



COLORADO
Department of Education

**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

Welcome and thank you for your interest, time, and support on this accountability decision point! This recording will explain the accountability section of the ESSA State Plan pertaining to the methods and criteria Colorado will use to identify and exit schools for support and improvement. The accompanying survey (see link in blue box) can be used to give us input on the decision points being considered about school identification.

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

2



ESSA requires states to use five indicators in its statewide accountability system. Those indicators are listed in the table below and include: Academic Achievement on English language arts and math; Academic Growth on English language arts and math; for English learners, Progress on the English language Proficiency assessment which in Colorado is the WIDA ACCESS; for high schools, postsecondary and workforce readiness indicators which in Colorado include graduation, dropout and matriculation rates; and an other indicator of school quality or student success. Colorado is in the process of identifying the metric that will be used to measure the other indicator, which will be added to the calculations for identifying schools when the data are ready.

The other decision points being considered by the Accountability Spoke will impact the final results of how many schools and which schools get identified for support and improvement. If you are interested in the other decision points, recordings and surveys are available on all other accountability decision points on the same page as this recording.

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

Green font
represents
decisions needed
to develop
Colorado's Plan

- 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

3



In order for Colorado to prepare to develop the accountability section of our plan, we have to address the following decision points:

“What criteria and methods will Colorado use to identify and exit schools for comprehensive support and improvement? And what criteria and methods will Colorado use to identify schools for targeted support and improvement”

There are 3 categories of comprehensive schools: any title I schools performing in lowest five percent, high schools with a graduation rate below 67% and any school identified for additional targeted support, which means that the school has at least one group that meets the definition of the lowest performing 5% on its own and has not met the state’s exit criteria in a state determined number of years.

Schools must be identified for targeted support and improvement if the school has at least one group of students that is consistently underperforming. The student groups that must be considered in our methods for identifying schools are English learners, students with disabilities, students from any major racial or ethnic groups, and students of poverty. Therefore, when we refer to student group, student groups, or groups of students within this presentation, we are referring to these four student groups.

The green font in this slide and the ones to follow represents the decisions needed in order for us to develop our plan. As you will note, some finer decisions will be

necessary, in order to be in a position to respond to these major decision points.

Before we get started, please keep in mind that there are some differences in what identification means for each type of school. Comprehensive schools will need to submit improvement plans to CDE for review and approval. The state must oversee and support the improvement of schools identified for comprehensive support. The local educational agencies (or districts) will be responsible for the oversight of the targeted schools' improvement plans and determining their exit criteria and timeline for exiting. However, the state does need to establish the length of time schools identified for additional targeted will be allowed to meet exit criteria before they become comprehensive schools.

Requirements

For Each Type of School



Let's first learn about the requirements for each type of school.

Requirements: Comprehensive

Comprehensive Support & Improvement	
ESSA Statute	<p>§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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>§200.19 – Identification of schools</p> <p>(a) Comprehensive schools</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>SB-163 (2009)</p> <p><u>22-11-102</u> ~ (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.</p> <p><u>22-11-403 through 406</u> ~ Colorado schools shall be assigned one of four plan types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance • Improvement • Priority Improvement • Turnaround

ESSA requires each state to identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement starting with the 2017-2018 school year and at least once every 3 years thereafter. More frequently (such as each year) would be allowed; however, less frequently (such as once every five years) would not be allowed under the statute. This category of schools must include:

- I. At least the lowest performing 5% of Title I Schools
- II. All high Schools with graduation rate below 67%
- III. Additional Targeted Schools that have not met exit criteria in state determined number of years

In May 2016, the USDE proposed rules to regulate accountability under ESSA which should be finalized in the near future. Once the rules are finalized, they might impact these decisions. Therefore, we will have to revisit the methodology and criteria being developed for the ESSA State Plan at that time. The next 3 slides include examples of potential changes for your reference.

Under state policy, we identify schools into four different categories which does align with ESSA, with the lowest category being called Turnaround.

Requirements: Targeted

Targeted Support & Improvement	
Statute	ESSA §1111(c)(4)(C)(iii) – Each SEA must notify LEAs of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently underperforming student group(s) identified using the methods described in rules 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 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Annual identification

6



Each state that accepts funds under ESSA must notify local educational agencies or districts of any school in which one or more student groups is consistently underperforming based on all indicators.

