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• Overall Decision Points
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The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) passed in December 2015

States have to develop an accountability plan that identifies schools for the 2017-18 school year (using 2016-17 data)

By engaging together, we have an opportunity to develop a single system for DC
Timeline Based on Proposed Regs

Begin Stakeholder Engagement

DC Submits State Plan to ED
March 2017*

DC issues school report card with 2017-18 school year data
December 2018

Planning and Transition

Implement New Accountability System

2015-16
ESSA Passed
December 2015

2016-17
ED issues draft regulations on accountability
May 2016

Identify schools for comprehensive support for the 2017-18 school year

2017-18
Identify schools for targeted support for the 2018-19 school year

2018-19

*Per timeline outlined in draft regulations. Final regulations TBD.
ESSA Stakeholder Engagement

• Two surveys – Accountability Measures Survey and Vision for DC Education

• Meetings in spring and summer 2016 with LEAs, SBOE, and other stakeholders

• Meetings in September and October – feedback on specific types of measures and decision points in the accountability framework and state education plan
Principles

Is **transparent** and provides information about how all of our schools are serving all students

- Values **comparability**
- Emphasizes **equity**

- Values **growth and performance**
- Focuses on **building the best system, even if that requires growing into it**
Academic Achievement & Growth
Possible Indicators – Academic Achievement

• Percentage of students scoring on track for college and career readiness (levels 4+ on PARCC and level 3+ on MSAA)

• Percentage of students approaching, meeting, or exceeding expectations (scoring levels 3+ on PARCC and level 3+ on MSAA), with a lesser weighting
Focus on all kids: Schools should focus on and be rewarded for progress among all students. A growth model may be a more appropriate place to give recognition than a separate indicator for reduction of students at levels 1/2.
   – Next step: Growth measure modeling

Growth matters: Approach to growth measure(s), options for growth in high school, and overall weight of PARCC data in high school framework.
   – Next step: Working with research and data modeling partners

Differential weighting: Understanding that different schools have various groups of students, moving students who are already at the college-and-career-ready level may be different than moving students to meet that level initially.
   – Next step: Model differential weighting options for performance and growth, including consideration of n-size and subgroups
Graduation
Possible Indicators – Graduation

• Required: 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR)
• 5-year ACGR
• 6-year ACGR
High Schools Under 67% 4-Year ACGR

- 2013-14: 17 HS
- 2014-15: 16 HS
- 2015-16: 13 HS

Legend:
- Blue: Over 67%
- Blue: Under 67%
Key Points of Feedback

• **Consider stability of measures:** Do not include year-over-year growth for 4-year ACGR.

• **Concern over requirement to use 4-year ACGR**
  
  – Next step: Modeling on weight to individual indicators and overall domain, n-size
English Language Proficiency
ESSA moves Title III into Title I

Accountability framework must consider English language proficiency

Can consider measures different from historical AMAOs

Distinct from English learner subgroup PARCC/MSAA achievement and/or growth
First year ACCESS taker results are distributed fairly evenly across levels 1-5.

% of 1st Time Access Student by Level
(Average of Annual Results 2011-2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Level</th>
<th>% of 1st Time Access Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are students in earlier grades more likely to gain proficiency at higher rates?

Average Composite Level Change by Grade Level
(Average of Annual Results 2012-2016)
Key Points of Feedback & Next Steps

• Include a measure that considers growth and performance: Potentially adjusting the proficiency gain metric for different grade levels and/or starting ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 level.

• Use of ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 assessment: Question raised as to use of this assessment in an accountability system; OSSE still following up with WIDA for its position on this use case.

  – Next step: Modeling on goals, exit criteria, weight to individual indicators and overall domain, n-size
• **Access to quality instructional time** (e.g., through attendance measure)

• **Consideration of school climate** (e.g., through proxies such as attendance and re-enrollment)

• **Consider ways to get at breadth, depth, and diversity of how schools serve the whole child**, while balancing the need to consider existing data collections, burden, and comparability

• **Other high school academic measures** – SAT/ACT, PSAT, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate
The percentage of enrolled students who were present “in-seat” 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Days Each Student Misses/Attends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full membership days missed</th>
<th>Sum of membership days of each student</th>
<th>&gt; 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full membership days attended</td>
<td>Sum of membership days of each student</td>
<td>&lt; 90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why Use Chronic Absenteeism?

- 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.
How Are These Measures Different?

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

\[
[(180\times500)+(171\times250)+(161\times250)]/(180\times1000) = 96\%
\]

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).

Source: DC Truancy Taskforce, Sept. 2016
Key Points of Feedback

• Consider multiple measures of high school performance that cover multiple grade levels: Determining final set of measures and proposed business rules for measures. Determine viability of including other high school measures.

• Determine if modeling 9th grade on-track is viable
Key Decision Points

- **Modeling on metric stability:** Considering performance and n-size over time

- **Which students are included?** For academic performance, attendance, and other measures, further modeling and business rule development on which students are included in the universe (e.g., potential change from current FAY)

- **How to allocate points as well as how to orient** (e.g., floors/targets, differential weighting)

- **Short- and long-term school, LEA, and state goals**
Very few schools have 3 or more racial/ethnic groups.

Only 24% of schools have 10 or more EL students, while almost 90% have that number of students with IEPs.

Demographic Diversity

- One group: 59%
- Two groups: 22%
- Three+ groups: 19%

Breakdown of schools by number of racial/ethnic groups with 10+ students.

% of Schools with 10+ Students from a Specific Group

- EL Students: 24%
- Special Education Students: 87%

Note: Analysis based on a universe of 174 schools.
How many schools have at least 10/15/20/25 students in each subgroup for 4-year ACGR?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups and Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Minimum N Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ. Disadvantaged</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ways to Stay Engaged

• Recap webinar for this session: Friday, Oct. 28 from 9-10 a.m.

• ESSA surveys open until Monday, Oct. 31. Access them at [http://www.osse.dc.gov/essa](http://www.osse.dc.gov/essa)

• Stay tuned for additional engagement opportunities, including parent and community meetings in winter 2016-17: [http://www.osse.dc.gov/essa](http://www.osse.dc.gov/essa)

• ESSA questions, concerns, or additional feedback? Email OSSE at [OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov](mailto:OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov)