



**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

# Technical Advisory Panel Meeting

May 24, 2018

# Technical Advisory Panel

- Welcome!
- Introductions
  - Amanda Stevens, CASB Representative
  - New Members, Rural Representative
    - Submit cover letter/resume prior to June 8th



# Growth to Standard

Marie Huchton





**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

# Creating a New Growth-to-Standard (i.e. On-Track) Measure

Marie Huchton  
Accountability and Data Analysis

# New CMAS ELA and Math On-Track

## Considerations for Building New Metric

- CMAS proficiency benchmark (Level 4) is more rigorous than previous CSAP/TCAP assessment
- We haven't yet established state proficiency benchmarks for the PSAT and SAT assessments in grades 9-11
- We want the student-trajectories targets to be both ambitious and attainable
- Stakeholders would prefer graduated targets rather than a single proficiency benchmark (so a stepping stone model like ELP)



# New CMAS ELA and Math On-Track

## Outstanding Theoretical Decision Points

- For a target to be attainable, what's the necessary proportion of students who've been successful at moving up historically?
- For a target to be ambitious, should we be looking at the trajectories of high-growth exemplar schools?
- Does the clock start over every year (like CSAP/TCAP) or should this be a set trajectory where we track your progress from the first test result (like ELP)
- If the clock resets, to be successfully on-track, do you have to maintain the gains made? Or do you get credit for moving up a level even if it's not sustained?
- Are there concerns publishing the performance frameworks with meets state expectations cuts of less than 50% of students on-track to proficiency?



# Break



# Legislative Update

Alyssa Pearson





## HB18-1355 - Overview

CONCERNING CHANGES TO THE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM FOR THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM TO STRENGTHEN THE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM FOR THE BENEFIT OF STUDENTS.

[http://leg.colorado.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2018A/bills/2018a\\_1355\\_enr.pdf](http://leg.colorado.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2018A/bills/2018a_1355_enr.pdf)



## HB18-1355 - Status

- Passed through the House (63-1)
- Passed through the Senate (34-1)
- Awaiting Governor's signature



## HB18-1355 – Role for TAP

(c) THE STATE BOARD, AFTER CONSIDERING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL, SHALL BY RULE SPECIFY HOW THE PERFORMANCE OF EACH PUBLIC SCHOOL, EACH SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE INSTITUTE, AND THE STATE AS A WHOLE IS CALCULATED FOR THE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS DESCRIBED IN SUBSECTION (1)(a) OF THIS SECTION.

- Page 21



# HB18-1355 – Rule Making

- Content for rule-making:
  - Performance Indicators
  - Request to Reconsider Criteria
  - Accountability Clock Hearing Timing
- Timing is still being determined, but will probably begin in winter 2018/19



# Other Bills Impacting Accountability

- HB18-1019
  - Adds successful completion of AP, IB and Concurrent Enrollment classes into the PWR indicators of the frameworks for 2020-21
- SB18-012
  - Adds military enlistment into the matriculation indicator, if data is available



# CDE State Accountability Updates

Ashley Piche



# ESSA & State Accountability: Communication Plan

Ashley Piche & Marie Huchton





**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

# 2018 State Performance Frameworks vs. ESSA Identification Calculations



# Overview

- Conversations around and requirements for the state and federal accountability systems have evolved over the past year and CDE is no longer trying to create a single integrated state/federal system.
- Instead we will continue having separate state and federal accountability ratings, based upon similar (but not identical) data sets, sub-indicator/indicator roll-up and weighting methodologies.
- The following presentation compares the two systems and explicitly notes where they diverge.

# Academic Achievement

	Colorado Frameworks	ESSA Calculations
Academic Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mean scale score</li> <li>▪ Elementary, middle, high</li> <li>▪ CMAS English language arts (ELA), Math and Science. Includes Alternate Assessments and CSLA</li> <li>▪ PSAT grade 9 and 10 Evidence-based Reading and Writing (EBRW) and Math</li> <li>▪ All students and by disaggregated group (individual Race/Ethnicity categories reported, but not included for points)</li> <li>▪ Newly arrived NEP exemption</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mean scale score with <b>Non-participants in excess of 5% recoded to lowest obtainable scale score</b></li> <li>▪ Elementary, middle, high</li> <li>▪ CMAS ELA and Math (<b>Science moved to School Quality indicator</b>). Includes Alternate Assessments and CSLA</li> <li>▪ PSAT 9, PSAT 10 and <b>SAT 11</b> EBRW and Math</li> <li>▪ All students and by disaggregated group, including <b>individual Race/Ethnicity categories and Aggregated non-White Group</b></li> <li>▪ Newly arrived NEP exemption</li> </ul>

