## STATE ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Character of Program</th>
<th>Components of Assessment</th>
<th>Value Added vs. Snapshot</th>
<th>Support Strategies for low Performing Schools</th>
<th>Incentives</th>
<th>Sanctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>High level test, success defined by one measure</td>
<td>Criterion-based test results</td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>State lacks resources for direct support; support is provided through intermediaries including contractors and universities</td>
<td>Michigan Merit Award Program - student scholarships, Golden Apple Award for schools</td>
<td>Parents may send children to another public school if poor performance, intervention team can recommend a variety of changes in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Emphasis on basic skills, Disaggregation of data</td>
<td>Criterion-based test results, dropout rates, attendance rates, on-site reviews</td>
<td>Use absolute, also calculate comparable improvement</td>
<td>No additional resources available to low-performing schools. Regional educational service centers often provide services through assistance teams</td>
<td>$ based on # of pupils</td>
<td>Parents may send children to another public school or receive voucher for eligible private school if persistent poor performance. State Board can recommend that local district take various actions ranging from providing additional resources to school reconstitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Test contains criterion and norm referenced sections; % of eligible students tested is also considered</td>
<td>Currently absolute; are moving to include value-added component</td>
<td>Dept. of Ed. and district both provide assistance and intervention, district encouraged to provide additional $ and differential pay as well</td>
<td>Greater autonomy; $ based on # of pupils that can be used for staff bonuses or for nonrecurring equipment/supplies at school's discretion</td>
<td>If schools do not improve, an assistance team will come in to help; Grade 3, 5, 8 promotion and HS graduation being made contingent on test scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Multiple tests that are criterion and norm referenced, alternative assessment portfolios; planning to implement &quot;gateways&quot; when student work is reviewed to determine promotion</td>
<td>Both combined</td>
<td>State provides assistance teams of educators from other school districts to help with evaluation and planning and provides additional resources</td>
<td>$ to school based on # of certified staff and teacher assistants</td>
<td>Focus on helping struggling schools improve but can ultimately reconstitute or close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Strong teacher support</td>
<td>Criterion-based test results</td>
<td>Both combined</td>
<td>Districts are responsible for providing assistance to low performing schools. A state support system is under consideration</td>
<td>$ based on # of pupils</td>
<td>Development action plan ($ is provided), if still don't meet goals, sanctions include school reconstitution, closure, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Academic Performance Index - normed test scores augmented test questions are criterion referenced, plus other measures</td>
<td>Value added only - targets set by state board of ed - currently 5% minimum/year</td>
<td>State provides additional resources, schools work with external evaluator and parents on an improvement plan</td>
<td>$, Spending flexibility, release from some regs</td>
<td>$ to school based on # of eligible teachers</td>
<td>Scholastic audits and/or personnel evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Test results, attendance, retention, dropout rates, and &quot;rate of successful transition to adult life&quot;, writing portfolios</td>
<td>Both combined</td>
<td>Increased financial resources and assistance from highly skilled educators. Also, state regional services centers are available to assist schools</td>
<td>$ to school based on # of eligible teachers</td>
<td>Technical assistance if below 95% of national norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Value added</td>
<td>Criterion-based and normed test results, dropout rates, attendance rates</td>
<td>Value added</td>
<td>In process of establishing a state identification/support system. Aids districts in acquiring federal assistance and funding</td>
<td>$ to school - student, principal, teach can receive honors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While accountability frameworks are generally based on a system of assessments, supports, incentives, and sanctions, the ways in which these components are designed and the emphasis placed upon each component reflect diverse opinions about the most effective way to measure and improve student achievement. As Michigan policymakers develop a new accountability framework, we can learn from the experiences of other states. The successes of programs that approach accountability in very different ways demonstrate that there is no one best accountability system. By drawing on the strengths of a variety of programs and considering their suitability to the Michigan context, we can design a system that encourages and supports all of the actors in Michigan education system as they strive to improve teaching and learning throughout the state.

State Tests Addendum:

**Michigan**
Michigan Education Assessment Program
Grades 4, 7: reading and mathematics
Grades 5, 8: writing, science, and social studies
High school: grade 11 proficiency test

**Texas**
Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (Will be replaced by TAKS series in 2003)
Grades 3-8: reading and mathematics
Grades 4, 8: writing
Grade 8: science and social studies
Grade 10: reading, writing, and mathematics
High school: English, United States history, biology, and algebra

**Florida**
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
Grades 3-10: reading and mathematics criterion referenced section of FCAT
Grades 3-10: reading and mathematics norm referenced section of FCAT
Grades 4, 8, 10: writing section of FCAT

**North Carolina**
End of Grade/Course tests to all students, Iowa Test of Basic Skills to a sample of students
Grades 3-8: reading and mathematics
Grades 4, 7: writing
Grade 8: computer skills
High school: various courses
Gateway grades: 3, 5, 8, high school

**Connecticut**
Connecticut Master Test
Grades 4, 6, 8: reading, writing, and mathematics
Connecticut Academic Performance Test
Grade 11: language arts, writing, mathematics, and science

California
Composition of Academic Performance Index (API) will change over time but at least 60% of the weighting must always be based on test results.
Currently API consists of Stanford Achievement test results augmented with questions tied to the state standards.
Future plans to include high school exit exam results, attendance, and drop out rates in the API.
Grades 2-8: reading, writing, and mathematics
High school: reading, writing, mathematics, social studies, and science

Kentucky
Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills
Grades 3, 6, 9: reading, mathematics, and language arts
Commonwealth Accountability Testing System
Grades 4, 7: reading, science, writing portfolio, and writing on demand
Grades 5, 8: mathematics, social studies, arts and humanities, practical living, and vocational studies
Grade 10: mathematics, practical living
Grade 11: mathematics, science, social studies, arts, and humanities
Grade 12: writing portfolio and writing on demand

Tennessee
Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program Achievement
Grades 3-8: reading, vocabulary, language, language mechanics, mathematics, mathematics computation, science, social studies, spelling, and word analysis
Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program Competency
Grade 9: language arts and mathematics
High School Subject Matter Tests: algebra I and II, geometry, mathematics for technology

This information was compiled by Debbi Weimer and Joseph Flynn, The Education Policy Center at MSU. January 2002.