ESSA Accountability: DC’s Vision, Federal Parameters, and Feedback on Potential Frameworks

LEA Leaders Meeting
June 26 and July 6, 2016
Accountability in ESSA

• Nationally states are approaching transition in different ways

• 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
Goals for stakeholder engagement

• Seeking feedback from you about:
  – What practitioners value in an accountability system
  – How these systems work on the ground
Goals for this meeting

- Ensure clarity around vision guiding accountability work
- Share federal parameters guiding development
- Gather feedback on frameworks
  - What you value
  - What your concerns are
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About current DC accountability

- Models of accountability running in parallel
  - OSSE’s ESEA Waiver
  - PCSB Performance Management Framework
  - DCPS 40/40 plan

- Information on schools in multiple places
  - My Schools DC
  - Equity Reports
  - LearnDC Report Cards
  - PCSB LEA Reports
Where we are

• DC is making tremendous progress, but serious and persistent gaps in outcomes still exist among our students

• Multiple accountability systems and sources of information have led to confusion for schools and for families
Where we want to go

• Common model for all schools in DC
• Accurate identification of low and high performing schools across both sectors
• Thoughtful interventions to drive improvement
• Integrated public reporting
• Flexibility in consequences across roles of SEA, authorizer, LEA
Work completed to date - 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work completed to date (cont.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review of ESSA and federal proposed regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crosswalk of all current metrics in ESEA Waiver, PMF, Scorecard, Equity Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research on measures, including growth models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guidance to LEAs on transition year accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholder sessions on ESSA accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Timeline based on proposed regs

**Begin Stakeholder Engagement**
- **2015-2016**

**Planning and Transition**
- **2016-2017**
  - Submit State Plan to ED (July 2017)

**2017-2018**
- Identify schools for comprehensive support for the 2017-18 school year (Summer 2017)

**2018-2019**
- Identify schools for targeted support for the 2018-19 school year (Summer 2018)
ESSA accountability requirements

- Establish a system for meaningfully differentiating on an annual basis all public schools in the state

- Apply to all students in all schools

- Minimum of 3 performance levels for each indicator and overall summative rating

- Allow for comparison across subgroups
ESSA accountability requirements

**Academic Achievement**
- Must weight R/LA and math state assessments equally
- ES/MS must include growth or progress indicator (optional for HS)

**Graduation Rate**
- System must include 4-year cohort and may include extended
- Schools not meeting 67% 4-year cohort rate automatically identified for comprehensive improvement
ESSA accountability requirements

- **English language proficiency**: Objective and reliable measures
  - Does not have to use AMAO methodology

- **At least one other indicator**: Valid, reliable, comparable, and must allow for differentiation
  - E.g., school climate, opportunity to learn, post-secondary readiness
ESSA accountability requirements

• Automatic identification for comprehensive support
  – Schools in bottom 5% based on overall summative rating
  – Schools not meeting 67% 4-year cohort graduation rate

• Automatic identification for targeted support
  – Schools “consistently” underperforming in one or more subgroups

• States have flexibility, but must take action
  – Schools with lower than 95% participation overall or by subgroup
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Possible Frameworks

GOALS
• Common, accurate model for all schools
• Value growth and performance

GUIDING QUESTIONS
• What best allows our values to be reflected?
• What raises concerns?
• What questions do these models raise?
Types of Aggregations - Index

• **INDEX**: Numerical Aggregation of Performance Across Measures

• Example: Delaware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>% of School Overall Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Growth</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Track to Graduation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; Career Preparation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of Aggregations – PMF Index

- 0-34.9: Tier 3; 35-64.9: Tier 2; 65-100: Tier 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>ES/MS with PK</th>
<th>ES/MS without PK</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Environment</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>(not scored if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of Aggregations - Index

• **INDEX**: Numerical Aggregation of Performance Across Measures

• **Pros**
  – Could maximize differentiation between schools
  – Could create rating threshold clarity

• **Cons**
  – Can minimize transparency of performance on individual measures
  – Difficult to weight appropriately
Types of Aggregations - Matrix

• **MATRIX**: Balance Performance of Two Domains

• Example: Center for American Progress Design Competition
CAP Matrix Example

Growth

Achievement

Top 25%

Middle 50%

Bottom 25%

Bottom 25%

Middle 50%

Top 25%
CAP Matrix Example

Green: Schools with high growth, or schools with high achievement and average or high growth. Must have high or average culture and climate.

Red: Schools with low growth, low achievement, and low culture and climate.

Yellow: All other schools.
Types of Aggregations - Matrix

- **MATRIX**: Balance Performance of Two Domains

- **Pro:**
  - Transparency about ways school can improve

- **Cons:**
  - Can be more difficult to explain to stakeholders
  - Harder to establish federal school classifications
Types of Aggregations - Gates

- **GATES**: Minimum bar, maximum opportunities to show success
- Example: Tennessee

- **Step 1**: Minimum performance gate

- **Step 2**: Achievement status designation

- **Step 3**: Gap closure status designation

- **Step 4**: Final district determination
## TN Gates Example Cont.
### District X, Achievement Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Performance toward Goals</th>
<th>Relative Performance</th>
<th>Growth measure</th>
<th>Best Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-5 Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 ELA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District Achievement Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Overall, we see that District X is either meeting or exceeding expected performance, with an average of 2.5. This would make District X **achieving** for Achievement Status.
**Types of Aggregations - Gates**

- **GATES:** Minimum bar, maximum opportunities to show success

- **Pro**
  - May prevent improving schools from receiving low summative ratings
  - Multiple opportunities for success

- **Con**
  - Could cloud lack of progress on something we care about
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Upcoming engagement

• IMMEDIATE:
  – Measures survey in July
  – Measures meeting in August

• SUMMER: Measures

• FALL: Classifications and visualizations

• WINTER: Consequences

• EARLY 2017: Comprehensive vision
Looking forward to measures

- Required for ESSA State reporting
- Required/wanted for formal accountability system
- Wanted for public reporting

Other measures
### Example measures – high school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>Presence in Formal Accountability System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – must be in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – open to consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – definitely not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If 4 or 5, would this be appropriate for reporting only?</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCC ELA achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCC Math achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCC ELA growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCC Math growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Science achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Science growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate – 4 year cohort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate growth – 4 year cohort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate – extended cohort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps

• Registration for upcoming sessions and survey will be advertised through LEA Look Forward
• Deck will be posted to OSSE ESSA homepage: www.osse.dc.gov/essa
• Session on measures: Aug. 4 4-5:30, Aug. 8 10-11:30 (virtual option), Aug. 9 3:30-5