ESSA Accountability

Academic achievement & subgroups

10.18.16
Agenda

- 3:30 Welcome
- 3:40 English language proficiency metric research
- 3:50 Achievement and subgroup data
- 4:00 Small group discussions
- 4:25 Sharing from small group discussions
- 4:45 Q&A
- 5:00 Additional engagement opportunities
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)
Students at lower proficiency levels tend to increase proficiency faster than students at higher proficiency levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Year Access Level</th>
<th>Average Composite Level Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students at level 5 are supposed to be moved out of ELL status, but many have ACCESS records the year after reaching level 5.*
Average ACCESS proficiency levels vary significantly by grade level.

Average Proficiency Level by Grade Level
(Average of Annual Results 2012-2016)
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)
## Academic Achievement

**Draft frameworks shared 9/28 (ES/MS and HS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Academic Achievement:</strong> Based on PARCC and MSAA ELA and mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-track achievement:</strong> Percent of students scoring at levels 4+ and a lesser portion of points for students scoring at levels 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement progression:</strong> Percent reduction in students in levels 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subgroup performance:</strong> Based on, at minimum, economically disadvantaged, children with disabilities, English learners, and students from major racial and ethnic groups (African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Hispanic or Latino, White)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Very few schools have 3 or more racial/ethnic groups.

Demographic Diversity

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

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

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

% 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.
Small Group Data Study Instructions

• Review data

• Discuss implications for inclusion of possible measures related to PARCC/MSAA performance

• Be prepared to share back three key takeaways or lingering questions from your discussion
• Data to review: PARCC 2014-15 and 2015-16: Levels 4+, 3+ and 1+2

• Consider
  – Patterns when looking at all students vs. subgroups
  – Differentiation between different level aggregations
  – What is surprising or not surprising

• Key takeaways or lingering questions
  – 1.
  – 2.
  – 3.
• Friday: School Quality and Student Success and Graduation Rates
Oct. 21, 8:30-9:45 a.m., OSSE, Room 806 A&B

• Next week: Recap webinar for today’s group
Oct. 24, 2-3 p.m., register at http://osse.dc.gov/node/1182576

• ESSA questions, updates or additional feedback?
OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov; http://www.osse.dc.gov/essa
Thank you!