and address weaknesses;
- inform areas of technical assistance and use of school improvement resources; and
- inform stakeholders.

Committee discussions concerning school accreditation have centered on using multiple measures of school quality, which if implemented would replace the existing school accreditation system. A matrix-based system has been presented that would emphasize both academic outcomes and opportunities for all students to learn. These outcomes and opportunities would be quantified through school quality measures, or indicators. The measures would include traditional measures of academic performance, such as achievement rates on state assessments and graduation indicators, as well as additional indicators of school performance, such as rates of chronic absenteeism and an index of college and career readiness. Technical assistance and school improvement resources would be targeted based on performance in each indicator. Each school would be held accountable for each measure based upon one of four performance levels for each applicable measure, from Level 1 for the highest performing schools, to Level 4 for the schools most in need of improvement. These multiple performance levels would encourage continuous improvement in schools as they strive to achieve the next-highest performance level. Displaying accountability information in this manner would also provide a more comprehensive, easy to interpret picture of school quality, rather than limiting school quality measures to academic outcome measures only.

An example of an accreditation matrix is provided below:

School Quality Measures	Performance Levels			
	High			Low
Indicator A				
Indicator B				
Indicator C				

Concept 1: Defining School Quality. Under the current accreditation system, accreditation is an endpoint, meaning accreditation ratings are determined to assign ratings of “fully accredited,” “partially accredited,” or “denied accreditation.” Those ratings are then used to determine when school improvement efforts should be initiated and at what level.

The existing system does not lend itself to encouraging schools that are fully accredited to continue to advance to a higher level of student achievement. Currently, when a cutoff point for full accreditation is reached, for example, 75 percent of students making the benchmark on English assessments, the accountability system does not address the remaining 25 percent of students.

The current system of accreditation also does not consider strengths and weaknesses in areas other than academic achievement. For example, preliminary analysis indicates that 875 of Virginia’s 1,490 fully accredited public schools (58 percent) demonstrate chronic absenteeism rates greater than 15 percent. An alternative approach using a matrix system and levels of performance would have the potential to serve as a process to encourage continuous improvement because all schools would strive to advance to the next performance level in multiple areas, instead of only striving for a benchmark of “full accreditation” in one area. Continuous improvement also could be encouraged through the incorporation of benchmarks that recognize levels of improvement in a given school quality measure, instead of labeling schools as failures if they are making substantial progress but not meeting the minimum level of performance as provided in the current system.

Questions for consideration:

Should the overall purpose and approach to measuring school quality be centered around a summative accreditation rating that is based on one outcome, or should school quality be measured through a process which is based on multiple measures and drives continuous improvement?

Concept 2: School Quality Measures. The Committee has been presented several school quality measures that could be used for initial inclusion in the system.

Measures. The chart below represents each of the school quality indicators, or measures, that have been presented to the Committee for initial consideration, and whether the indicator is required by *ESSA*. *ESSA* requires each state’s accountability system to include measures of several specific academic outcomes and at least one additional measure of school quality. Each of the indicators noted below as not being required by *ESSA* could be used to satisfy the requirement to show an additional measure of school quality.

SCHOOL QUALITY MEASURES	REQUIRED IN ESSA
<i>Achievement on Assessments</i>	
Pass Rates on State Assessments*	Yes
Achievement Gaps*	Yes
Student Growth/Progress: <i>elementary and middle*</i>	Yes
English Learner Progress	Yes
<i>Graduation/School Progress</i>	
Graduation Indicator* <i>high school</i>	Yes (FGI)
Drop Out Rates (<i>e.g., 3-year cohort rate, grades 6-9 and 4-year cohort rate, grades 9-12</i>)	No ‡
<i>College & Career Readiness</i>	
College & Career Readiness Index	No ‡
<i>Student Participation & Engagement</i>	
Chronic Absenteeism (<i>e.g., absent 10% or more of school year</i>)	No ‡
Student Discipline (<i>e.g., short-term suspensions for most frequently reported incidents or disproportionality of short-term suspensions</i>)	

Notes:

* ESSA requires that these indicators be measured for all students and reporting groups.

‡ Measures of school quality that could be used to satisfy ESSA requirements.

FGI = Federal Graduation Indicator, which differs from the Virginia GCI (Graduation and Completion Index)

Additional school quality measures that have been presented to the Committee, but have not been proposed for initial inclusion in the matrix, include: Career and Technical Education Credentials/Advanced Placement enrollment; retention; school climate or learning environment (determined through surveys); and teacher absenteeism.

