COLORADO
Department of Education

ESSA Accountability Work Group
Other Indicator Decision Point

November 21, 2016

Hello, I would like to begin by welcoming you to the ESSA Accountability Work Group – Other indicator, informational recording. This presentation serves as a brief overview of the work conducted by the Accountability Work Group in regards to the 'Other' Indicator as described within the Every Student Succeeds Act. The primary purpose of this recording is to solicit your feedback regarding the other indicator as we work towards finalizing a state plan that will be submitted to the United States Department of Education next year.

Decision Point

- **Identify viable indicators to implement for the "Other Indicator" under ESSA**
- **Develop short-term recommendations**
- **Identify long-term possibilities**

2

The Accountability Work Group, which is comprised of a wide range of educational stakeholders, has worked to identify possibilities for the 'other indicator' to satisfy the requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act. Based on the desire to ensure our due diligence regarding the appropriateness of our recommendations, the Colorado Department of Education and Accountability workgroup members, have created both short-term and long-term recommendations.

Requirements

ESSA SEC 1005- (c)(4)(B)(v)(II): "may include measures of–
- (III) student engagement;
- (IV) educator engagement;
- (V) student access to and completion of advanced coursework;
- (VI) postsecondary readiness;
- (VII) school climate and safety

3

The Every Student Succeeds Act allows for the inclusion of additional measures to create an 'other' indicator. Approved measures may include: student engagement measures, educator engagement measures, student access to and completion of advanced coursework measures, postsecondary readiness measures, and/or school climate and safety measures.

The proposed regulations for ESSA state, in regards to the other indicator, that CDE:
Must use the same indicator for all schools at a grade level
The indicator must be disaggregated by student group
The indicator must differentiate performance
The indicator must be valid, reliable and comparable
The Proposed regulations require evidence that it increases student academic achievement or graduation rates.
The indicator cannot raise the rating of a school to prevent it from being identified for comprehensive or targeted support.

What We've Heard

Listening Tour and Other Groups:

- As much as possible, keep the framework "the same" – a desire to minimize data burden on districts and schools,
- Consider some type of school climate indicator – as it is important to share out information on parent and student satisfaction, safety, attendance or engagement with schools
- Consider the use of the TELL survey – results from TELL serve as an indicator of educator satisfaction with working conditions at schools

5

In order to help the Accountability work group develop their recommendations, a wide range of feedback was considered to help inform the decision-making process. The most common feedback received included:

As much as possible, keep the framework "the same" – this reflects a desire to minimize data burden on districts and schools; Consider some type of school climate indicator – as it is deemed important to share out information on parent and student satisfaction, safety, attendance or engagement with schools; and last, consider the use of the TELL survey – as the results from TELL serve as an indicator of educator satisfaction with working conditions at schools

Process Used to Narrow the Selection

- Reviewed the ESSA regulations and proposed regulations
- Considered stakeholder input
- Identified *additional* (in addition to ESSA requirements and accountability purpose) guiding principles for sub-indicator selection based on stakeholder input
- Identified 3 general "other" categories (school climate, PWR and social-emotional learning) based on stakeholder input and work being piloted in schools
- Determined feasibility of implementation with pros- and cons-: selected <u>short-term </u>and identified possible <u>long-term </u>indicators that fall under the 3 broader categories
- Outlined considerations for implementing the short-term indicators
- Considered existing research supporting the use of selections
- Outlined a general process for considering possible long-term indicators

6

So what was the process for selection of possible measures and to identify possible areas of focus? The group reviewed the ESSA regulations and proposed regulations, they considered stakeholder input wherever available, they identified *additional* (in addition to ESSA requirements and accountability purpose) guiding principles for sub-indicator selection based on stakeholder input, they identified 3 general "other" categories (school climate, PWR and social-emotional learning) based on stakeholder input and work being piloted in schools, they determined feasibility of implementation with pros- and cons-: selected <u>short-term </u>and identified possible <u>long-term </u>indicators that fall under the 3 broader categories, they outlined considerations for implementing the short-term indicators, they considered existing research supporting the use of selections, and lastly they outlined a general process for considering possible long-term indicators

