

Overview of Submitted ESSA State Plans



ALLIANCE FOR
EXCELLENT EDUCATION

What's in an ESSA Accountability Plan?



Designing an Accountability System to Measure Progress and Support Struggling Schools

- Setting Long-Term goals
- Selecting indicators (test scores, grad rate, English language proficiency, another academic indicator (elem/middle); school quality and student success
- Clarifying which subgroups will be included in accountability and support
- Weighting indicators (substantially more weight on academic indicators)
- Identifying schools for targeted and comprehensive support and improvement
- School ratings

General Themes (Strengths & Weaknesses)



Strengths

- Significant weight on academic indicators
- Evidence-based SQSS indicators directly related to student learning (i.e. strength of diplomas and college readiness)
- Low n-size (many reductions)
- Strong long-term goals, either the same for each subgroup or with aggressive closing of achievement rate gaps

General Themes (Strengths & Weaknesses)



Areas of Uncertainty

- States aren't saying much about intervention strategies
- Exit criteria from identification are largely undefined
- States plan to develop and explore different SQSS indicators that may not be evidence-based or disaggregated by subgroup (school climate surveys, socio-emotional skills, etc.)
- School improvement

General Themes (Strengths & Weaknesses)



Weaknesses

- Use of super-subgroups (including in states with high n-sizes)
- Limited role of subgroup performance in school ratings
- Few (if any) consequences for low participation rates
- Use of non-cohort graduation rates
- Few states taking advantage of the direct student services opportunity

4-Year Graduation Rate



Clear inclusion of 4-year ACGR as an individual measure within accountability system

- Connecticut - The 4-year ACGR will make up 7.4% of the index
- District of Columbia - The 4-year ACGR will make up 11% of the index
- Louisiana - The 4-year ACGR will make up 25% of the index
- Massachusetts - The 4-year ACGR will likely be an individual indicator, but weights are TBD
- New Jersey - The 4-year ACGR will make up 20 percent of the accountability index
- New Mexico - The 4-year ACGR will make up 8 percent of the accountability index

Unclear how the 4-Year ACGR will be included in accountability system

- Colorado - Uses the 4-, 5-, 6-, and 7-year ACGRs, unclear if measures will be averaged
- Delaware - Uses 4-, 5-, and 6-year ACGRs, unclear if measures will be averaged
- Maine - Uses the 4-, 5-, and 6-year ACGRs, weights TBD
- Nevada - Uses the 4- and 5-year ACGRs, unclear if measures will be averaged

4-year ACGR will NOT be included as in individual measure within accountability system

- Illinois - IL includes 4-, 5-, and 6-year ACGRs in graduation rate indicator; also, IL plans to use a growth measure comparing ACGR to 9th grade on-track indicator
- Tennessee - Uses “Ready Graduate Rate” which multiplies the ACGR with a CCR indicator
- Vermont - Uses an average of the 4-year and 6-year ACGRs

School Quality & Student Success Indicator



Colorado (5% ES; 6.7% HS)

(ES & MS) Reduction in Chronic Absenteeism

(HS) Dropout Rates



Connecticut (33.4%)

Chronic Absenteeism

Preparation for Postsecondary and Career Readiness Coursework

Preparation for Postsecondary and Career Readiness Exams

9th Grade on Track Indicator

Postsecondary Entrance

Physical Fitness

Arts Access



Delaware (20%)

Chronic Absenteeism

College and/or Career Preparedness (e.g. AP, IB, SAT, DDOE- approved industry credential, ASVAB, Postsecondary credit)



District of Columbia (25%)

Chronic Absenteeism

In-Seat Attendance

Re-Enrollment

Access & Opportunities (TBD)



Illinois (25%)

Chronic Absenteeism

Climate Surveys

Fine Arts Indicator (0%)

9th Grade On-Track Indicator

College and Career Readiness (TBD)

School Quality & Student Success Indicator



Louisiana (30%)

Dropout Credit Accumulation Index (schools with 8th grade only)

Strength of Diploma Index (HS only)

Interests & Opportunities Measure (TBD)



Maine (TBD)

Consistent Attendance



Massachusetts (TBD)

Chronic Absenteeism

Success in Grade 9 Courses

Successful completion of challenging courses (honors, AP, IB)



Nevada (55% ES & MS; 35% HS)

Closing Opportunity Gaps

Engagement (ES & MS)