Criteria. The matrix must use quality indicators that reflect meaningful information about school success in order for it to effectively fulfill its intended purposes. This would be accomplished through application of criteria that would be used to select the school quality measures. In order for the Board to select any given school quality measure, the following criteria should be met:

- Research demonstrates that the indicator is related to academic performance. *This ensures the selection of indicators is evidence-based and positively related to improved academic outcomes among students.*
- Standardized procedures across schools and school divisions exist for data collection. *This ensures the indicator is measured and reported the same across all schools.*
- The data about the measure is reliable and valid. *This ensures reporting of quality information that can be objectively used to rate the performance of a school.*
- The measure is modifiable through school-level policies and procedures. *This ensures schools are held accountable for indicators within their control.*
- The measure meaningfully differentiates among schools based on progress of all students and student reporting groups. *This ensures the indicator uniquely reflects school quality and adds value to the identification of struggling schools, and does not just duplicate findings from another indicator.*
- The measure does not unfairly impact one type or group of schools or students. *This ensures the selection of indicators does not over-identify struggling schools based upon the indicators' relationship with student composition and demographics.*
- The measure is moderately to strongly correlated with school-level pass rates on state assessments. *This ensures indicators are positively related to improvement in Virginia students' academic performance as measured through state assessments.*

The table below shows how the criteria would be applied to chronic absenteeism as a school quality measure:

School Quality Measure Selection Checklist: Chronic Absenteeism	
Criteria	Analysis
Is there research demonstrating that the indicator is related to academic performance?	The body of scientific literature on chronic absenteeism demonstrates a high correlation to student-level academic performance.
Are there standardized data collection procedures across schools and school divisions?	VDOE’s Student Record Collection (SRC) provides a platform to measure chronic absenteeism across all schools. The SRC currently includes measures of the cumulative numbers of days a student is absent, whether excused or not.
Is the data reliable and valid?	Data contained in the SRC is locally verified.
Is performance modifiable through school-level policies and procedures?	Evidence-based school-level interventions have shown promising decreases in absenteeism rates.
Does the indicator meaningfully differentiate among schools based on progress of all students and subgroups?	The data indicates that schools with high pass rates on assessments continue to experience chronic absenteeism.
Does the indicator equitably identify schools across different school types or student compositions?	Data indicate that rates of chronic absenteeism cannot be solely contributed to school type or student composition.
Is there a moderate to strong correlation with school-level pass rates on state assessments?	A significant correlation exists among students with high absenteeism and failure of state assessments.

Questions for consideration:

Is the proposed criteria adequate to determine whether an indicator provides an accurate picture of school quality?

Concept 3: Performance Levels. Each school would be assigned to one of four performance levels for each measure in the matrix, which would guide whether the school should be recognized for exemplary performance, or if actions should be taken to improve performance.

Performance Levels			
Level 1 Exemplar	Level 2 Monitor	Level 3 Guide	Level 4 Intervene
Demonstrating best practices.	Meets minimum standard.	Does not meet minimum standard. Should take action.	Far below minimum standard. Intervention should occur.

Questions for consideration:

Are the four levels described adequate and appropriate?

Concept 4: Benchmarks. Benchmarks would be established to form the upper and lower limits for each performance level for each school quality measure for the purpose of determining whether a school would be grouped into Level 1, 2, 3, or 4. Benchmarks could represent actual performance levels or recognize increases or decreases in performance over time, or a combination of the two. This would allow Virginia’s accreditation model to begin to recognize improvements in school quality, and provide early detection and intervention where decline in school performance is indicated.

		Performance Levels			
		Level 1 Exemplar	Level 2 Monitor	Level 3 Guide	Level 4 Intervene
School Quality Measures	Performance Benchmarks	highest performance	acceptable performance	substandard performance	lowest performance
	Trending Benchmarks		sharply increasing	moderately increasing	stable or declining
	Combination	highest performance	acceptable performance or sharply increasing	substandard performance or moderately increasing	lowest performance or stable/declining

A standard process should be considered to determine appropriate benchmarks for grouping schools into four performance ratings for each indicator. Similar to the process envisioned for the selection of indicators, the Board would establish a procedure to identify meaningful benchmarks for each indicator. In order for the Board to determine benchmarks, these steps should be followed:

1. Several potential benchmarks should be determined, by examining:
 - a. scientific studies on meaningful benchmarks;
 - b. models from other states; and
 - c. an analysis of Virginia’s data for patterns and trends.