As a reminder the required indicators are academic achievement on English language arts and math assessments, growth on English language arts and math assessments, progress on the English language proficiency assessment (for English language learners only), postsecondary and workforce readiness indicator (for high school students only), and when available the other indicator of school quality or student success.

Requirements: Additional Targeted

Additional Targeted Support & Improvement	
Statute	<p>ESSA §1111(d)(2)(C) – Each SEA must notify LEAs of any schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That have a student group that on its own meets the criteria for the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools <p>The improvement plan developed by those schools and their LEAs must address any resource equities</p> <p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are funded under Title I and have not met exit criteria in a state determined number of years
Proposed Rules on Accountability	<p>§200.19 – Identification of schools</p> <p>(a) Comprehensive schools</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

7



ESSA requires that the state educational agency notify local educational agencies (or districts) 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 LEA or district must work with the schools identified for additional targeted support and improvement to address any resource inequities within their improvement plan.

ESSA also requires, schools identified for additional targeted support to 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

Feedback To Date



We will briefly discuss what we have heard from various stakeholders to date about this aspect of accountability.

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

9



To date, we have gathered input from the State Board of Education, the ESSA Hub Committee, from the Listening Tour, the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education Stakeholders, and CDE's Committee of Practitioners

A high level summary of the feedback includes, recommendations that we should Define "chronic" as 3-5 years. We have also been requested to not forget about the students within those systems, stating that 2-3 years would be a more appropriate timeline before more rigorous interventions are required

Continue to value growth and therefore growth should be weighted heavier in calculations

Comments were included to suggest that honoring schools that are making progress is important for school culture

Not set criteria such that too many schools are identified to effectively support or so that funds available are diluted across too many schools minimizing impact/effectiveness of supports

Define "consistently underperforming" based on schools' performance on a minimum of 3 indicators

Don't use the language proficiency of English Learners alone to keep schools

from being identified if their English learners are underperforming on content; conversely, we've been requested to honor schools that are making linguistic progress for their English learners

Select criteria that is transparent and easy to understand by the public (suggestions have been made to create 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



Next, we will discuss the decisions needed for each type of school. We will also discuss the options created by the small group working on this decision point. When a recommendation is being put forth, that recommendation is presented in bold font.

Comprehensive: Lowest Performing 5%

Option #	Option Description	Considerations
<i>What criteria and methods will Colorado use to define lowest performing 5%?</i>		
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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%

11



As you will recall, there are 3 types of schools that must be identified for comprehensive support and improvement. The first one we'll discuss is the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools and how those schools will be identified and exited.

The Accountability Spoke small group that worked on this aspect of accountability considered two options. Both options that were considered are listed on this slide and the recommendation is in bold font. The considerations column lists the factors that need to be considered in making a final decision.

ESSA requires the use of a summative score to rate schools and identify the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools on that summative score, based on all indicators that we have been discussing so far.

In the Colorado's statewide accountability system, all schools get a percentage of points earned on the indicators and they are also assigned a plan type on the School Performance Framework or SPF. The small group discussed and considered using each of them. Using the percentage of points would allow us to always meet the minimum 5% requirement, whereas using the turnaround plan type might not produce a minimum of 5% of schools in some years. Therefore, it is recommended that we use the percentage of points earned.

It is also recommended that we use 3-year aggregated data so a larger amount of data

is used for identification.

It is also recommended for schools to maintain the comprehensive status for three years to allow the school to implement strategies that are likely to result in sustainable improvements.

Comprehensive: Lowest Performing 5%

Option #	Option Description	Considerations
<i>How often will Colorado identify schools for comprehensive support?</i>		
1	• Annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for onboarding schools that decrease in performance each year • Might lead to higher number of schools being identified
2	• Every 3 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer schools might get identified • Schools could be low performing for 2-3 years before getting identified
<i>What criteria will Colorado use to exit schools?</i>		
1	School no longer meets identification criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's simple, transparent and easy to understand and explain

12



The first question on this slide pertains to **how often** Colorado will conduct the analyses to identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement. ESSA requires that schools are identified for comprehensive at least every 3 years; therefore, the options would be every year, every other year, or every three years. Identifying schools every other year does not align with any other accountability timelines and was therefore eliminated as an option. Colorado School Performance Frameworks are developed annually. Only identifying schools once every 3 years would leave some schools lingering with low performance for the years in between identification cycles.

