

MISSOURI

1 Assigns to schools annual ratings that are clear and intuitive

1

STRONG



2 Encourages schools to focus on all students, not just low performers

2

STRONG



3 Measures all schools fairly, including those with high rates of poverty

3

MEDIUM



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 Missouri'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 September 18, 2017,⁵⁴ as explained below.

1

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

Missouri's plan is **strong** on this point because it proposes to use an index score. 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. Missouri receives a **strong** rating because those two components constitute 87.5 percent of schools' annual ratings. A performance index counts for 50 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 37.5 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?

Missouri gets a **medium** here because student-level growth for all students will constitute 37.5 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.