

This document describes proposed changes to the 2015-16 School Quality Reports. These changes build on the methodology described in the [2014-15 Educator Guides to the School Quality Reports](#). The School Performance team will collect feedback about these proposed changes during meetings with principals and during an open-comment period. Please send any feedback to SchoolPerformance@schools.nyc.gov by June 28, 2016. After considering feedback, a Final Changes document will be published indicating the methods that will be used for the 2015-16 School Quality Reports.

Proposed Phase-In Changes

The following proposed phase-in changes will not affect ratings in the 2015-16 reports, but will affect ratings in the 2016-17 reports.

1. **6-Year College Readiness Index with Persistence (HS):** In the 2014-15 reports, this metric combined two distinct concepts: (1) meeting CUNY's standards to avoid remediation within six years of starting high school, and (2) remaining enrolled in college through the beginning of the third semester of college, within six years of starting high school. Students who met either of the two criteria contributed to the numerator. To better describe student outcomes, we propose to separate this metric into two metrics: (1) 6-Year College Readiness Index, and (2) College Persistence. The 6-Year College Readiness Index will show the percentage of students that met CUNY's standards to avoid remediation within six years of starting high school. The College Persistence metric will show the percentage of students who remained enrolled in college through the beginning of the third semester of college, within six years of starting high school.

The College Persistence metric will count as *extra credit* in the Student Achievement section (similar to the Closing the Achievement Gap metrics in the 2014-15 reports). It cannot lower the school's Student Achievement score—but strong performance in this area will increase the score.

2. **Comprehensive Readiness Rate Including Enrollment (Transfer HS/YABC):** For the 2014-15 reports, this metric combined two distinct concepts: (1) meeting CUNY's standards to avoid remediation within the student's graduation deadline, and (2) enrolling in college within the student's graduation deadline. Students who met either of the two criteria contributed toward the numerator in the current metric. To better describe student outcomes, we propose to use a College Readiness Index metric focused on the first concept, which shows the percentage of students that met CUNY's standards to avoid remediation within their graduation deadline. The second concept in the 2014-15 metric, regarding college enrollment, is already captured through the existing Postsecondary Enrollment Rate by Six Months after High School metric.

We will include values and targets for these new metrics in the 2015-16 reports, but they will not contribute to the Student Achievement rating until the 2016-17 reports.

Proposed Technical Changes

1. **Rigorous Instruction section rating:** The scoring for Rigorous Instruction, which is based on a combination of Quality Review ratings and NYC School Survey results as described in the [2014-15 Educator Guides to the School Quality Reports](#), will be supplemented with an additional rule:

The Rigorous Instruction score cannot fall below 3.00 if

- The school did not receive a Quality Review during the past year (e.g., during 2015-16 for the 2015-16 School Quality Reports); and
- The school’s Rigorous Instruction survey score is at least 3.50; and
- The school’s Student Achievement score is at least 3.50.

This rule is designed to make it possible for schools that attain strong results on the Rigorous Instruction survey questions and in student achievement to earn Meeting Target in Rigorous Instruction if they do not have updated Quality Review ratings from 2015-16.

2. **Overage/Undercredited (HS):** For high schools, the method of matching students for a school’s Comparison Group takes into account students’ overage/undercredited status upon entry to the school, as well as the school’s percentage of overage/undercredited students (upon their entry at the school). For 2014-15, overage/undercredited status for high-school students was based on credits earned given the students’ age, upon entry to the school. The proposed technical change for 2015-16 is to base overage/undercredited status for high-school students on credits earned and Regents passed given the student’s age, upon entry to the school.

Overage/Undercredited

Age	Previous Criteria	New Criteria
16	Under 11 credits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits and two or fewer Regents passed.
17	Under 22 credits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits; or • Under 33 credits and three or fewer Regents passed.
18	Under 33 credits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits; or • Under 33 credits and four or fewer Regents passed; or • Under 44 credits and one or fewer Regents passed.
19 or older	Under 44 credits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 33 credits; or • Under 44 credits and one or fewer Regents passed.

The Comparison Group matching also takes special account of the subset of overage/undercredited students who are very far behind: these students fall in the Most-at-Risk category. The following table shows the criteria:

Most-at-Risk

Age	Previous Criteria	New Criteria
16	Under 11 credits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 11 credits and zero Regents passed.
17	Under 11 credits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits.
18	Under 22 credits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits; or • Under 33 credits and one or fewer Regents passed.
19 or older	Under 33 credits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 22 credits; or • Under 44 credits and one or fewer Regents passed.

For students entering a high school from outside of the DOE, the previous credits-only criteria will apply (because those students generally would not have taken Regents exams at their prior school).

3. **Multi-year growth table in Snapshot (ES, MS, K-8, HS):** The Student Achievement page on the 2014-15 Snapshot included key student results from the past year, broken out by students' starting points from an earlier year (e.g., performance on the state Math and ELA tests in 8th grade broken out by students' 5th grade starting points). To be displayed, values required a minimum of n=5 (in the denominator). This table was informational and did not directly factor into the Student Achievement rating.

The technical change for 2015-16 is that the multi-year growth table will include key student results from the past three years, broken out by students' starting points (e.g., the table values will reflect 8th grader performance in 2015-16, 8th grader performance in 2014-15, and 8th grader performance in 2013-14, broken out by those students' 5th grade levels). To be displayed, values required a minimum of n=15 (in the denominator). The table will remain informational and will not directly factor into the Student Achievement rating.

Including three years of data and a minimum of n=15 will provide a more accurate and stable picture of how well students from different starting points are improving and performing at the school.

Response to Prior Feedback

During the past year, we have heard questions and concerns from principals and others about ratings based solely on data from the NYC School Survey. While the NYC School Survey is an important measurement of the Framework elements, we are exploring other information that could be included in Framework sections because we agree that the ratings could be further strengthened by including additional measures.

We also note that survey results can provide useful and valid measures of school conditions, which impact student achievement. For example, the University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research found that strength on the Framework elements, as measured by surveys, was strongly connected to student learning gains.¹ In addition, recent research from The Research Alliance for New York City Schools found relationships between school contexts, as measured by the NYC School Survey, and increases in student achievement and reductions in teacher turnover.²

¹ See <https://uchicagoimpact.org/5essentials/research>.

² See http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/scmsAdmin/media/users/sg158/PDFs/schools_as_organizations/SchoolOrganizationa|Contexts_WorkingPaper.pdf