

Accountability in ESSA: Setting the Context

September 27, 2016

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION



Goals of this presentation

- ★ Review accountability requirement under ESSA
- ★ Review our implementation timeline and stakeholder outreach to this point
- ★ Explain our accountability system design principles
- ★ Discuss possible indicators to include in our accountability system
- ★ Discuss our schedule for updating the Board prior to plan submission



Every Student Succeeds Act enacted

- ★ Signed by President Obama 12/10/15
- ★ Reauthorizes the federal Elementary & Secondary Education Act (ESEA)
 - ★ Replaces No Child Left Behind (NCLB)
 - ★ Gives us a new acronym - ESSA
- ★ Maintains certain accountability requirements for schools, which take effect in SY 2017-18
- ★ ESEA/NCLB flexibility waiver expired 8/1/16



Accountability framework under ESSA

- ★ Maintains NCLB's annual testing requirements
- ★ Requires states to incorporate a 95% assessment participation requirement into the accountability system
- ★ Requires system of "annual meaningful differentiation" for all public schools
- ★ Requires states to establish "ambitious state-designed long-term goals" & measures of interim progress, for all students and subgroups including a focus on gap closing



Accountability framework under ESSA

- ★ Requires states to include the following indicators in an accountability system
 - ★ Academic achievement based on annual assessments in ELA, math and science
 - ★ A measure of student growth or progress for elementary and middle schools.
 - ★ Graduation rates for high schools
 - ★ Progress in achieving English proficiency for English language learners
 - ★ At least one measure of school quality or student success



Accountability framework under ESSA

- ★ “Substantial weight” is required to be given to the achievement, progress, ELL proficiency and graduation rate indicators and taken together, they must be given “much greater weight” in the differentiation process than any measures of school quality or student success
- ★ Requires the identification of the lowest performing 5 percent of schools & high schools with graduation rates below 67%
- ★ Requires the identification of schools with low performing subgroups



ESSA accountability transition timeline

Year	Federal context
2015-16	ESEA flexibility waiver <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Current accountability requirements
2016-17	Transition year <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support low performing schools while reconsidering design of system
2017-18	ESSA <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New accountability requirements



Planning for transition to 2017-18



April-July 2016	July-October 2016	October – Dec 2016	Dec 2016 – March 2017
<i>Listening</i>	<i>Modeling</i>	<i>Listening</i>	<i>Revising</i>
External stakeholders ESE staff	ESE staff BESE	External stakeholders ESE staff	External stakeholders ESE staff BESE



Stakeholder feedback

- ★ First “listening” phase was conducted between April and July 2016
- ★ Three modes of stakeholder feedback
 - ★ Online survey
 - ★ Open conference calls
 - ★ Specific group meetings



Stakeholder feedback - survey

- ★ ESE posted an online survey aimed at allowing interested parties to share their thoughts and opinions about the future design of our accountability and assistance system.
- ★ Survey was shared broadly with over 100 stakeholder groups and individuals.
- ★ Over 2,200 responses received with 34% of responses coming from teachers and 20% coming from parents



Stakeholder feedback - calls

- ★ Over 100 different organizations/individuals invited to participate in three calls
 - ★ Advocacy organizations
 - ★ Business community
 - ★ Civil rights organizations
 - ★ Parent organizations
 - ★ Professional education associations
 - ★ Research and education policy organizations
 - ★ Student groups



Stakeholder feedback - meetings

Accountability and Assistance Advisory Council
American Federation of Teachers
College Board
Education researchers and Massachusetts-based policy think tanks
M.A.S.S. Executive Institute
Massachusetts Teachers Association
Network for Education Research and Data
Next Generation MCAS Workgroup
Principals Advisory Cabinet
Rennie Center for Education Research and Policy
Safe and Supportive Schools Commission
State Student Advisory Council
Superintendents Advisory Cabinet
Teachers Advisory Cabinet
TeachPlus
Title I Committee of Practitioners
Urban Leaders Network for School Climate and Student Support
Urban Superintendents Network



Guiding Principles in Design

- ★ System focus on proficiency gap closing & preparing students for success at the next level
- ★ Measures included in the system must be actionable at the district or school level
- ★ System must provide a clear designation or signal to our highest & lowest performing schools
- ★ System must provide clear signal to schools about where improvement is needed to focus efforts
- ★ Measures are supported by research showing evidence of improved student outcomes



Framing questions

- ★ To what extent does an indicator align with ESE goals and mission?
- ★ To what extent does an indicator align with the values of internal and external stakeholders?
- ★ To what extent can the state validly and reliably measure the indicator for all schools or groups of schools?
- ★ To what extent is an indicator actionable at the district or school level?
- ★ To what extent should an indicator be included in the formal accountability system versus being publicly reported in a broader school report card?



Potential indicators for consideration

Core Indicators

- ★ ELA, math and science participation and achievement
- ★ ELA and math growth
- ★ 4/5 year graduation rate
- ★ Annual dropout rate
- ★ English language proficiency results

Additional Indicators

- ★ Conditions for Success
 - ★ Chronic absenteeism (All)
 - ★ Climate and culture (All)
 - ★ 9th grade course passing
 - ★ Annual course-taking (HS)
- ★ Opportunity
 - ★ Access to the arts (All)
 - ★ Access to aspirational curriculum (All)
 - ★ Advanced coursework (HS)



Input and review timeline

Month	Activity
September	BESE meeting to set context and review what we have heard from stakeholders
October November	Finish modeling and gather feedback from external stakeholders through multiple modes
December	BESE meeting to present proposed model incorporating feedback received from the field
January	Revise model based on feedback from BESE
February	Final review of proposed model with BESE
March	Submit ESSA state plan to U.S. Department of Education



QUESTIONS?

