

Academic Achievement in the Every Student Succeeds Act

NGALC Meeting 1
June 29, 2016

Ryan Reyna

ESSA Proposed Regulations: Indicators

Indicator	Key Proposed Regulatory Requirement(s)
Academic proficiency as measured through assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Must equally weight ELA and math• Other subjects may be considered, but do not need to receive same weight• For high schools, indicator may also include growth
Elementary/Middle school academic progress indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Growth on academic assessments or another indicator

Note: all indicators must include at least 3 levels of performance

Challenges of Proficiency

- 100%
- Focus on the bubble
- Narrowing of curriculum
- Limited accounting for prior achievement or improvement
- Cut-score dependent
- Correlation with poverty

Multiple Ways to Address Proficiency

- % Proficient
- Scale
- Performance index
- Weighting subgroup performance
- Improvement
- Competency?

Performance Index Examples

Ohio Performance Index	
Proficiency Level	Weight
Advanced Plus	1.3
Advanced	1.2
Accelerated	1.1
Proficient	1.0
Basic	0.6
Limited	0.3
Tests Not Taken	0.0

Rhode Island Performance Index		
Performance Level	Weight	Added Credit for High Needs
PL 5	1.0	1.25 x 1
PL 4	1.0	1.25 x 1
PL 3	0.66	1.25 x 0.66
PL 2	0.33	1.25 x 0.33
PL 1	0	0

Weighted Subgroup Performance

Subgroup	# student	Actual # Reading Proficient	Actual % Reading Proficient	Equal Weight in reading component	Duplicate Weight in overall grade	Duplicate Weight in reading component	Unique Weight in overall grade	Unique Weight in reading component
All Unique Students	368	212	57.61%	100%	14%	100%	14%	100%
White	29	17	58.62%	9%	0.80%	5.60%	1.13%	7.88%
Black	300	165	55.00%	9%	8.27%	57.92%	11.65%	81.52%
Hispanic	25	19	76.00%	9%	0.69%	4.83%	0.97%	6.79%
Asian	8	6	75.00%	9%	0.22%	1.54%	0.31%	2.17%
Native Am	2	2	100.00%	9%	0.06%	0.39%	0.08%	0.54%
2+ races, not rpt	4	3	75.00%	9%	0.11%	0.77%	0.16%	1.09%
ELL	21	4	19.05%	9%	0.58%	4.05%	Reported, accountable in race groups	Reported, accountable in race groups
SWD	19	4	21.05%	9%	0.52%	3.67%	Reported, accountable in race groups	Reported, accountable in race groups
FRL	110	59	53.64%	9%	3.03%	21.24%	Reported, accountable in race groups	Reported, accountable in race groups
Total Duplicate Students	518	279	53.86%					
Equal Weight	518	279		73.27%				

Looking at Improvement

Status	4				
	3				
	2				
	1				
		1	2	3	4
		Improvement			

Accountability in Northeast – ES/MS

State	ELA	Math	Science	Social Studies	Other
Connecticut	Index – 11% Growth – 11%	Index – 11% Growth – 11%	Index – 11%	Index – 11%	Performance of high needs in each subject and growth in ELA & Math included
Massachusetts	Proficiency – 20% Growth – 20%	Proficiency – 20% Growth – 20%	Proficiency – 20%		Rating based on improvement and extra credit available
Maine	Proficiency – 25% Growth – 25%	Proficiency – 25% Growth – 25%			Performance of high needs in growth in ELA & Math included
New Hampshire	Growth – 30%	Growth – 30%	Index – 10%	Index – 10%	
Rhode Island	Index – 20% Growth – 15%	Index – 20% Growth – 15%			Also gap closure ELA & Math and bonus for high needs students
Vermont	Index - AYP	Index – AYP			Includes bottom achievement level in ELA

Note: All percentages are approximate

Accountability in Northeast – HS

State	ELA	Math	Science	Social Studies	Other
Connecticut	Index – 11%	Index – 11%	Index – 11%	Index – 11%	Performance of high needs in each subject included
Massachusetts	Index – 14% Growth – 14%	Index – 14% Growth – 14%	Index – 14%		Rating based on improvement and extra credit available
Maine	Proficiency – 20% Improvement – 20%	Proficiency – 20% Improvement - 20%			
New Hampshire	Index – 11%	Index – 11%	Index – 11%	Index – 11%	
Rhode Island	Index – 20%	Index – 20%			Also gap closure ELA & Math and bonus for high needs students
Vermont	Index – AYP	Index – AYP			

Note: All percentages are approximate

Questions?

- To what extent should the state include other subjects? Should they receive equal weight as ELA and Math?
- To what extent should the state prioritize assessment performance across the spectrum (vs. only proficiency)? Or is that better addressed through other metrics?
- To what extent should the state balance current year performance vs. performance over time or year-to-year improvement?