Therefore, the recommendation is to identify schools annually. We do need to consider that this method might produce a higher number of schools than 5%, as more schools are added each year, but maintain their status for 3 years. This might pose a potential problem with identification of more schools than the state could feasibly support.

The last question about the lowest performing category of schools is to determine what criteria the state will use to exit schools from this status. The recommendation is to consider a school as having met exit criteria, if after the 3 years, the school no longer meets the identification criteria. This method is easy to understand and to explain. It is also transparent and provides predictability for schools to know that they have 3 years to develop and implement sustainable improvements.

Comprehensive: High Schools with Low Graduation Rates

Option #	Option Description	Considerations
<i>What methods and criteria will Colorado use for identifying high schools with low graduation rates for comprehensive support and improvement?</i>		
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use 4-year graduation rate, plus the extended year rate Use 3-years of data Identify schools for 3 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use the 4-year graduation rate only Use 3-years of data Identify schools for 3 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

13



The second category of comprehensive schools are the high schools identified for low graduation rates.

The needed decisions are:

- What methods and criteria will Colorado use for identifying high schools with low graduation rates for comprehensive support and improvement?
- How often will Colorado identify high schools with low graduation rates for comprehensive support?
- What exit criteria will be used to determine if high schools are no longer in need of comprehensive support?

For the first question, ESSA allows use of both the 4-year and extended year; but the proposed rules require use of 4-year graduation rate only. Again, Colorado will have to revisit this criteria to check for alignment with the rules once they are finalized.

For now, we propose using the 4-year, plus the extended year rate, because it gives credit to schools that continue to work with students that need longer than 4 years to graduate – for example, dual enrollment student who are earning college credit while in high school or students with disabilities. Also, using only 4-year graduation rates is likely to inflate the number of high schools identified and would result in a higher number of schools than the state has the capacity or funds to appropriately support.

It is recommended to use 3 years of data to ensure that the low graduation rate is a consistent concern before a school is identified for comprehensive support.

Comprehensive: High Schools with Low Graduation Rates

Option #	Option Description	Considerations
<i>How often will Colorado identify high schools with low graduation rates for comprehensive support?</i>		
1	• Annual identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for onboarding schools that decrease in performance each year • Might lead to higher number of schools being identified
2	• Every 3 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer schools might get identified • Schools could be low performing for 2-3 years before getting identified
<i>What criteria will Colorado use to exit high schools?</i>		
1	School no longer meets identification criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's simple, transparent and easy to understand and explain



Next we'll consider how often Colorado should identify high schools. Annual identification will allow onboarding of schools that decrease in their graduation rates, but not allow schools to languish in between identification cycles. It is also consistent with the frequency recommended for identifying the lowest performing 5%.

Just as with the lowest performing schools, it is recommended that after 3 years, high schools be exited if they no longer meet the identification criteria. This method is transparent, easy to understand and explain.

Comprehensive: Additional Targeted Schools

Option #	Option Description	Considerations
<p>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)).</p> <p>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?</p>		
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<p>What criteria will Colorado use to exit additional targeted schools from comprehensive status?</p>		
1	School no longer meets identification criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's simple, transparent, and easy to understand and explain

15



The final category of comprehensive schools is the additional targeted, which by statute are 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 (in other words, schools that have chronic and consistent low performance for a group or groups of students).

Therefore, the decision point for this category is for Colorado to determine how we define **chronic**. In other words, how many years is a fair and equitable number of years to allow identified schools to meet exit criteria before they are considered in need of comprehensive support?

Stakeholders that have weighed in on this decision point, so far, have identified a range of 3 to 5 years as a fair and equitable number of years to allow schools to implement strategies that are likely to improve the performance of any student groups. Some stakeholders have expressed concern that waiting 4 or 5 five years before more rigorous interventions are required might leave schools struggling for too long. Most input has overwhelmingly indicated that anything shorter than 2 years would give schools too little time to impact the performance of any student group. Lastly, 3 years would allow time to sustain improvements before the category of the school is changed.