# Academic Growth

	Colorado Frameworks	ESSA Calculations
Academic Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Median growth percentiles</li> <li>▪ Elementary, middle, high</li> <li>▪ CMAS ELA and Math</li> <li>▪ PSAT 9, PSAT 10, SAT 11 EBRW and Math</li> <li>▪ All students and by disaggregated group (individual Race/Ethnicity categories reported, but not included for points)</li> <li>▪ Growth-to-Standard Measure (informational for 2018)</li> <li>▪ English Language Proficiency (ELP) MGP</li> <li>▪ ELP Growth-to-Standard Measure (informational for 2018)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Median growth percentiles</li> <li>▪ Elementary, middle, high</li> <li>▪ CMAS ELA and Math</li> <li>▪ PSAT 9, PSAT 10, SAT 11 EBRW and Math</li> <li>▪ All students and by disaggregated group, including <b>individual Race/Ethnicity categories and Aggregated non-White Group</b></li> <li>▪ ELP MGP</li> <li>▪ <b>ELP Growth-to-Standard Measure</b></li> </ul>

# Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness

	Colorado Frameworks	ESSA Requirements
Post-secondary & Workforce Readiness/ Graduation Rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Best-of 4-,5-,6-,7-year graduation rate (or completion rate for AECs)</li> <li>▪ Dropout rate</li> <li>▪ SAT 11 EBRW Mean Scale Score</li> <li>▪ SAT 11 Math Mean Scale Score</li> <li>▪ All students and by disaggregated group (informational for Dropout and SAT)</li> <li>▪ Matriculation Rate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 4-year graduation rate (weighted 1% of grad points)</li> <li>▪ 7-year graduation rate (weighted 99% of grad points)</li> <li>▪ All students and by disaggregated group, including individual Race/Ethnicity categories and Aggregated non-White Group</li> </ul>

# 'Other' Indicator

	Colorado Frameworks	ESSA Calculations
Indicator of School Quality or Student Success		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Science achievement</li><li>▪ Change in Chronic Absenteeism for Elementary and Middle Schools</li><li>▪ Dropout rate for High Schools</li><li>▪ All students and by disaggregated group, including individual Race/Ethnicity categories and Aggregated non-White Group</li></ul>

# Participation Impact

	Colorado Frameworks	ESSA Calculations
Participation: Accountability Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Ratings lowered for schools/ districts that missed the 95% participation target in two or more subject areas (not counting parent excuses)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ A school may be identified for Comprehensive, Targeted and/or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement if the impact of non-participants recoded as the lowest obtainable scale score results in the school being in the lowest performing 5% of all schools. However, schools identified due to non-participants will be differentiated and will not be prioritized for support.</li></ul>

# Targets & Indicator Ratings

	Colorado Frameworks	ESSA Calculations
Targets & Indicator Ratings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Framework Achievement and Growth ratings set at 15-50-85, with base-lined percentiles.</li><li>▪ Framework post-secondary and workforce readiness ratings based on state average and external criteria.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Most indicator ratings set at 15-50-85, with base-lined percentiles from 2017.</li><li>▪ <b>For Achievement, Exceeds cut-score required to be at or above 750 for each grade/content area.</b></li></ul>

# Weighting of Indicators

	Colorado Frameworks	ESSA Calculations
Weighting of Indicators	<p>Elementary &amp; Middle Schools-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 40% Achievement</li> <li>▪ 60% Growth</li> </ul> <p>High Schools &amp; Districts-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 30% Achievement</li> <li>▪ 40% Growth</li> <li>▪ 30% PWR</li> </ul>	<p>Elementary &amp; Middle Schools-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>23.3%</b> Achievement (with science achievement moved to the other indicator)</li> <li>▪ 60% Growth</li> <li>▪ <b>16.7%</b> Other Indicator (change in chronic absenteeism and science achievement)</li> </ul> <p>High Schools-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>20%</b> Achievement (with science achievement included in the other indicator)</li> <li>▪ 40% Growth</li> <li>▪ <b>15%</b> Graduation Rate</li> <li>▪ <b>25%</b> Other Indicator (dropout rate and science achievement)</li> </ul>