2. Selected potential benchmarks then should be tested through:
 - a. “what if” scenarios to examine the distribution of schools based on various benchmarks;
 - b. an analysis of the validity of these benchmarks using a sample set of schools; and
 - c. an analysis of the relationship of the school’s performance level with other indicators of school performance.

3. A determination should then be made to consider:
 - a. Whether the benchmark appropriately reflects values and expectations. *For instance, is the selected benchmark unreasonable or aspirational, or does it suggest continuous*

improvement? Benchmarks should be reasonable for all schools and encourage continuous improvement.

- b. *Whether unintended consequences exist from the selection of the benchmark. For instance, the measurement of one school quality measure may mask a deeper issue or encourage behaviors detrimental to all students' performance.*
4. The Board also should continue to examine the effectiveness of the benchmarks used over time, to determine if they are advancing school quality. At any point in the future, it may be necessary for the board to re-benchmark to maintain the focus on continuous improvement.

Questions for consideration:

Are the steps listed for determination of benchmarks adequate?

Should the Board anticipate regular re-benchmarking over time?

Concept 5: Actions. Performance levels drive what types of action a school would be required to take for each indicator area or whether it should serve as an exemplar school.

While the existing accreditation system uses one standard approach to school improvement requirements when a school is partially accredited or is denied accreditation, a matrix approach would allow interventions to be targeted to results for each school quality measure. Currently, when a school is partially accredited or is denied accreditation, a school improvement process is initiated. A revised approach based on a matrix would allow interventions to be targeted for each school quality measure, and would begin to address some areas of school quality that were never addressed previously in fully accredited schools. Under the matrix system, levels of performance on separate school quality measures would alert schools to specific problems, and schools would then self-examine the root causes related the performance in that indicator and initiate appropriate actions to intervene and improve.

Each performance level would correspond with a set of actions or recognition as follows:

Performance Levels	Action
Level 1 Exemplar	These schools have demonstrated the highest level of performance in the given indicator. Actions taken by these schools should serve as an example for schools seeking to improve.
Level 2 Monitor	These schools should monitor their performance in the corresponding indicator and continue to strive for advancement to Level 1.
Level 3 Guide	These schools should closely analyze their performance, and be required to develop and implement corrective action plans for the corresponding indicator. These schools will receive technical assistance and guidance from VDOE. Schools that remain at this level for multiple years and do not show improvement may drop to Level 4 and receive state intervention.
Level 4 Intervene	These are the lowest performing schools, and state level-intervention should occur for each corresponding indicator, to include a corrective action plan from the school and school division.

Questions for consideration:

Are the actions suggested appropriate for each level?

Concept 6: System Transition. Transitioning from our current accreditation system to a system with additional indicators of school quality should allow school administrators sufficient time to become aware of the new indicators, and how they would theoretically be affected under the new system. Schools will need to examine the areas of strengths and weaknesses identified by the matrix, understand the underlying causes, and begin assessing actions that may be needed.

Two recent actions by the General Assembly may assist with providing time to transition to the new system:

- Legislation approved by the General Assembly in 2015 ([HB 1674](#)) provided that schools that were fully accredited for three consecutive years could transition to a triennial accreditation cycle. For a school to retain its three-year accreditation status, at the end of the three year period, it would need to have met full accreditation requirements for each of the three prior years. If it did not, it would revert to a one-year accreditation cycle until three years of full accreditation occurs again.
- Legislation approved by the General Assembly in 2016 ([SB 368](#)) permit the Board to accredit schools that are not fully accredited for up to three years, provided that a Board-approved corrective action plan exists for the school for the duration of the period of accreditation. The Board has not yet exercised this authority.

Questions for consideration:

How should the transition to the new system occur?

Is a three-year transition period appropriate?



Measuring School Quality Using Multiple Measures

Board of Education's Committee on School and Division Accountability

Dr. Cynthia A. Cave
Assistant Superintendent for Policy and Communications
November 16, 2016

Approaches to Accountability

- **Input-based system**
 - Virginia's original system of accreditation
 - Considered inputs through minimum standards for staffing, facilities, other resources
- **Outcome-based system**
 - Virginia's current system of accreditation
 - Considers student achievement through pass rates on standardized tests
- **Continuous improvement-based system**
 - Drives continuous improvement using a matrix to display performance in multiple areas of school quality

Goals for Accountability

The accountability system should:

- Provide a comprehensive picture of school quality
- Drive continuous improvement for all schools
- Build on school strengths and address weaknesses
- Inform areas of technical assistance and use of school improvement resources
- Inform stakeholders

Overview

Matrix-based system:

- Uses multiple school quality measures, or indicators
- Schools assigned performance levels for each measure

	Performance Levels			
School Quality Measures	High			Low
Indicator A				
Indicator B				
Indicator C				

Concept 1: Defining School Quality

Existing system:

- **Outcome-based**
- **Provides a summative accreditation rating based on measure of academic outcomes**
- **“Full accreditation” status represents an “endpoint” with no state driver for further improvement**

System with multiple measures of school quality:

- **Process-based**
- **Drives continuous levels of improvement in areas affecting student achievement**
- **Encourages advancement to next performance level**
- **Indicates strengths and weaknesses**

Concept 1: Defining Accreditation

Question:

Should the overall purpose and approach to measuring school quality be centered around a summative accreditation rating that is based on one outcome, or should school quality be measured through a process which is based on multiple measures and drives continuous improvement?

Concept 2: School Quality Measures

SCHOOL QUALITY MEASURES
<i>Achievement on Assessments</i>
Pass Rates on State Assessments
Achievement Gaps
Student Growth/Progress: <i>elementary and middle</i>
English Learner Progress
<i>Graduation/School Progress</i>
Graduation Indicator <i>high school</i>
Drop Out Rates (<i>e.g., 3-year cohort rate, grades 6-9 and 4-year cohort rate, grades 9-12</i>)
<i>College & Career Readiness</i>
College & Career Readiness Index
<i>Student Participation & Engagement</i>
Chronic Absenteeism (<i>e.g., absent 10% or more of school year</i>)
Student Discipline (<i>e.g., short-term suspensions for most frequently reported incidents or disproportionality of short-term suspensions</i>)

Concept 2: School Quality Measures

Criteria for selection of measures:

- Is there research demonstrating that the indicator is related to academic performance?
- Are there standardized data collection procedures across schools and school divisions?
- Is the data reliable and valid?
- Is performance modifiable through school-level policies and procedures?
- Does the indicator meaningfully differentiate among schools based on progress of all students and subgroups?
- Does the indicator equitably identify schools across different school types or student compositions?
- Is there a moderate to strong correlation with school-level pass rates on state assessments?

Concept 2: School Quality Measures

Question:

Is the proposed criteria adequate to determine whether an indicator provides an accurate picture of school quality?

Concept 3: Performance Levels

Performance Levels			
Level 1 Exemplar	Level 2 Monitor	Level 3 Guide	Level 4 Intervene
Demonstrating best practices.	Meets minimum standard.	Does not meet minimum standard. Should take action.	Far below minimum standard. Intervention should occur.

Question:

Are the four levels described adequate and appropriate?

Concept 4: Benchmarks

- A standard process is needed to determine appropriate benchmarks for grouping schools into four performance ratings for each measure.
- Suggested process:
 - Identify several potential benchmarks, by examining research, other state models, and Virginia's data
 - Test potential benchmarks using “what if” scenarios
 - Determine whether the benchmark drives continuous improvement.
 - Periodically re-evaluate the benchmark after implementation

Concept 4: Benchmarks

		Performance Levels			
		Level 1 Exemplar	Level 2 Monitor	Level 3 Guide	Level 4 Intervene
School Quality Measures	Performance Benchmarks	highest performance	acceptable performance	substandard performance	lowest performance
	Trending Benchmarks		sharply increasing	moderately increasing	stable or declining
	Combination	highest performance	acceptable performance or sharply increasing	substandard performance or moderately increasing	lowest performance or stable/declining

Concept 4: Benchmarks

Questions:

Are the steps listed for determination of benchmarks adequate?

Should the Board anticipate regular re-benchmarking over time?

Concept 5: Actions

Performance Levels	Action
Level 1 Exemplar	These schools have demonstrated the highest level of performance in the given indicator. Actions taken by these schools should serve as an example for schools seeking to improve.
Level 2 Monitor	These schools should monitor their performance in the corresponding indicator and continue to strive for advancement to Level 1.
Level 3 Guide	These schools should closely analyze their performance, and be required to develop and implement corrective action plans for the corresponding indicator. These schools will receive technical assistance and guidance from VDOE. Schools that remain at this level for multiple years and do not show improvement may drop to Level 4 and receive state intervention.
Level 4 Intervene	These are the lowest performing schools, and state level-intervention should occur for each corresponding indicator, to include a corrective action plan from the school and school division.

Concept 5: Actions

Questions:

Are the suggested actions appropriate for each level?

Concept 6: System Transition

Questions:

How should the transition to the new system occur?

Is a three-year transition period appropriate?