Therefore, it is recommended that additional targeted schools that continue to have at

least one student group in the lowest performing 5% for 3 consecutive years be re-identified as in need of comprehensive support and improvement.

Just as with other school types, it is recommended that any school that no longer meets the identification criteria (or is not in the lowest performing 5% for a given student group) should be exited from this status.

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All possible indicators (each student group must have enough students in an indicator for that group to be included in calculations) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All available indicators (schools will only be accountable if enough students in all indicators) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could result in using only 1 indicator to identify a school, which does not meet the definition of “consistent”
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

16



The final category of schools that have to be identified are targeted schools, which is any school with at least one student group that is consistently underperforming based on all indicators.

Two decisions are needed pertaining to targeted schools:

How will Colorado define “consistently underperforming” using all indicators **and** how often?

In Colorado, the School Performance Frameworks (SPFs) calculate a percentage of points for each student group on each indicator, which can be used to identify the schools that earned a Does Not Meet (DNM) or has not met expectations for any of the student groups. Just as with other school types and for the same reasons, it is recommended that we use 3 years of data for identification of schools and we identify schools annually.

However, identifying the schools that earned a DNM on each indicator will require an additional decision about how we include “all indicators” in the analyses. There are 3 ways we could include “all indicators”: we could use all available indicators, all possible indicators or a minimum of available indicators.

Using all possible indicators would result in identification of schools, only when each student group has enough students on each and every indicator to be included in the

analyses. Using this method would eliminate any schools from the calculations that do not meet the minimum number of students within a group on that indicator. In other words, most schools would be eliminated – not because they meet expectations for students, but due to small counts of students in that student group.

Using all available indicators would result in including schools in the calculations only for the indicators for which they have a minimum number of students. Therefore, a school could be identified, for example, for not meeting expectations (earning a DNM) for English learners on academic achievement only, if that is the only available indicator for that student group. The concern with this method would be that it results in schools being identified for not meeting the expectations for a student group based on their performance on only one indicator; which would not be considered “consistently” underperforming.

Therefore, it is recommended that we:

- Use the School Performance Framework (SPF) indicator calculations for each student group
- Only include schools that have enough students from a given student group on a minimum of 3 indicators
- Identify any school that has earned a Does Not Meet (DNM) on all of the indicators available for that school for each student group (note: a school could be included in the analyses and be identified for one or more student groups)

Just a reminder that once targeted schools are identified, the local educational agency or the district oversees their improvement efforts and determines how many years before more rigorous interventions are needed. In other words, the district decides how and when to exit schools from this status. Therefore the state does not have any decisions to be made about exit criteria or timeline for exiting targeted schools.

Some stakeholders have expressed concerns with using DNM on the English language proficiency indicator, which is further discussed on the next slide.

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



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

Stakeholders representing English learners have raised concerns 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

Using progress on English language proficiency for English learners is a statutory requirement; however, it is a valid concern that we must consider and continue to work on to develop options to address this concern

To date, the following options have been suggested as potential solutions:

- Use approaching on the ELP indicator instead of Does Not Meet
- Identify schools for content and language performance separately or not include language proficiency as an indicator in the analyses, but rather as a check point to see if a school is also failing to meet the linguistic needs of students (language proficiency would not be used for identification, but schools would be notified if language proficiency is a concern)
- Use the length of time English learners are in program as part of the calculations

- Weight language proficiency different than other indicators

There are pros and cons for each potential option and details remain to be worked out. Using a different level of expectations for language proficiency or a different weight in and of themselves create concern. It might be inequitable to identify schools based on language proficiency alone. These issues are still under consideration and we welcome and would appreciate your input or suggestions for how best to address this concern.

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

18



We would greatly appreciate your input by responding to the questions on the survey. Please click on the link provided on this page or back on the website to go to the survey.

We would like your input on each of the decision points covered in this recording. Specifically, each of the green highlighted questions covered in this presentation. Responses are due by Wednesday, December 14, 2016

Thank you for listening to this recording. And thank you in advance for your input on these decision points. We sincerely appreciate your time and help.