Short-Term Recommendations by Category

School Climate (for E and M only)
- **Student engagement** – use an improvement sub-indicator that tracks changes in student absenteeism in schools

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness
- **Postsecondary readiness** –graduation rate, dropout rate, matriculation rate, and SAT (already in SPF and DPF)

Social-Emotional Learning
- None deemed to be feasible for 2018 implementation across all schools in the state

7

As mentioned in the previous slide, a set of recommendations for the short-term, which we're considering to be the fall of 2018, and long-term implementation of the 'other indicator' were prepared. Short-term possibilities included student engagement measures at the elementary and middle school levels, along with postsecondary and workforce readiness measures at the high school and district levels. For the long term we would likely expand beyond attendance and would recommend that social-emotional learning measures be considered.

One Sub-Indicator of Student Engagement for Elementary and Middle Schools

School Climate
(E and M only)

- **Student engagement** – use an improvement sub-indicator that tracks changes in student absenteeism in schools

Rationale for selection:

1. Various studies point to strong relationship between measures of attendance with student performance outcomes
2. Standardized attendance data is already collected by CDE from districts and will allow for disaggregated group reporting
3. Actions can be taken at the school-level to work with individual students, parents and guardians to improve behaviors around attendance

8

When looking sat the inclusion of various measures of attendance at the elementary and middle school levels, that is, which serve as a proxy for student engagement, the rationale for inclusion was developed. Three key reasons for including are that, various studies point to strong relationship between measures of attendance with student performance outcomes, Standardized attendance data is already collected by CDE from districts and will allow for disaggregated group reporting, and Actions can be taken at the school-level to work with individual students, parents and guardians to improve behaviors around attendance

One Sub-Indicator of Student Engagement for Elementary and Middle Schools

School Climate (E and M only)

- Student engagement – use an improvement sub-indicator that tracks changes in student absences in schools

▪ Options for reporting on this attendance related sub-indicator for elementary and middle schools:

a. Improving chronic absenteeism rates – Chronic absences defined as at least 10 days of excused and unexcused absences in a school year

b. Improving truancy rates – Habitual truant count defined as at least 10 days of unexcused absences in a school year

c. Improving the lowering of mobility rates – mobility defined as the percentage of students moving between districts or schools within the same year

9

While looking at student engagement measures, it is recognized that various options exist for reporting. One possibility is the use of Improving chronic absenteeism rates with Chronic absences being defined as at least 10 days of excused and unexcused absences in a school year. A second option is the use of Improving truancy rates with Habitual truant count defined as at least 10 days of unexcused absences in a school year. A final possibility is focusing on improving the lowering of mobility rates with mobility being defined as the percentage of students moving between districts or schools within the same year

Considerations for Attendance Related Options

- **Truancy –** not likely to see a lot of variation in rates across schools (applies to attendance rate too)
- **Chronic absences –** can penalize schools with students that have legitimate reasons (e.g., medical leave) for having an excused absence. Decisions would have to be made regarding exceptions (e.g. medical)
- **Mobility –** schools have less control of factors driving mobility, difficult to track accurately and data not currently reported at the disaggregated level
- For the first two options, CDE may need to provide common definitions for "unexcused" vs. "excused" since districts defining these in different ways.

10

A number of considerations would need to be factored into our final choice as each approach may have certain benefits and challenges. In regards to **Truancy** – we're not likely to see a lot of variation in rates across schools this would also apply to overall attendance rates too.   **For Chronic absences** – can penalize schools with students that have legitimate reasons (e.g., medical leave) for having an excused absence. Decisions would have to be made regarding exceptions (e.g. medical) **Last, for Mobility** – schools have less control of factors driving mobility, difficult to track accurately and data not currently reported at the disaggregated level

It should also be noted that for both truancy and chronic absences, CDE may need to provide common definitions for "unexcused" vs. "excused" since districts may define these constructs in different ways.

