ESSA Accountability Work Group Decision Point:
Long-Term Goals and Interim Targets

Public Survey Respondents

- 83% (71) educators
- 14% (12) parents
- 13% (11) members of public
- 5% (4) members of Hub Committee

- 45% (38) suburban
- 30% (25) rural
- 25% (21) urban

How will Colorado measure interim progress and progress toward long-term goals?

☐ Set targets based on mean scale scores

- Hub: 12 of 17 votes

- Public: 48 of 87 recommended; 20 did not recommend (3.37 on 5-point scale)

☐ Set targets based on the percentage of students at specific performance levels

- Hub: No votes

- Public:

How should Colorado establish graduation rate targets?

❑ Take into consideration the 4-year <u>and</u> extended-year, adjusted cohort graduation rates

▪ Hub: 11 of 17 votes

▪ Public: 73 of 86 recommended; 7 did not recommend (4.23 on 5-point scale)

❑ Base on the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate <u>only</u> (exclude extended-year rates)

▪ Hub: 1 of 17 votes

How should Colorado set long-term goals?

❑ Base on cut-scores informed by historical data (e.g., percentile ranks)

- Hub: 8 or 17 votes
- Public: 44 of 84 recommend; 16 do not recommend. (3.37 on a 5-point scale).

❑ Base on theoretical criteria (e.g., a specific percentage of students should be able to meet PARCC achievement objectives, all students should graduate in 4 years)

- Hub: no votes

Establishing Interim Targets

❑ Same interim targets for all students and all disaggregated groups

  ▪ Hub: 3 of 17 votes

  ▪ Public: 10 of 85

❑ Different interim targets based on starting point of disaggregated groups (with same long-term goal)

  ▪ Hub: 5 of 17 votes

  ▪ Public: 75 of 85

Frequency of Interim Target increases

❑ Raise interim targets every year

- ▪ Hub: 2 of 17 votes
- ▪ Public: 20 of 85

❑ Raise interim targets every 2 (or 3) years

- ▪ Hub: 10 of 17 votes
- ▪ Public: 65 of 85

Timeline to reach long-term goals: group recommended 5-10 years

Based on the public's responses, anything from 3 to 7 years is preferred, with 5 years getting most votes.

years	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
# votes	3	10	5	30	9	9	2		6		1

Comments from Hub Committee Members

Regarding targets based on mean scale scores

- Initially favorable; leaning this way
- Mean scale score has big benefits
- Can we find a way to do both options?
- Would like to know how median would impact results versus mean.
- Important to focus on each student, regardless of performance level.
- Is there an indication of how likely we are to get through ED?

Regarding 4-year and extended-year grad rates

- Agree
- Fits our system and kids better. We just want kids to graduate
- Use this to include all students
- Education should offer sufficient time as needed by the student with their education development

Regarding long-term goals based on historical data

- Like this option best
- Concern about lack of longitudinal data to inform this; want a caveat in the draft plan to provide the state the ability to refine these targets once historical data becomes available
- Needs more urgency around student performance
- If cut scores are rigorous, then ok
- Concerned that we won't set bar high enough; concerned that reliance on past data could result in bar being set too low. Ambitions goals are best for kids; should focus on how to make them more attainable

Regarding raising interim targets

- How do you incentivize schools/districts to improve if it's constantly changing?
- Interim: longer better
- Is there something in between these two?
- Every 2 years seems like good middle ground

Comments from Public

Regarding time to reach long-term goals

- 3 years should be the maximum for longer-term goals; however schools can request a 2-year extension with justification for what they will do DIFFERENTLY to achieve.

- You need to have consistent targets and sustain the same targets for 5-7 years.

- A 5-7 year timeline has value for examining effects of interventions put in place in middle school to impact graduation rate. My non-profit was able to produce a 32% jump in HS graduation rate, to 96%; but I was only able to see it when I looked at years after they exited the program

Frequency of raising interim targets

- Too many factors can change to support good data with a one-year change (Administrators can leave, funding issues, etc.)

- Every year is too frequent; need some consistency to help educators keep track of progress more meaningfully.

- A single year might be an anomaly and not accurate data

- Is there a monetary cost to establish or raise targets? Will it take different/more people to monitor students and determine if they are meeting their goals?

- Raising targets every year creates a moving target; 2-3 years allows for adjustments, investigation into research, etc.

- 2-3 years is preferable so schools/districts can seriously engage in long-term UIP planning and not be constantly seeking a moving target.

Regarding mean scores

- Prefer median scale score to mean. With smaller Ns, median is a better measure; a few under-performing students in a group of 25 can distort the mean and hide an effective program

- Proficiency standards articulate what we expect every student should know/be able to do. Our accountability systems must be indexed to these standards.

  - Basing targets on mean scores allows under-performing students in high-performing schools/districts to slip through the cracks.

  - Despite mean's greater sensitivity to small changes, cannot support their exclusive use as primary accountability measure. Means could be used in conjunction with proficiency rates to balance small improvements in performance with the imperative that schools serve all students.

Regarding targets based on percentile ranks informed by historical data

- Long-term goals in terms of percentiles are not commensurate with the belief that Colorado proficiency standards articulate the content all students need to master. It masks how far the system is from in educating all students. We need to examine historical data to set ambitious yet attainable targets, but targets need to be grounded in student proficiency.

- We have come full circle and appear to be recreating AYP, with a metric of scaled scores rather than "theoretical criteria," which came from educators who reviewed the state assessments and defined grade-level expectations based on their expertise around content standards. If the accountability system does not fully reference students meeting expectations, we ignore the contribution of educators and rely on statisticians to create metrics that define achievement.

- There should be targets for how many students reach proficiency along with means. Both must be reported annually.

Regarding interim goals

- We want high standards for all groups during the interim period. Setting lower bars for some groups sends the wrong message and may encourage a "hockey stick" effect at the end (spending on consequences of not meeting interim targets).

- Communicating expectations to the general public is crucial; keep it as simple as possible

- We are all trying to meet the same end targets. If they are lowered based on starting point, some would never get there.

- Comments included setting different long-term goals:

  - Why can't we have differentiated interim targets AND long term goals?

  - Goals should be based on a norm and set individually for each school instead of setting the same targets for all schools. Schools have their own needs and their goals should factor in current performance and set goals accordingly.

  - Would like to see differentiated long-term goals. As a teacher, it is best practice to differentiate for different learners in my class. Yes, it is more work...but education is not a one size fits all. Neither should our reporting be. Each district and school has different needs, different demographics...why is our reporting not reflecting this?

Comments Regarding Grad Rates

- Very concerned about graduation guidelines only focusing on graduation certificates, not alternative pathways for students with disabilities, after the state has worked hard to provide LEAs with some very solid recommendations that support students with disabilities.