# Ratings & Identifications

	Colorado Frameworks	ESSA Calculations
Ratings & Identifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Based on either 1 or 3-years of data</li><li>▪ District Accreditation Ratings and School Plan Types<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Turnaround</li><li>• Priority Improvement</li><li>• Improvement</li><li>• Performance</li><li>• Distinction (Districts only)</li></ul></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Based on 3-years of data</li><li>▪ School Identifications only</li><li>▪ Comprehensive Support and Improvement Plan<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lowest performing 5% of Title I schools</li><li>• All public high schools with 4 and/or 7-year Graduation Rates below 67% (Low Graduation Rate)</li><li>• Comprehensive Chronically Low-performing student groups</li></ul></li><li>▪ Targeted Support and Improvement Plan<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Schools where "any subgroup of students is consistently underperforming"</li></ul></li><li>▪ Additional Targeted Support and Improvement Plan<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Schools where at least one student group performs in the lowest 5% for that student group</li></ul></li></ul>

# K-2 Schools

	Colorado Frameworks	ESSA Calculations
Identifying K-2 Schools	District assigns rating to K-2 school	<p><b>Achievement- 40%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Percent of students identified with significant reading deficiency on the K-3 READ Act literacy assessments</li></ul> <p><b>Growth- 60%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Change in the percent of students identified as having a significant reading deficiency on READ Act assessments is 45% of the total framework points</li><li>▪ English learner proficiency growth is 15% of the total framework points</li></ul>

# AECs

	Colorado Frameworks	ESSA Calculations
Identifying Alternative Education Campuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ AEC School Performance Framework school plan types:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• AEC: Turnaround</li><li>• AEC: Priority Improvement</li><li>• AEC: Improvement</li><li>• AEC: Performance</li></ul></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Identify 1 Title I-funded AEC as the lowest performing 5% of AECs for Comprehensive Support and Improvement based on traditional SPF and AEC SPF percent of points earned</li><li>▪ Majority of AECs will be identified for Comprehensive: Low Graduation Rate due to 3-year 7-year Graduation Rates below 67%</li></ul>

# Small Schools

	Colorado Frameworks	ESSA Calculations
Identifying Small Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Schools and districts not meeting minimum N reporting requirements due to small enrollment are assigned an Insufficient State Data rating. In some cases, districts then assign a performance rating to these systems.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ If a school's three-year aggregated data meets the minimum N requirements, three years of data will be used. If a school's three year aggregated data does not meet minimum N requirements, five years of data will be used to ensure small schools can meet minimum N reporting requirements and eligibility for identification.</li></ul>

**Thank you!**



# ESSA School Identifications

Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson & Tina Negley





**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

# ESSA Update and Decision Points

May 24, 2018

# Purpose

- May 8<sup>th</sup> - ESSA plan approved
- August - Run identification of schools for Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement (CS & TS)
  - Gathering input on remaining decision points



# Achievement and Participation

# Achievement and Participation – Final Changes

- For identifying schools for support and improvement under ESSA:
  - Cannot exclude parent excusals
  - Must count non-participants, above 5%, as not proficient
    - Must assign lowest obtainable scale score (LOSS) to non-participants in excess of 5%
      - For example, scale score of 650 on CMAS
    - Running analyses with actual data and with LOSS scores applied
      - Schools identified with actual data will be prioritized for support and improvement

# Achievement and Participation – Decision Point

- How should participation rates be calculated for the purpose of determining the adjusted mean scale scores?

Options	Considerations
Calculate participation rates for the school overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More closely aligns with state accountability system</li><li>• Results in a single participation rate for each content area</li><li>• Does not align with achievement ratings, which are calculated at the EMH-level</li></ul>
Calculate participation rates separately by grade span (EMH)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Aligns with achievement ratings, which are calculated at the EMH-level</li><li>• Limits impact of participation to specific grade span(s)</li><li>• Separate participation rates with smaller counts might make it easier to miss 95% participation requirement</li></ul>

# Other Indicators of School Quality and Student Success (SQSS)

## Other Indicators– Final Changes

- Moved science achievement out of academic achievement indicator and into SQSS indicator
  - Overall weighting remains the same
- SQSS indicator also includes reduction in chronic absenteeism rates (elementary and middle) and dropout rates (high)

# Other Indicators– Decision Points

- How should reduction in chronic absenteeism rates be calculated?

