

Comparison: North Star accountability system and proposed star rating system

	North Star system	Proposed star ratings
Stakeholder engagement	Built after a year and half of engagement with hundreds of students, educators, families, community members, and other stakeholders across Minnesota with the goal of promoting transparency and equity.	Not clear how families or communities were included in the star rating proposal’s development.
Transparency	<p>Emphasizes the importance of math achievement, reading achievement, and progress toward English language proficiency (for English learners) by including these three measurements as the first stage of a three-stage decision process.</p> <p>Each indicator of the North Star system is reported separately for each school and district. Families and communities get a clear picture of how schools and districts are doing in each area of the accountability system. Successes and challenges are more transparent and can lead to productive conversations around improvement. Low performance on any indicator is obvious, as is high performance.</p>	<p>Combines all indicators, which would mask the unique successes and challenges within schools and districts. Families and communities would have a hard time understanding the nuances behind school and district performance.</p> <p>While the intent is that a star rating system would make data clear for families and communities, it would establish a separate measurement system that would lead to confusion and frustration, as seen in other states that have done this. With two systems, a school could perform well on one and not the other, or struggle in one but not the other.</p> <p>The proposed star rating system equally weights each component; however, the federal ESSA law requires that academic components be given much greater weight in the system.</p>
Equity	<p>Meaningfully includes many student groups. The overall performance for a school or district on any indicator includes: all students, each major racial and ethnic group, students in special education, students eligible for free or reduced price lunch, and English Learners. Each group’s performance on each indicator is reported separately. The equal weighting of groups in the overall average means that smaller groups carry greater weight relative to their size. This approach encourages schools and districts to focus on every student group, including smaller ones which often represent Minnesota’s historically underserved student populations.</p>	<p>Only uses the “all students” group for many measurements. When it does look at student groups, it usually looks at gaps for students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch and a “super group” that combines all students of color and American Indian students.</p>

Measurement inconsistency

The star rating proposal would establish a separate accountability system which uses measures that differ from the system developed with Minnesota stakeholders and approved by the U.S. Department of Education. Reporting measures that are different would lead to confusion and frustration among families and communities.

North Star system	Proposed star ratings	Same, different or unknown
Districts	Districts	
Math achievement for each student group	High school math achievement	Different
Reading achievement for each student group	High school reading achievement	Different
Progress toward English Language Proficiency		Different
Math progress for each student group		Different
Reading progress for each student group		Different
Four-year graduation rate for each student group	Four-year graduation rate	Different
Seven-year graduation rate for each student group		Different
Consistent attendance for each student group		Different
	Students of color achievement gap score	Different
	Low-income student achievement gap score	Different
	Third grade reading achievement	Different
Elementary and middle schools	Elementary and middle schools	
Math achievement for each student group	Math achievement	Different
Reading achievement for each student group	Reading achievement	Different
Progress toward English Language Proficiency	Progress toward English Language Proficiency	Same
Math progress for each student group	Math progress	Same
Reading progress for each student group	Reading progress	Same
Consistent attendance for each student group	Consistent attendance (student groups unclear)	Unknown
	Students of color (super group) achievement gap score	Different
	Low-income student achievement gap score	Different
High schools	High schools	
Math achievement for each student group	Math achievement	Different
Reading achievement for each student group	Reading achievement	Different
Progress toward English Language Proficiency	Progress toward English Language Proficiency	Same
Four-year graduation rate for each student group	Four-year graduation rate gap	Different
Seven-year graduation rate for each student group		Different
Consistent attendance for each student group	Consistent attendance (student groups unclear)	Unknown
	Students of color (super group) achievement gap score	Different
	Low-income student achievement gap score	Different