College and Career Readiness & Student Engagement (HS) (e.g. ACT, Postsecondary pathway options, 9th & 10th grade credit sufficiency, academic learning plans)

School Quality & Student Success Indicator



New Jersey (10%)

Chronic Absenteeism



New Mexico (10% ES & MS; 22% HS)

Opportunity to Learn Survey (Teacher Effectiveness)

Chronic Absenteeism

College & Career Readiness (Metrics in development, but likely to include CTE and college entry and persistence)



Tennessee (10%)

Chronic Absenteeism



Vermont (30%)

Science

Physical Education

College & Career Readiness (TBD; How well did seniors perform on college & career ready assessments?)

Postsecondary Outcomes (TBD; Are alumni pursuing and obtaining college and career ready outcomes within 16 months of graduation?)

Weight of High School Academic Indicators



N-Size for Accountability



N = 15 or less

DE = 15; DC = 10; LA = 10; ME = 10; NV = 10

16 < N < 30

CO = 16 & 20; IL = 20; MA = 20; NJ = 20; NM = UNCLEAR (0-20); VT = 25;

Unspecified or
N = 30 or more

CT = 20 (?); TN = 30

Participation Rates



Colorado

- “Colorado law prohibits LEAs from coercing parents and students into having their students participate in state standardized assessments. Compliance with this provision of state law makes it impossible for the State Board of Education to ensure compliance with the 95 percent requirement.”

Connecticut

- Schools that would otherwise be categorized as a 1 or 2 will be lowered a category if the participation rate in the state summative assessments in any subject for either the all students group or the high needs group is less than 95%.

Delaware

- UNSPECIFIED

District of Columbia

- UNSPECIFIED

Illinois

- If a school does not have a 95% participation rate, it cannot score at the highest level of proficiency

Louisiana

- For the calculation of the school and district performance scores, when students who are required to participate in state testing fail to do so, the school receives scores of zero on all relevant indices (status and growth). The zero is factored into the calculation of the school performance score.

Maine

- The 95% participation rate will not factor into the accountability system

Participation Rates



Massachusetts

- A school's summative performance will be lowered if that school assesses less than 95% of students in the aggregate or for any subgroup that meets a minimum n-size of 20.

Nevada

- If a school fails to meet the subgroup participation rate of 95%...over the most recent two or three years for a third consecutive year, the school will be identified as and subjected to a "continuing participation penalty." Schools designated as such will earn zero points for the student proficiency indicator.

New Jersey

- NJDOE is proposing to factor the participation rate into its school accountability system by applying the minimum requirements of Section 1111(c)(4)(E) of ESSA.

New Mexico

- If the participation rate is less than 95%, then the school will drop a letter grade.

Tennessee

- Schools that do not meet the 95% participation rate in any subject, either for all students or for any accountability subgroup included in the achievement indicator, will receive an "F" on the achievement indicator for the given group of students.

Vermont

- If a school has lower than 95% participation, the school's preliminary summative score will be multiplied by the percentage of eligible students participating in the assessment. Thus, the score will be lowered if fewer than 95% of students tested.

TSI: “Consistently Underperforming”



Good examples:

- **New Mexico:** Identifies TSI schools based on gaps in two academic indicators: achievement in math and English
- **Louisiana:** Schools with “persistent excessive out-of-school discipline” are identified for TSI
- **Nevada:** Identifies TSI schools based on (a) missing interim targets in math/reading, (b) not reducing the number of nonproficient students by 10 percent over the prior year, and (c) 4-year graduation rate

Concerning:

- **DC:** Uses definition of “low performing” as definition for consistently underperforming
- **Illinois:** Definition does not include achievement/graduation rates for subgroups (only participation rate and performance of former ELs and former SWDs)
- **Delaware:** Definition is TBD
- **Tennessee and Connecticut:** Definitions are based on super-subgroups
- **Arizona:** Undefined (i.e., a school with “one or more significant achievement gaps between subgroups and any low achieving subgroups for three years”)
- **Massachusetts:** Undefined (i.e., a school with “one or more of the lowest performing subgroups in the state over multiple years”).

For More Information...



Phillip Lovell
Vice President
Policy Development and
Government Relations
plovell@all4ed.org

Lindsay Dworkin
Director
State Policy Development
and Government Relations
ldworkin@all4ed.org

www.all4ed.org/essa