Continuous Improvement and Accountability Data Analysis Planning Guide

The New York State Education Department (NYSED or "the Department") encourages all schools and districts to engage in a continuous improvement process that results in an annual improvement plan collaboratively developed by stakeholders and informed by a needs assessment. Accountability data woven into local evidence of student learning and performance can be useful in continuous improvement planning to help ensure the success of all students.

For more information about a continuous improvement process, please see the NYSED Continuous Improvement webpage. Accountability level cut points and other resources about accountability support model calculations can be found on the NYSED School and District Accountability Resources and Data webpage.

Districts with schools that have any of the following results are encouraged to layer the recommendations into their planning efforts. NYSED has also developed *Understanding Our Final Determinations Data,* a slide deck intended for school and district leaders to use to present their local data to involved stakeholders for guiding further inquiry and planning next steps.

SUPPORT MODEL IDENTIFICATION RECOMMENDATIONS	
IF our school and/or subgroup is identified for…	**THEN the following recommendations should be considered for continuous improvement planning**
Any Support Model, including Local Support and Improvement (LSI)	• Examine how the school's All Students group and subgroups are performing in relation to the indicator cut points • Compare the English language arts (ELA) and math subject performance indices (PIs) for the Core Subject Performance indicator to identify any significant variation between the subjects
Potential Targeted Support and Improvement, Year 1 (LSI:PTSI-1)	• Conduct a comprehensive root cause analysis to understand the underlying factors contributing to subgroup identification • Collect and analyze all relevant data associated with the identified subgroup • Develop and implement targeted strategies aimed at improving achievement in identified areas
Potential Targeted Support and Improvement, Year 2 (LSI:PTSI-2)	• Compare current year data with prior year results to identify persistent areas of concern • Monitor progress closely, keeping in mind that if the subgroup meets the identification criteria again based on this year's data, it will be formally identified for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) • Develop and implement targeted strategies aimed at improving achievement in identified areas
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Additional Targeted	**For the English language learner (ELL) subgroup:** Consider the following when engaging in needs assessments and improvement planning for the ELL subgroup:

Support and Improvement (ATSI), TSI, or LSI:PTSI	[Multilingual Learner (ML) and ELL Program Quality Review and Reflective Protocol Toolkit](#): This toolkit strengthens the school quality review process for ML and ELL programs and services [Regional Bilingual Education Resource Network (RBERN)](#): The purpose of the RBERNs is to establish regionally based resources to provide a coordinated system of high-quality technical assistance, training, information dissemination, and professional development to districts/school to improve their instructional programs and practices for ELLs **For the Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup:** It is beneficial to engage with the [New York State Education Department Educational Partnership](#). - The Educational Partnership is a coordinated and cohesive network of support focused on enhancing services and support for students with disabilities from early childhood and school-age education to engagement in post-school opportunities - The Educational Partnership's mission is to support and empower educational organizations, families, and communities to improve equity, access, opportunities, and outcomes for all students with disabilities in New York State

ACCOUNTABILITY LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS	
IF the All Students group or accountability subgroup(s) receive the following accountability level…	**THEN the following recommendations should be considered for continuous improvement planning**
Level 1 for the Weighted Average Achievement indicator and Level 2 for the Core Subject Performance indicator	- Recognize that the Level 1 results fall within the bottom 10% statewide, signaling the need for targeted strategies within an improvement plan - Use Student Information Repository (SIRS) 106 and 114 reports to examine participation rates, as low participation may be influencing overall performance - Identify and implement strategies to increase participation in statewide assessments - Analyze student-level results compared to the Weighted Average Achievement and Core Subject Performance indicator level cut points to inform goal setting and progress monitoring

Level 3 or 4 for the Weighted Average Achievement indicator and the Core Subject Performance indicator and Level 1 for the Graduation Rate indicator	- Analyze barriers preventing students from graduating on time - Consider support and programmatic modifications to boost graduation rates - As schools can be identified for CSI if the All Students group has a 4-year Graduation Rate lower than 67% and 5-year and 6-year Graduation Rates not at or above 67%, review the SIRS 105 report to examine which students are graduating in each cohort
Level 1 for the Weighted Average Achievement indicator and the Core Subject Performance indicator alongside Level 3 or 4 for the Graduation Rate indicator	- Recognize that this combination of results aligns with Scenario 2 for identification, indicating performance concerns that require targeted improvement efforts - Review student-level results in relation to the Weighted Average Achievement and Core Subject Performance indicator level cut points to guide analysis, identify gaps, and set measurable goals - Examine local curriculum and grading policies to ensure alignment with the New York State Learning Standards and support consistent expectations for student learning
Level 1 or 2 for the Attendance indicator	- Recognize that earning a Level 1 on the Attendance indicator is one of the criteria that may contribute to identification - Use the SIRS 113 report to review student-level attendance patterns in relation to the indicator cut points to inform analysis and goal setting - Develop targeted interventions for students whose attendance places them near the Level 1/Level 2 threshold - Examine the effectiveness of current programs in meeting students' holistic needs, particularly supports related to mental health, family engagement, and wraparound services
Level 1 or 2 for the English Language Proficiency (ELP) indicator	- Recognize that earning a Level 1 on the ELP indicator is one of the criteria that may contribute to identification - Analyze trends and needs across all ELP performance levels to determine programmatic strengths and gaps - Use student-level data from the SIRS 113 report to identify specific areas of need and the expected growth required to demonstrate annual progress in the upcoming school year
Level 1 for the College, Career, and Civic Readiness (CCCR) indicator	- Recognize that earning a Level 1 on the CCCR indicator is one of the criteria that may contribute to identification - Examine barriers that limit students' access to or completion of CCCR-aligned credentials

	• Identify and maximize opportunities such as coursework, programs, and pathways that support students in earning credentials • Verify the accuracy of the SIRS 108 report data, including ensuring that students assigned a weight of "0" are reported correctly and that students who have dropped out but have earned a High School Equivalency diploma have contributed positively to the CCCR Index
Level 1 for the Student Growth indicator	• Recognize that earning a Level 1 for Student Growth falls within Scenario 2 for potential identification • Use the SIRS 112 report data to understand the narrative that the growth results tell about student learning • Clarify how the ELA and math Growth Indices differ and what each reveal about student trajectories • Compare growth rates across subgroups and grade levels, analyzing root causes for any discrepancies • Identify student growth data that were unexpected or concerning ("red flags") and investigate underlying factors • For students who demonstrated low growth last year and are still enrolled this year, examine current growth patterns and reflect on support needed to accelerate progress

Supplemental Resources

To review the data used for accountability measures, please use the following resources:

- Accountability SIRS reports
- The preliminary accountability data file posted to the IRS Portal
- Accountability Indicator Level Cut Points