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The Every Student Succeeds Act

• Allows for transition into 2017-18 school year
• Carries forward standards, annual assessments, accountability, and subgroup disaggregation
• Gives DC greater control in the areas of accountability, school improvement, and teacher support and evaluation
• Emphasizes transparency in public reporting
• New requirements on supporting and reporting on performance of particular groups of students (ELs, homeless, foster care, military family)
• Eliminates some discretionary grant funding, re-channels some funding, and newly emphasizes other priorities
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ESSA Requirement: A New SEA Plan

The purpose of the consolidated state plan is to:

1) to improve teaching and learning by encouraging greater cross-program coordination, planning and service delivery;

2) to provide greater flexibility to state and local authorities through consolidated plans, applications, and reporting; and

3) to enhance the integration of programs under the Act with state and local programs.
Accountability in ESSA

• Requires new accountability system for 2017-18 school year (using 2016-17 data)

• SBOE must approve plan early next year

• Plan must be developed with meaningful consultation from SBOE, OSSE, teachers, principals, charter sector, DCPS, parents, etc.
What is an Accountability System?

• U.S. law requires states to develop system that shows which schools need more support

• Develop plan and actions to improve lowest performing schools

• Creates large questions of how we define performance and how we support struggling schools
Current DC Accountability

• Multiple 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

Result: confusion for families and for schools
Where We Want to Go with Accountability

- Common model of school accountability for all schools in DC
- Accurate identification of low performing schools across both sectors
- Thoughtful interventions to drive improvement
- Integrated public reporting
- Flexibility in consequences across roles of SEA, authorizer, LEA
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**
Critical Questions

• What do we expect from our schools?
• What qualities should a successful school possess?
• How should we measure school success?
• How do we ensure all schools are successful?
• How should we support struggling schools?
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, chronic absenteeism
ESSA Accountability Requirements

• “Comprehensive” support
  – Schools in bottom 5% based on overall summative rating
  – Schools not meeting 67% 4-year cohort graduation rate

• “Targeted” support
  – Schools “consistently” underperforming in one or more subgroups

• States must take action if schools have less than 95% participation on assessments overall or by subgroup
What’s Next

• FALL:
  – Stakeholders participate in surveys open until Sept. 16
  – OSSE hosts focus groups Sept. 28 – Oct. 26 for LEAs to discuss measures and possible model
  – SBOE public meetings
  – Additional meetings for leaders, teachers and public to provide feedback
How Can You Get Involved?

• **Take a survey** to share your thoughts on what is important (open until Sept. 16)
  – Accountability measures
  – Vision for DC Education

• **Attend a meeting** to learn about ESSA requirements and give input
  – LEA focus groups: Sept. 28, Oct. 6, Oct. 14, Oct. 18, Oct. 26
  – SBOE public meetings

• **Stay informed.** View the [OSSE ESSA Webpage](#) and the [SBOE ESSA Webpage](#) for ongoing ESSA updates and resources

• **Ask questions** by sending an email to [OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov](mailto:OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov) and [SBOE@dc.gov](mailto:SBOE@dc.gov).
OTHER QUESTIONS
APPENDIX
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>10%</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
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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATRIX:</strong> Balance Performance of Two Domains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Transparency about ways school can improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Can be more difficult to explain to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Harder to establish federal school classifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

**District Determination:**
- *Exemplary, Achieving or Progressing*
- *In Need of Improvement*
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