

2015 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC)

Discussion of Options for A–F Ratings Beginning in 2017 Accountability

The following is a summary of preliminary options for a rating system that assigns each district a grade of either A, B, C, D, or F. Based on current statute, the new rating system is scheduled to be implemented beginning with the accountability ratings for the 2016–2017 school year.

Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) Preliminary Options

On December 8–9, 2014, the Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) met to discuss various topics related to accountability, including possible options for an A–F rating system for school districts. While the ATAC agreed that much more work will need to be done to develop the new rating system, members described three options—based on existing data—for how this rating system could work.

For each option below, the rating is shown in the left-most column, and the requirements for each rating are listed in the remaining columns in that row.

Option 1 –Performance Indexes

Example: To earn an A, a district that is rated on all four indexes must meet all four indexes; there are no requirements for safeguards or distinctions.

Rating	Index Criteria Count of Indexes Evaluated				Safeguards Met	Distinctions Count of Distinctions Earned
	4	3	2	1		
A	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	Not specified	Not specified
B	●●●○	●●○	—	—	Not specified	Not specified
C	●●○○	—	●○	—	Not specified	Not specified
D	●○○○	●○○	—	—	Not specified	Not specified
F	○○○○	○○○	○○	○	Not specified	Not specified

● Index met | ○ Index not met | — No rating available

Option 2 –Performance Indexes and System Safeguards*

Example: To earn an A, a district that is rated on all four indexes must meet all four indexes and meet at least 90% of system safeguards.

Rating	Index Target Count of Indexes Evaluated				Safeguards Met	Distinctions Count of Distinctions Earned
	4	3	2	1		
A	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	≥ 90%	Not specified
B	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	70%–89%	Not specified
C	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	50%–69%	Not specified
D	●●●○	●●○	●○	○	≥ 50%	Not specified
D	●●○○	●○○	—	—	≥ 50%	Not specified
D	●○○○	—	—	—	≥ 50%	Not specified
F	○○○○	○○○	○○	○	< 50%	Not specified

● Index met | ○ Index not met | — No rating available

*Additional variations could permit a rating of B or C despite missing one or more indexes.

2015 Distinction Designation Indicators

Option 3 – Performance Indexes, System Safeguards, and Distinction Designations

Example: To earn a *A*, a district that is rated on all four indexes must meet all four indexes, meet 100% of system safeguards, and earn at least one distinction.

Rating	Index Target Count of Indexes Evaluated				Safeguards Met	Distinctions Count of Distinctions Earned
	4	3	2	1		
A	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	100%	One
B	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	90%–99%	None
C	●●●○	●●○	●○	–	70%–89%	None
D	●●○○	●○○	●○	–	< 69%	None
F	○○○○	○○○	○○	○	–	None

● Index met | ○ Index not met | – No rating available

The following variations could be considered for Option 3:

- 1) Eliminate requirement to earn one distinction since districts are only eligible to earn one distinction designation for postsecondary readiness
- 2) Require that a certain number or percentage of all campus-level distinctions be earned across the school district
- 3) Add criteria that if any campus in the district is rated *Improvement Required*, the district will not receive a rating of *A*

The table below describes how Option 3 could be applied at the campus-level if A-F labels were also required to be assigned to campuses.

Example: To earn an *A*, a campus must meet all indexes evaluated, meet 100% of system safeguards, and earn at least two campus-level distinctions.

Rating	Index Target Count of Indexes Evaluated				Safeguards Met	Distinctions Count of Distinctions Earned
	4	3	2	1		
A	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	100%	Two
B	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	90%–99%	One
C	●●●○	●●○	●○	–	70%–89%	None
D	●●○○	●○○	●○	–	< 69%	None
F	○○○○	○○○	○○	○	–	None

● Index met | ○ Index not met | – No rating available

2015 Distinction Designation Indicators

Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) Preliminary Option

On January 21, 2015, the 2015 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) had its initial meeting on accountability system development for 2015 and beyond, which included a review of preliminary options for an A–F rating system for school districts. APAC members reviewed the three ATAC preliminary options and suggested the following:

- Consider a transition over time by starting with *Option 1 –Performance Indexes* before phasing-in *Option 2 –Performance Indexes and System Safeguards* in a subsequent year
- Consider an option similar to *Option 2 –Performance Indexes and System Safeguards* that doesn't require districts to meet all four indexes
- Consider a new option that assigns grades for each index in addition to an overall grade
- Determine whether using distinction designations to determine grades might disadvantage smaller or less affluent districts