Options	Considerations
Calculate based on the difference between the two rates (e.g., chronic absenteeism rate of 15% in 2017 and 10% in 2018, results in a reduction of 5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Straightforward calculation</li><li>• Schools with lower rates of chronic absenteeism have less room for improvement</li></ul>
Calculate the percentage decrease (e.g., $(10 - 15)/15 = 33.3\%$ reduction)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Change is relative to starting rate</li><li>• Requires more progress from schools with higher rates of chronic absenteeism</li></ul>

## Other Indicators– Decision Points, Cont.

- How should schools with chronic absenteeism rates at or near 0% be treated?

Options	Considerations
Exclude schools (rating of N/A) with chronic absenteeism rates (for both years) below a certain threshold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removes expectation for improvement for schools with extremely low rates of chronic absenteeism</li> <li>• Places emphasis on schools needing to demonstrate the highest levels of improvement</li> <li>• Does not give credit for schools with low chronic absenteeism rates</li> </ul>
Schools with initial chronic absenteeism rates below a certain threshold expected to maintain or improve rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All schools would receive a rating (if they meet the minimum N)</li> <li>• Any increase in chronic absenteeism rates would result in schools not meeting expectations</li> </ul>

## Other Indicators– Decision Points, Cont.

- Should a school's rating on the other indicator(s) keep them from being identified for Targeted Support and Improvement (or enable them to meet exit criteria)?
  - If so, to what extent should a school's rating on the other indicator(s) impact school identification?



# K-2 Schools

## K-2 Schools– Final Changes

- Must develop methods and criteria for identifying K-2 schools for support and improvement
  - Using percent of students with an SRD as the achievement indicator
  - Using reduction in percent of students with an SRD as the growth indicator
  - ELP growth

# Other Indicators– Decision Points

- How should reduction in percent of students with an SRD be calculated?

Options	Considerations
Calculate based on the difference between the two rates (e.g., rate of 15% in 2017 and 10% in 2018, results in a reduction of 5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Straightforward calculation</li> <li>• Schools with lower rates have less room for improvement</li> </ul>
Calculate the percentage decrease (e.g., $(10 - 15)/15 = 33.3\%$ reduction)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change is relative to starting rate</li> <li>• Requires more progress from schools with higher rates</li> </ul>
Determine how many of the students with an SRD the previous year are no longer identified with an SRD the current year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rating based on percent of students no longer on an SRD only, rather than reflective of overall SRD rates (which determine the achievement indicator ratings)</li> </ul>

# Identification of Small Schools

# Identification of Small Schools– Final Changes

- Must have method and criteria for identifying small schools for ESSA support and improvement
  - If the school does not meet minimum N with 3-years of data, use 5-years of data

# Identification of Small Schools– Decision Point

- What threshold should be used in determining when to use 5-years of data for small schools?

Options	Considerations
Schools must have at least one sub-indicator rating for Achievement <u>or</u> Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools may be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement based solely on achievement of the All Students group</li> <li>• Smaller schools would not be eligible for identification for Targeted Support and Improvement</li> </ul>
Use 5-years of data if it results in the availability of any additional sub-indicator ratings (for all students or any student groups)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smaller schools may be eligible for identification for Targeted Support and Improvement</li> <li>• Ensures identification is based on as much data as possible</li> <li>• Recent changes in performance may not have as much impact on identification</li> </ul>

# ESSA Updates Only

# Graduation Rates



## Graduation Rates– Final Changes

- Can include extended-year graduation rates, but must include points for 4-year graduation rate as well
  - Must select the same extended-year rate for all schools, cannot use the “best of” rate
    - Chose the 7-year rate
- Cannot use completion rates for identification of AECs for comprehensive support and improvement - low graduation rate category

# Long-Term Goals

# Long-Term Goals– Final Changes

- Achievement
  - Set different interim targets and long-term goals for student groups so that all groups are increasing over time
    - All groups will reach or exceed a mean scale score of 750 within 20 years, using a gap closure model based of 25% every 5 years
- Graduation
  - Set separate 4-year and extended year (7-year only) graduation goals
- English Learner Progress
  - Cut-scores for ELP, timelines to proficiency, and methods for measuring progress towards established targets are now included in plan



# Technical Advisory Panel

- Future Items
- Public Comment
- Close Meeting
  - Next Scheduled Meeting, August 30<sup>th</sup> (Thu), 9-noon at CDE.