Option for High School: Leave PWR "as is"

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

- Postsecondary readiness – best of graduation rate, dropout rate, matriculation rate, and SAT (already in SPF and DPF)

Rationale for selection:

1. Adheres to wishes of stakeholder groups to leave PWR "as is" in the frameworks
2. No additional data collection required from districts for 2018 implementation
3. Continues state's interest in evaluating the extent to which high schools and districts are moving students toward postsecondary and workforce readiness

11

Turning to High school in the short term, it is being recommended that the current postsecondary and workforce readiness measures utilized by the state be used to meet the 'other indicator' requirements for high schools and districts. The rationale for this action is that it:

Adheres to wishes of stakeholder groups to leave PWR "as is" in the frameworks
Requires no additional data collection from districts for 2018 implementation
Continues with the state's interest in evaluating the extent to which high schools and districts are moving students toward postsecondary and workforce readiness

Option for High School:
Leave PWR "as is"

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

- Postsecondary readiness – best of graduation rate, dropout rate, matriculation rate, and SAT (already in SPF and DPF)

Considerations:

- Weight assigned to PWR in current frameworks is not consistent with ESSA proposed regulations, this weighting decision should be contested with USED
- Matriculation as currently defined by legislation, should be re-examined to ensure broader definition is considered

12

A few points of consideration for the use of postsecondary and workforce readiness as a short term measures is the recognition that the weight assigned to PWR in our current frameworks is not consistent with the proposed regulations and would likely need to be contested with the U.S. Department of Education. Also, it was expressed that matriculation, as defined by legislation, should be reexamined to ensure that a broader definition is considered.

Educator Satisfaction: TELL Survey

Rationale for not including at this time:

- To preserve integrity and the use of survey or other teacher surveys we believe this should be considered a long-term option
- Inadequate respondent participation for accountability – less than 55% of all educators participate

13

The use of the TELL survey was also considered to satisfy the 'other' indicator requirements. However, it was felt that it should instead be looked at closer when selecting long-term options. In the short-term it was felt that it may have an inadequate response rate for accountability with less than 55% of all educators participating.

Moving on to the long-term possibilities, the current slide reveals suggested areas that the work group felt should be further explored at a later time. Each of these areas will need to be well defined in order to ensure all districts share a common understanding of what is being assessed.

General Process for Considering Long-Term Options

In regards to future process, the subgroup recommends...

- Defining a theory of action for selecting and using any given indicator in this area to support accountability goals
- Ensuring that key principles used to select the short-term indicators apply to the selection of the possible long-term indicators
- That members from the AWG along with any other relevant stakeholders (e.g., parents) are involved with the next set of discussions around considering the long-term possibilities for this other indicator
- Ensuring that clear definitions are developed for each indicator in this new area as a means to identify better measures for evaluating each indicator
- Ensure that a timeline and evaluation plan is defined to evaluate impact and efficacy of selected indicators relative to the theory of action

The last slide of our presentation reflects a recommended process for determining long-term options related to the other indicator. The recommendations include:
Defining a theory of action for selecting and using any given indicator in this area to support accountability goals
Ensuring that key principles used to select the short-term indicators apply to the selection of the possible long-term indicators
That members from the AWG along with any other relevant stakeholders (e.g., parents) are involved with the next set of discussions around considering the long-term possibilities for this other indicator
Ensuring that clear definitions are developed for each indicator in this new area as a means to identify better measures for evaluating each indicator
Ensure that a timeline and evaluation plan is defined to evaluate impact and efficacy of selected indicators relative to the theory of action

Survey Feedback

- In order to improve our recommendations, we're requesting that you complete a brief on-line survey.

- Please click on this link to access the survey:

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

- Thank you for your assistance!

16

We want to thank you for taking the time to watch this informational recording. Also, we would like to request that you complete a brief on-line survey regarding the 'other' indicator. Please access the survey by clicking on or copying the link presented on this slide. Your feedback is critical as we continue work on our ESSA state plan. Thank you for your time and feedback, have a good day.