

Idaho Public Charter School Commission

Recommendations for Developing Effective MSES

The Difference between Inputs, Outputs, and Outcomes

Before you can write strong Measurable Student Educational Standards (MSES), it is important to understand the difference between inputs, outputs, and outcomes. Both outputs and outcomes can be measured, but only outcomes are focused on the results of the activity. The level of completion of an activity, including participation, is an output and can be quantified. However, participation alone is not a result, since it is not a measure that provides information about the performance of a student.

While outputs (and even inputs) can be mentioned in your charter regarding the evaluation process, **your MSES should be focused, specific, and easily measured outcomes.**

	DEFINITION	EXAMPLE(S) – Using the ISAT test as the identified activity
INPUTS	The resources needed to complete the activity.	The ISAT assessment, students, desks, pencils, etc.
OUTPUTS	The completed activity and level of completion.	The number of testing days or tests given, the number or % of students who completed the test, etc.
OUTCOMES	The measureable results of the activity.	The % of students who tested at proficient or advanced; the % of students who met adequate growth, etc.

Techniques for Developing Strong MSES

1. With each MSES, strive to answer the following question:

HOW MANY of **WHICH STUDENTS** will achieve **WHAT LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE** as measured by **WHICH ASSESSMENT TOOL** within **WHAT TIME FRAME**?

Note: A time frame is not required for goals that are measured using an assessment tool that has an established timeline. Thus, if a different timeline is not specified, the school will be held accountable to the assumed timeline of the measurement tool (i.e. ISAT results would be considered annually).

2. Be careful selecting your assessment tools. Make sure your tool is objective and results can be easily and accurately measured.

Appropriate Assessment Tools

- Statewide standardized tests
- Star Rating System (SGP, AGP)
- Graduation Rates
- Other consistent, established tools *widely* used by outside entities (i.e. assessment tools that measure student progress over time that were not created by the school and have strong documentation)

Assessment Tools to AVOID:

- Internally developed, subjective, and / or frequently modified tools
- Participation (output)
- Classroom grades, portfolios, etc. (subjective)

Aligning Your MSES with the Idaho Five Star Rating System

The Idaho Five Star Rating System is a recommended assessment tool to help you build strong MSES. Since it is now Idaho's primary method for evaluating student achievement and school quality, the PCSC recommends that schools align at least some of their MSES with the Star Rating System. MSES using the Star Rating System can be strong, particularly since the system has both a built-in timeline (annual) and comparisons (to other schools and to students' academic peers in the growth areas).

EXAMPLES OF MSES USING THE STAR RATING SYSTEM (K-12)

MSES	WHY IT IS EFFECTIVE	NOTES
At least 85% of Example Charter's students will score proficient or advanced on the ISAT / ISAT-ALT test.	The percentage of students is clearly identified. The target would ensure that the school would receive 4 of 5 available achievement points.	
80% of students will have a Student Growth Percentile (SGP) that is equal to or greater than their Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) in math.	The percentage of students who will reach the goal is clearly identified. It focuses on student-level data that already has a built-in comparison group. The target is challenging yet attainable.	A school would generally have a similar goal for all three academic areas (math, reading, and language arts).
Each year, Example Charter School will have a Median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) of 60 or higher in reading.	The goal identifies a numerical target. The SGP target would ensure the school would receive at least 3 points in each academic area (4 points if the school meets Adequate Growth).	A school would generally have a similar goal for all three academic areas (math, reading, and language arts).
Each year, Example Charter School will meet Adequate Growth in language arts.	Meeting AGP shows that students are making gains similar to or better than their peers and increases the school's chances of getting the Growth to Achievement points needed to receive a 3 star rating or better.	A school would generally have a similar goal for all three academic areas (math, reading, and language arts).
Example Charter School will achieve and maintain a Star Rating of 4 or higher.	The goal is clear and easily measured. The Star Rating also provides a built-in comparison to other schools.	

EXAMPLES OF MSES USING THE STAR RATING SYSTEM (SCHOOLS W/ 12TH GRADE)

MSES	WHY IT IS EFFECTIVE	NOTES
Each year, at least 90% of Example Charter School's 12th grade students will achieve on-time high school graduation.	The target is clear, specific, and challenging (yet attainable for most schools).	Defining on-time high school graduation in the charter would be highly recommended and could impact how well this goal aligns with the Star System.
Each year, at least 25% of students in grades 9-12 will complete advanced opportunity courses.	The population is specifically identified. The target is clear and increases the school's chances of receiving at least 3 advanced opportunity points.	Depending on the school's goals and population, the target or grade levels may need to be adjusted.
Each year, at least 60% of students enrolled in advanced opportunity courses will complete with a C or better.	The population is identified and the target would increase the school's chances of getting at least 3 advanced opportunity points.	