


# MASSACHUSETTS



ESSA grants states more authority over their school accountability systems than did NCLB. Three of the most important improvements states can make are to: (1) assign to schools annual ratings that are clear and intuitive for parents, educators, and the public; (2) encourage schools to focus on all students, not just their low performers; and (3) measure and judge all schools fairly, including those with high rates of poverty.

To determine whether Massachusetts's proposed ESSA accountability system accomplishes these three objectives, this analysis evaluates its state plan, as submitted to the U.S. Department of Education on May 10, 2017,<sup>49</sup> as explained below.

## 1 Are the labels or ratings for schools clear and intuitive for parents, educators, and the public?

Massachusetts's plan is **strong** on this point because it proposes to use a six-tier system for schools' annual ratings. This model immediately conveys to all observers how well a given school is performing.

## 2 Does the rating system encourage schools to focus on all students?

There are two primary ways for state accountability systems to encourage schools to focus on all students: (1) use a performance index or scale scores in place of proficiency rates when measuring achievement and (2) measure the growth of all students. Massachusetts receives a **strong** because those two components constitute 85 percent of schools' annual ratings. Average scale scores count for 60 percent, which encourages schools to look beyond those pupils who are near the cutoff for proficiency. And a measure of growth for all students constitutes another 25 percent of schools' summative ratings, which should also lead schools to heed the educational needs of every child.

## 3 Is the rating system fair to all schools, including those with high rates of poverty?

Massachusetts is **weak** here because academic growth will constitute just 25 percent of schools' annual ratings. Growth measures gauge changes in pupil achievement over time, independent of prior achievement, and are therefore less correlated with poverty—thus affording high-poverty schools the opportunity to earn positive ratings. Massachusetts's approach will unfairly disadvantage high-poverty schools.