ESSA Accountability Spoke Committee Decision Point:
Identification and Exit Criteria for School Support & Improvement

For the accompanying survey to give input on the decision points, please visit

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JMFTNVB

November 21, 2016

Context

- **Each SEA must use its statewide accountability based on long-term goals and interim measures on five indicators to meaningfully differentiate schools and identify schools for support and improvement**

Achievement		Growth		ELP Progress	Grad Rate (for HS)	Other Indicator
English Language Arts	Math	English Language Arts	Math	Access Growth	PWR: Grad, Drop-out, Matriculation	When Available

Decision Point

- **What methods and criteria will Colorado use to identify and exit schools for**

  - Comprehensive Support and Improvement

    - Lowest Performing 5% of Title I Schools
    - High schools with graduation rates below 67%
    - Additional Targeted

- **What methods and criteria will Colorado use to identify schools for**

  - Targeted Support and Improvement

    - Any schools with consistently underperforming students group(s)

      - English learners, students with disabilities, students from any major racial or ethnic groups, and students of poverty

> Green font represents decisions needed to develop Colorado's Plan

3

Requirements

For Each Type of School

Requirements: Comprehensive

	Comprehensive Support & Improvement
ESSA Statute	§1111(c)(4)(D)(ii) – starting in 2017-2018, at least once every 3 years, using the statewide accountability system, identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement that include: I. Not less than lowest performing 5% of Title I Schools II. High Schools with graduation rate below 67% III. Additional Targeted Schools that have not met exit criteria in state determined number of years

Proposed Rules on Accountability	§200.19 – Identification of schools
	(a) Comprehensive schools
	    1. Lowest-performing at each grade level (elementary, middle and high)
	    2. High school graduation rate based on 4-year rate
	    3. Chronically low-performing group of students

State Policy	SB-163 (2009) **22-11-102** ~ (1) …an effective system of statewide education accountability is one that…(d) Holds the state, school districts, the institute, and individual public schools accountable for performance on the same set of indicators and related measures statewide, ensures that those indicators and measures are aligned through a single accountability system, to the extent possible, that objectively evaluates the performance of the thorough and uniform statewide system of public education for all groups of students at the state, school district or institute, and individual public school levels, and, as appropriate, rewards success and provides support for improvement at each level. **22-11-403 through 406** ~ Colorado schools shall be assigned one of four plan types: • Performance • Improvement • Priority Improvement • Turnaround

Requirements: Targeted

	Targeted Support & Improvement
Statute	ESSA §1111(c)(4)(C)(iii) – Each SEA must notify LEAs of • Any school in which any group of students is consistently underperforming based on all indicators

Proposed Rules on Accountability	§200.19 – Identification of schools
	(b) Targeted schools
	    1. Consistently underperforming student group(s) identified using the methods described in rules
	    2. Low-performing student group(s) receiving additional targeted support – student group(s) is/are performing at or below the summative level of performance of all students in any school identified as the lowest performing 5%
	(d) Timeline
	    1. Annual identification

Requirements: Additional Targeted

	Additional Targeted Support & Improvement
Statute	ESSA §1111(d)(2)(C) – Each SEA must notify LEAs of any schools • That have a student group that on its own meets the criteria for the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools The improvement plan developed by those schools and their LEAs must address any resource equities Furthermore, schools identified for Additional Targeted Support as stated in §1111(d)(2)(C) will be identified for comprehensive support and improvement if the schools • Are funded under Title I and have not met exit criteria in a state determined number of years

Proposed Rules on Accountability	§200.19 – Identification of schools
	(a) Comprehensive schools
	    1. Lowest-performing at each grade level (elementary, middle and high)
	    2. High school graduation rate based on 4-year rate
	    3. Chronically low-performing student group
	        • Title I school that was identified for additional targeted support (low-performing student group receiving additional targeted support) and has not improved, as defined by the state, after improvement targeted support and improvement for no more than 3 years

Feedback To Date

What We've Heard So Far

- **We have gathered input from**
  - State Board of Education and ESSA Hub Committee
  - CDE's Committee of Practitioners
  - ESSA Listening Tour
  - Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education Stakeholders

> For the complete report from the ESSA Listening Tour visit
> http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essa_ltreport

- **Feedback**
  - Define chronic as 3-5 years; conversely, don't forget about the students within those systems (2-3 years would be more appropriate)
  - Colorado values growth and therefore growth should be weighted heavier in calculations
    - Honoring schools that are making progress is important for culture of the school
  - Don't set criteria such that so many schools are identified that it is not feasible or reasonable to support those schools or that funds available are diluted across too many schools minimizing impact/effectiveness of supports
  - Define consistent based on schools' performance on a minimum of 3 indicators
  - Don't define criteria such that growth on language proficiency of English Learners alone can lead to schools being exited or not being identified; conversely, honor schools that are making linguistic progress for their English learners
  - Select criteria that is transparent and easy to understand by the public (parent friendly, easier to read, public facing ratings)
  - Don't set criteria such that schools are identified differently under state and federal accountability

Decision Points, Options and Recommendations

By School Type

Comprehensive: Lowest Performing 5%

Option #	Option Description	Considerations
What criteria and methods will Colorado use to define lowest performing 5%?		
1	• Use the total percentage of points earned on the Colorado School Performance Frameworks (SPF) to rank schools • Use 3-year aggregated data (3-year SPF rating) • Identify Title I schools in the lowest 5% up to 7% • Identify schools for 3 year designations	• By allowing up to 7% of schools to be identified, it gives the state the discretion to fund as many schools as feasible based on funding • Ensures being able to identify enough schools even if less than 5% earn a particular plan type • Allows for identification of small schools and ensures consistent and chronic low performance • Aligns with ESSA statutory requirement; however, might create misalignment with state accountability
2	• Use the lowest rating on the school performance frameworks (SPFs) - Turnaround Plan Type – to identify schools • Use 3-year aggregated data (3-year SPF rating) • Identify any Title I school that earned a Turnaround Plan Type	• Might result in identifying less than 5% of schools if too few earn a Turnaround Plan Type • Allows for identification of small schools • Aligns with state accountability • Would need to find a way to identify more schools if number of Turnaround drops below 5%

Comprehensive: Lowest Performing 5%

Option #	Option Description	Considerations
How often will Colorado identify schools for comprehensive support?		
1	• **Annually**	• Allows for onboarding schools that decrease in performance each year • Might lead to higher number of schools being identified
2	• Every 3 years	• Fewer schools might get identified • Schools could be low performing for 2-3 years before getting identified
What criteria will Colorado use to exit schools?		
1	School no longer meets identification criteria	• It's simple, transparent and easy to understand and explain

Comprehensive: High Schools with Low Graduation Rates

Option #	Option Description	Considerations
What methods and criteria will Colorado use for identifying high schools with low graduation rates for comprehensive support and improvement?		
1	• **Use 4-year graduation rate, plus the extended year rate** • **Use 3-years of data** • **Identify schools for 3 years**	• **Credits schools for continuing to work with students that do not meet 4-year graduation requirements** • **Credits schools that provide dual enrollment which sometimes leads to delayed HS graduation while students earn college credit paid for by their HS**
2	• Use the 4-year graduation rate only • Use 3-years of data • Identify schools for 3 years	• Will result in identifying higher number of high schools for which the State will not have funds or capacity to support • Does not credit schools that allow dual-enrollment, which often results in students graduating HS in 5 years while earning college credits • Does not credit schools for continuing to work with students that do not qualify for 4-year graduation requirements

Comprehensive: High Schools with Low Graduation Rates

Option #	Option Description	Considerations
How often will Colorado identify high schools with low graduation rates for comprehensive support?		
1	• **Annual identification**	• Allows for onboarding schools that decrease in performance each year • Might lead to higher number of schools being identified
2	• Every 3 years	• Fewer schools might get identified • Schools could be low performing for 2-3 years before getting identified
What criteria will Colorado use to exit high schools?		
1	School no longer meets identification criteria	• It's simple, transparent and easy to understand and explain

Comprehensive: Additional Targeted Schools

Option #	Option Description	Considerations
Any school that has a student group that on its own meets the criteria for lowest performing 5% of schools and has not met the exit criteria within a state determined number of years (chronically, consistently low performing student group(s). *Decision needed:* *How will Colorado define chronic? In other words, how many years is a fair and equitable number of years to allow schools identified for additional targeted support to meet exit criteria before they are identifying as needing comprehensive support and improvement?*		
1	• **3 years**	• Based on feedback from the ESSA Listening Tour and various stakeholders, 3 years seems to be a fair and equitable amount of time to allow schools to improve the performance of any students groups before the school is moved to comprehensive • It allows time for schools to implement strategies that are likely to result in improvement • It makes it more likely that the improvement is sustainable before a decision is made to move or not move the school to another category
What criteria will Colorado use to exit additional targeted schools from comprehensive status?		
1	**School no longer meets identification criteria**	• It's simple, transparent, and easy to understand and explain

Targeted Schools

Option #	Option Description	Considerations
Any school that has at least one student group that is consistently underperforming based on all indicators.		
How will Colorado define "consistently underperforming" using all indicators from §1111(c)(4)(B) and how often?		
Recommended Criteria: On the School Performance Framework (SPF), use the lowest possible rating for all indicators, to determine which schools have not met expectations for each student group; use 3 years of data for identification; identify schools annually		
How will Colorado use "all indicators" in the analyses for identifying schools for targeted support and improvement?		
1	• All possible indicators (each student group must have enough students in an indicator for that group to be included in calculations)	• Very few schools will have enough students in the given student groups on all indicators to be included in the analyses. Therefore, many schools would fall out of the calculations all together.
2	• All available indicators (schools will only be accountable if enough students in all indicators)	• Could result in using only 1 indicator to identify a school, which does not meet the definition of "consistent"
3	• **A minimum of 3 available indicators to be considered consistently underperforming** • **Define consistently underperforming as not meeting expectations (earned a Does Not Meet) on all indicators available for that school**	• **Is more likely to produce a realistic number of schools** • **Using a minimum number of indicators ensures that schools will not be identified based only on one indicator**

Targeted Schools: Issue Unique to English Learners

- **As previously stated, the following indicators are required in the statewide accountability system; however, the English Language Proficiency (ELP) Progress is only used in analyses for schools with a large enough English learner population to be included in the analyses**

Achievement		Growth		ELP Progress	PWR (for HS)	Other Indicator
English Language Arts	Math	English Language Arts	Math	Access Growth	Grad, Drop out, Matriculation	When Available

- **Concern has been raised that using the ELP Progress adds an additional indicator into the calculations for the English learner group, which is not required for any other student group**

- **Statutory requirement to use ELP progress; however, it is a valid concern that we must consider and we continue to work on developing options to address**
  - Proposed Options to date:
    - Use approaching on the ELP indicator instead of Does Not Meet
    - Identify schools for content and language performance separately or use language proficiency as a "check" point
    - Use the length of time ELs are in program as a consideration or part of the calculations
    - Weight language proficiency different than other indicators

17

Input Needed and Next Steps

- **On the survey provided at [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JMFTNVB], you will be asked to provide input on each decision point (green highlighted questions throughout the presentation)**

- **Responses are due by Wednesday, December 14, 2016**