

ESSA Accountability Focus Group: School Quality & Student Success and Graduation Rates

October 21, 2016



- 8:30 Welcome and introductions
- 8:40 School quality and student success: focus on attendance
- 8:55 Small group discussion
- 9:10 Sharing from small group discussions
- 9:20 Graduation rate
- 9:40 Additional engagement opportunities
- 9:45 Close





- School quality and student success metrics:
 - Must be differentiated by school
 - Must allow for disaggregation by specific groups of students
 - Should be actionable by LEAs and schools
 - Ideally have a low burden to collect and report



• Days in school correlated to PARCC performance



% PARCC Level 4/5 ELA by Absence %



% PARCC Level 4/5 Math by Absence %





The percentage of enrolled students who were present "inseat" during a given period of time. Generally expressed as an average rate for the school year.

Sum of membership days for each student MINUS sum of full day absences of those students

Sum of membership days of each student

- Familiar metric included on many school report cards nationwide and in the Performance Management Framework (PMF).
- Typically, 93 percent and above considered to be "good" in-seat attendance.



Students who are "chronically absent" miss 10 percent or more of the school year – approximately 18 days of instruction lost in a full school year.

Full membership days missed Sum of membership days of each student

OR

Full membership days attended Sum of membership days of each student > 10%

< 90%



- Significant evidence that chronic absence predicts low educational outcomes, including early indication of whether a student will graduate within four years.
- In the early grades, chronic absenteeism is associated with lower likelihood of grade-level reading by third grade.
- Difference from truancy counts both excused and unexcused absences.



Scenario:

- School A has 1,000 students
- Each student is enrolled for 180 days
- 500 (50%) of students attended 180 (100% of) days
- 250 (25%) of students attended 171 (94.4% of) days
- 250 (25%) of students attended 161 (89.4% of) days

ISA

• [(180*500)+(171*250)+(161*250)]/(180*1000) = **96%**

Percentage of Students Attending 90% or More of Instructional Days

• (750/1000) = **75%**

Percentage of Students Missing 10% or More of Instructional Days

• (250/1000) = **25%**

Median Percentage of Instructional Days Attended

• 97.5%



 Looking at schools, ISA rates tend to cluster between 90 and 95 percent, which chronic absenteeism rates are spread more broadly.





• Chronic absence rates can vary significantly even among schools with similar overall attendance rates.





In the 2015-16 school year:

- ISA rate for DC Public Schools was 89.7 percent.
- ISA rate for public charter schools was 92.1 percent.
- Citywide, 26 percent of students were chronically absent, and 21 percent of students were truant.
- The rate of chronic absenteeism increased two percentage points since the 2014-15 school year (from 24 to 26 percent), even though ISA rates have increased slightly.
- Almost 10 percent of students were "profoundly" or "severely" chronically absent (missing 20+ percent of the school days on which they were enrolled).



• Within ISA ranges, chronic absence rates can vary significantly.

	Chronic Absence		
ISA Range	Average	Range	
81-85	54%	10%	
86-90	42%	20%	
91-95	23%	26%	
96-100	4%	9%	



- What does attendance tell us about a school?
- Examples of metrics that measure impact of student time in school:
 - (1) Percentage of Students Attending 90% or More of Instructional Days
 - (2) Percentage of Students Missing 10% or More of Instructional Days
 - (3) Average Percentage of Instructional Days Attended
 - o ...something else?
- How might we think about the thresholds for % of students?
- How do we think attributing students to schools?



Both ISA and chronic absence are associated with improved PARCC outcomes. Controlling for race/ethnicity, economically disadvantaged status, gender, LEP status, and special education status:

- Each percentage point increase in ISA is associated with an additional 0.5 scale score points in ELA and an additional 0.3 scale score points in Math.
- Not being chronically absent is associated with an additional 8 scale score points in ELA and an additional 5 scale score points in math relative to chronically absent students.





- 4-year cohort required as an indicator toward a HS's final rating
- 67% 4-year cohort as a "threshold" for "comprehensive support"
- Extended cohorts and other measures optional

High Schools Under 67% 4-Year ACGR





How many schools have at least 10/15/20/25 students in each subgroup for 4year ACGR?

	Minimum N Size			
	10	15	20	25
Black	34	34	34	34
Hispanic	13	11	8	7
White	4	2	2	2
LEP	9	9	8	4
SPED	23	19	17	14
Econ. Disadvantaged	34	34	34	32



- Reactions on n size?
- Pros/cons of strategies for dealing with this in scoring?
 - Remove points from overall denominator if subgroups are not of sufficient size
 - Assign fixed number of points for all subgroups and distribute points equally
 - Assign fixed number of points for all subgroups and distribute points based on subgroup size
 - Calculate different frameworks for each subgroup
- What about schools where all students fall into one subgroup?



Inclusion of Extended Cohort Rates

- Should we also include 5- and/or 6-year ACGR?
- Why are these metrics important?
 - Motivates schools to focus on graduating students even after the four-year mark passes
 - Gives schools credit for graduating students even if it happens after the four-year mark
- If we're interested in including these metrics, how should we implement?





- Register at: <u>http://osse.dc.gov/node/1182576</u>
- Recap webinar for academic measures and subgroups: Oct. 24, 2-3 p.m.
- Recap of today's webinar: Oct. 26 9:30-10:30 a.m.
- In-person update on draft accountability framework: Oct. 26 10:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
- ESSA questions, updates or additional feedback?
 <u>OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov</u>; <u>http://www.osse.dc.gov/essa</u>

